



## Order under Section 21.2 of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

**Citation:** Woodward v Pilon, 2026 ONLTB 33651

**Date:** 2026-04-27

**File Number:** LTB-L-026499-25-RV

**In the matter of:** 411, 391 Main St. North  
MOUNT FOREST ON N0G2L1

**Between:** Karlee Woodward Landlord

**And**

Michele Pilon Tenant

### Review Order

**This order was intended to be issued on April 27, 2026.**

Karlee Woodward (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Michele Pilon (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-026499-25 issued on July 4, 2025.

On April 10, 2026, the Landlord requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the materials in the LTB's file as well as the audio recording for this hearing.

### Determinations:

1. The order under review was made on consent, with both parties agreeing to its terms.
2. The Landlord's request for review alleges that the order contains a serious error on the basis that it fails to name an additional lawful tenant, incorrectly identifies the property manager as the Landlord, and misapplies the last months rent deposit.
3. I listened to the hearing recording. Both the Landlord and the Tenant were present. The order accurately reflects the terms agreed to by the parties at the hearing. At no time did either party raise any concerns regarding the alleged misidentification of the Landlord or the omission of an additional Tenant from the order.
4. The Hearing Officer confirmed the terms of the agreement on the record, and neither party objected to those terms. The Landlord had the opportunity at that time to raise any concerns or request amendments to the terms but did not do so.

5. The Divisional Court has stated that “parties ought not to be easily able to revisit Board orders that have been made on consent. The effective resolution of matters that come before the Board will be greatly impaired if parties can continually seek to revisit issues that they have earlier agreed to resolve.” (Trust Construction Corporation v. McKie, 2017 ONSC 4702)
6. The Divisional Court also stated that “The policy of the courts is to promote settlement. The discretion to refuse to enforce a settlement should be exercised rarely...agreements, and joint submissions, are serious and they should not be easy to simply overturn. To allow parties, after the fact, to raise claims they could have or allow second thoughts after an agreement is struck would cause unnecessary waste on our Tribunals and Courts. No one, even with an order, would feel safe to rely on what has been agreed to. This would not be a just result.” (*Gent v. IMH Pool III LP*, 2017 ONSC 7230 CanLII).
7. In the circumstances, there is no reason to revisit the order. The Landlord’s concerns relate to matters that were within their own control and do not establish an error on the part of the Board.
8. With respect to the allegation regarding the application of the last month’s rent deposit, the Board’s records indicate that an amended order addressing this issue was issued on April 24, 2026. Accordingly, this issue has been resolved and is now moot. It was therefore not considered in my determination.
9. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings. The Landlord’s request for review is denied.

**It is ordered that:**

1. The request to review order LTB-L-026499-25 issued on July 4, 2025 and April 24, 2026, as amended, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

**June 29, 2026**  
**Date Issued**

---

Mayra Sawicki  
Member, Landlord and Tenant Board

15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor  
Toronto ON M7A 2G6

If you have any questions about this order, call 416-645-8080 or toll free at 1-888-332-3234.