



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

Citation: Shore v Marsilla, 2026 ONLTB 51366

Date: 2026-06-29

File Number: LTB-T-067218-24-RV

In the matter of: Main, 1864 LARKSMERE CRT
PICKERING ON L1V6E4

Between: Sara Shore Tenant
Metaya Shore

And

Margaret Marsilla Landlord
Joseph Carpara

And

Sara Shore Former
Metaya Shore Tenant

Review Order

Sara Shore and Metaya Shore (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Margaret Marsilla and Joseph Carpara (the 'Landlord') :

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- altered the locking system on a door giving entry to the rental unit or residential complex without giving the Tenant replacement keys.
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant.

The Tenants also applied for an order determining that the Landlords failed to meet the Landlords' maintenance obligations under the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 (the 'Act') or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards.

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-067218-24 issued on May 28, 2026.

On June 27, 2026, the Tenant, Sara Shore, requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing.

Determinations:

1. The Tenant alleges that the order contains a serious error. For the reasons that follow, the request to review is denied.
2. The entirety of the Tenant's request reflects a disagreement with the remedies ordered by the Member. The Tenant submits that the remedies were unjust and that their viva voce evidence was not considered. However, the order clearly identifies the evidence considered and explains the basis upon which the Member granted or dismissed the requested remedies.

3. Interpretation Guideline 8 - Review of an Order states:

A review is not an appeal or an opportunity to change the way a case was presented. The purpose of the review process is not to provide parties with an opportunity of presenting a better or different case than they did at first instance. There is nothing in the record or in the request for review to support a determination that the Member applied improper principles in assessing the evidence introduced or that there was insufficient evidence before the Board to support its conclusions. I would not interfere with the assessment of the evidence by the Member of first instance, who had the opportunity of observing the witnesses and of hearing the evidence in its totality. [TSL-51694-14-IN-RV \(Re\)](#), 2015 CanLII 23959 (ON LTB) at para 10.

4. The Tenant's disagreement with the Member's determinations is not sufficient grounds for review. There is no indication that the Member applied improper principles in assessing the evidence introduced in this case or that there was insufficient evidence before the Board to support the Member's conclusions.
5. Based on 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. As a result, the review must be denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-067218-24 issued on May 28, 2026 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.