

CONDOMINIUM AUTHORITY TRIBUNAL

DATE: January 6, 2025

CASE: 2024-00333R

Citation: Ebegbuzie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 1151, 2025 ONCAT 4

Order under section 1.44 of the *Condominium Act, 1998*.

Member: Mary Ann Spencer, Member

The Applicant,

Beverly Ebegbuzie

Self-Represented

The Respondent,

Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 1151

Represented by Shan Liu, Agent

Hearing: Written Online Hearing – October 16, 2024, to December 23, 2024

REASONS FOR DECISION

A. INTRODUCTION

- [1] The Applicant, Beverly Ebegbuzie, is the owner of a unit of Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 1151 (“MTCC 1151” or the “corporation”). On May 9, 2024, she submitted a Request for Records to the corporation. She alleges that it has failed to provide her with all of the records responsive to that request and that it is failing to keep adequate records, contrary to section 55 (1) of the *Condominium Act, 1998* (the “Act”). She requests that the Tribunal order MTCC 1151 to provide her with the outstanding records. She also requests that MTCC 1151 be assessed a penalty for failing to provide records without reasonable excuse and that the members of its board of directors be ordered to take refresher training with respect to their obligations under the Act. Finally, she requests reimbursement of the \$200 she paid in Tribunal fees.
- [2] MTCC 1151 maintains that it has provided all of the records in its possession that are responsive to the Request for Records and requests that Ms. Ebegbuzie be ordered to pay \$180, the costs it incurred to produce them. It made no submission

with respect to Ms. Ebegbuzie's allegation that it was failing to keep adequate records.

- [3] I find that MTCC 1151 did not provide Ms. Ebegbuzie with the records responsive to her request within the timeframes set out in Ontario Regulation 48/01 ("O. Reg. 48/01"). While the corporation has now provided Ms. Ebegbuzie with all of the responsive records in its possession, I find that its initial refusal to provide a complete core record and its delay in providing non-core records amount to a refusal to provide records without reasonable excuse. In this regard, I assess a penalty of \$500. I also order MTCC 1151's directors to take Module 6, Corporate Records, of the Condominium Authority of Ontario's director training. Finally, I order MTCC 1151 to reimburse Ms. Ebegbuzie \$200 in respect of her Tribunal fees.

B. BACKGROUND

- [4] Ms. Ebegbuzie experienced water leaking into her bathroom ceiling on February 29, 2024, April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024. She testified that when the ceiling was cut open following the April 17, 2024, leak, mould was discovered. The mould was remediated on June 13, 2024. Because the mould was not being addressed as promptly as she wished, on May 9, 2024, she submitted a Request for Records to the corporation. She requested electronic copies of the following records with the date range of February 29, 2024, to May 9, 2024:

Core Records:

1. The Record of Owners and Mortgagees.

Non-Core Records:

1. All Incident Reports related to the investigation of water leaks reported by [Applicant's unit number redacted by the Tribunal] including water leaks that occurred on February 29, 2024, April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024.
2. Report(s) from ZG Golden King Plumbing for water leaks occurred in [Applicant's unit number redacted by the Tribunal] on February 29, 2024, April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024.
3. Original (i.e. first) quotation from ZG Golden King Plumbing outlining quote for water damage that occurred to [Applicant's unit number redacted by the Tribunal] on February 29, April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024.
4. Any additional quotations from ZG Golden King Plumbing outlining quote for

water damage that occurred to [Applicant's unit number redacted by the Tribunal] on February 29, April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024.

- [5] On May 16, 2024, Ms. Ebegbuzie e-mailed Christina Gobind, MTCC 1151's condominium manager at that time, and requested a status update, noting that it had been seven days since she had requested the Record of Owners and Mortgagees. Ms. Ebegbuzie appears to have misunderstood the requirements set out in section 13 of O. Reg. 48/01. A corporation has 30 days to respond to a Request for Records. The seven day timeframe applies only in relation to a request for a paper copy of a core record which does not apply in this case. Nevertheless, Ms. Gobind e-mailed a Board Response to Request for Records form and a version of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees to Ms. Ebegbuzie on May 16, 2024. The Board Response form only addressed the Record of Owners and Mortgagees.
- [6] Ms. Ebegbuzie's application to the Tribunal was accepted on May 28, 2024.
- [7] On July 18, 2024, Shan Liu, MTCC 1151's current condominium manager and its representative in this matter, provided some non-core records to Ms. Ebegbuzie. During the Stage 2 – Mediation in this matter, he provided an amended version of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees and additional non-core records which MTCC 1151 maintains are the only ones in its possession which are responsive to Ms. Ebegbuzie's request.

C. ISSUES & ANALYSIS

- [8] The issues to be decided in this matter are:
 - 1. Has the Applicant received all the records to which she is entitled?
 - 2. Are the records which the Applicant received from the Respondent adequate within the meaning of section 55 (1) of the Act?
 - 3. Did the Respondent refuse to provide records without a reasonable excuse? If so, should a penalty be awarded, and in what amount?
 - 4. Is either party entitled to costs or filing fees?
- [9] Ms. Ebegbuzie's position is that some of the records she received are incomplete and therefore she contends that MTCC 1151 is failing to maintain adequate records. Because the issue of adequacy is directly related to the completeness of the records Ms. Ebegbuzie has received, I am addressing the issues of receipt and adequacy of the records together in this decision.

[10] Ms. Ebegbuzie expressed some concern in her submission about the delay in the remediation of the mould in her bathroom ceiling, the quality of the subsequent repairs, and what she indicated was a failure of the corporation to provide her with advance notice of any repair costs which would be charged to her. However, the Tribunal's jurisdiction, which is established in Ontario Regulation 179/17, does not extend to these issues and they will not be addressed in this decision. She also submitted a number of documents related to quotes for mould remediation and repairs to her unit which she received in response to a further Request for Records she submitted to the corporation. While she raised issues about the completeness and adequacy of those records, that Request for Records is not before me and therefore I am not addressing it in this decision.

Issues 1 and 2: Has the Applicant received all the records to which she is entitled? Are the records which the Applicant received from the Respondent adequate within the meaning of section 55 (1) of the Act?

[11] Section 55 (1) of the Act states, "the corporation shall keep adequate records" and sets out a list of the records which must be kept. However, the word "adequate" is not defined in the Act. In *McKay v. Waterloo North Condominium Corp. No. 23*, 1992 CanLII 7501 (ON SC), a case which addressed the entitlement of owners to access corporation records, Cavarzan J. provides some guidance:

The Act obliges the corporation to keep adequate records. One is impelled to ask – adequate for what? An examination of the Act provides some answers. The objects of the corporation are to manage the property and any assets of the corporation (s. 12 (1)). It has a duty to control, manage and administer the common elements and the assets of the corporation (s. 12 (2)). It has a duty to effect compliance by the owners with the Act, the declaration, the by-laws and the rules (s. 12 (3)). Each owner enjoys the correlative right to the performance of any duty of the corporation specified by the Act, the declaration, the by-laws and the rules. The records of the corporation must be adequate, therefore, to permit it to fulfil its duties and obligations.

The question of adequacy is determined by whether the records are sufficient to enable the corporation to meet its obligations and not by whether they meet the specific purposes or expectations an owner may have in requesting them.

Core Item 1 – Record of Owners and Mortgagees

[12] The Record of Owners and Mortgagees which Ms. Ebegbuzie received on May 16, 2024, was not in accordance with the requirements set out in section 46. 1 (3) of the Act, which requires a corporation to maintain a record of an owner's name, unit

number, and address for service if that address is in Ontario. The Act also requires the corporation to keep a record of an owner's electronic communication address if it is provided by the owner, although I note that section 13.11 (2) of O. Reg. 48/01 states that owners requesting a copy of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees are not entitled to receive the electronic address.

[13] The record provided to Ms. Ebegbuzie contained the names of owners and their "mailing address" which, for each owner, was listed as MTCC 1151's municipal street address. No unit numbers were included. During the Stage 2 – Mediation in this matter, MTCC 1151 provided an amended record which sets out the unit number, owner's name(s) and their address for service, although I note this is still incorrectly labelled as "mailing address". For two units, the address for service is listed as "outside Ontario". The Act is clear that the corporation is only required to maintain a record of addresses for service which are in Ontario. Therefore, I find that Ms. Ebegbuzie has received the record she requested and that the corporation is maintaining adequate records.

[14] Ms. Ebegbuzie questioned whether the owners whose addresses are listed as "outside Ontario" provided only one address for service, thereby questioning the completeness of the record. I find Ms. Ebegbuzie's concern to be *de minimis*; she did not raise the question of accuracy with respect to any of the other entries on the Record of Owners and Mortgagees.

Non-Core Item 1 - Incident Reports for Leaks on February 29, April 17 and April 24, 2024

[15] As noted above in "Background", Ms. Ebegbuzie received no response to her request for non-core records before she filed her application with the Tribunal. On July 18, 2024, before the Stage 2 – Mediation began, Mr. Liu provided copies of a security incident report and a superintendent's report with respect to the February 29, 2024 leak. Copies of the security incident reports for the two leaks in April were provided during the mediation process.

[16] Ms. Ebegbuzie had previously received copies of the security incident and superintendent's reports for the February 29, 2024 leak from Ms. Gobind on March 7, 2024. Her concern is that the copies she received from Mr. Liu do not include all of the photographs which were provided with the copies she received from Ms. Gobind. Similarly, she believes the April 17, 2024 security incident report is incomplete because it does not include all of the photographs and/or videos which security staff took when she was present. She also submits that she received no copies of superintendent's reports for either the April 17, 2024, or the April 24, 2024 leaks and notes that she was present when the superintendent attended her

unit on both occasions.

- [17] The security incident report related to February 29, 2024 sent by Ms. Gobind includes two photographs of the ceiling in Ms. Ebegbuzie's unit as well as the number of the unit where the leak originated and two photographs of its bathroom. The copy received from Mr. Liu included the photographs of Ms. Ebegbuzie's unit but only one photograph of the bathroom of the other unit. Ms. Ebegbuzie noted that the photographs of her unit provided by Mr. Liu are less clear than those provided by Ms. Gobind, suggesting that they may have been deliberately altered. I dismiss this concern as the photographs submitted to the Tribunal are scanned copies. The superintendent's report of their investigation of the February 29, 2024, leak which Ms. Ebegbuzie received from Ms. Gobind included four photographs of the unit where the leak originated. The copy she received from Mr. Liu included no photographs.
- [18] While Ms. Ebegbuzie's concern is that the records she received from Mr. Liu are incomplete, in fact she was not entitled to receive many of the records that were provided to her by both Ms. Gobind and Mr. Liu. The exceptions to an owner's right to examine or receive copies of a corporation's records set out in section 55 (4) of the Act include records relating to specific owners or units. Ms. Ebegbuzie is entitled to copies of records about her own unit but she is not entitled to those relating to the unit where the leak originated. Notwithstanding that she likely could easily have deduced it, the number of the originating unit contained in the security incident report related to the February 29, 2024, leak should have been redacted and the photographs of that unit's bathroom should not have been provided. The superintendent's report of that incident is in fact a summary of their investigation of the unit where the leak originated and Ms. Ebegbuzie was not entitled to receive this report or any of its accompanying photographs. Further, both the April 17, 2024, and April 24, 2024 security incident reports Mr. Liu provided during the mediation also include information about and photographs of the other owner's unit which Ms. Ebegbuzie was not entitled to receive.
- [19] The exception set out in section 55 (4) (c) of the Act was not cited by the corporation as a reason that some of the photographs of the unit where the leak originated were not included in the copies of the reports provided to her by Mr. Liu. Mr. Liu submitted that the corporation has provided all of the documents and photographs he found in the corporation's unit files. He also indicated that he conducted a search of its e-mail files for any further records. With respect to the superintendent's reports which Ms. Ebegbuzie believes are missing, he advised that the superintendent does not prepare reports but rather, after they investigate, they report to management and, as needed, the relevant trade is called in.

- [20] Ms. Ebegbuzie is entitled to receive any photographs of her own unit that may have been appended to the security incident report of the April 17, 2024 leak. However, there is no evidence to support that MTCC 1151 is withholding any such records. It is speculation that all of the photographs and/or videos which she witnessed security staff taking were in fact attached to the incident reports they sent to the condominium manager. Nor is there any evidence that superintendent's reports were prepared following the April 17 and 24, 2024 leaks. I note that it is not clear that the unsigned document entitled "superintendent's report" that she received for the February 29, 2024 leak was prepared by the superintendent or if it was a note prepared by the condominium manager. I find that Ms. Ebegbuzie has received the reports which the corporation has on file. The Tribunal cannot order the corporation to provide records it does not possess.
- [21] I also find that the incident report records which MTCC 1151 is maintaining are adequate; while it may not have received and/or retained all of the photographs and/or videos taken when the leaks were investigated, the incident reports the corporation has on record are sufficient to provide the background for the resulting plumber's visits and the associated costs the corporation incurred.

Non-Core Items 2, 3 & 4 – ZG Golden King Plumbing Reports and Quotes

- [22] MTCC 1151 had ZG Golden King Plumbing assess both the February 29, 2024, and the April 17, 2024 water leaks in Ms. Ebegbuzie's unit. Mr. Liu testified that because the plumbers assessed the cause of the April 17, 2024 leak, they were not called in following the leak which occurred on April 24, 2024.
- [23] Ms. Ebegbuzie's position is that the plumber's quotes and reports she received are both incomplete and inadequate. It is the corporation's position that it has provided Ms. Ebegbuzie with all of the records of reports and/or quotations it received from ZG Golden Plumbing.
- [24] The corporation provided Ms. Ebegbuzie with copies of a quote from ZG Golden Plumbing dated March 12, 2024, for repair in both her unit and the unit where the leak originated. It also provided an email containing a series of photographs of the unit where the leak originated which ZG Golden Plumbing sent separately to Ms. Gobind. As with the security incident reports, Ms. Ebegbuzie was not entitled to receive the photographs of the unit where the leak originated. With respect to the April 17, 2024 leak, the corporation provided copies of a report and an invoice for services from GZ Golden Plumbing, both of which are dated April 21, 2024.
- [25] Ms. Ebegbuzie's concern is that there is no plumber's report of their investigation of the February 29, 2024, leak and no photographs of her unit. However, there is

no evidence that the plumber prepared a report.

- [26] With respect to the April 17, 2024 leak, Ms. Ebegbuzie's testimony is that mould was evident on the portion of the ceiling which the plumber removed. She believes that the following record is missing:

Additional quotation from ZG Golden King Plumbing capturing his recommendation to perform professional mold remediation related to the investigation and inspection that occurred after investigating the April 17, 2024 water incident report on April 19, 2024 as per his mold findings. Currently no records exist capturing pictures or records of the mold that he cut out of the ceiling and took pictures of.

- [27] That the corporation was aware of the possibility of the formation of mould following a water leak is evident in an e-mail sent to Ms. Ebegbuzie by Ms. Gobind on March 12, 2024, after the February 29, 2024 leak:

Once it is confirmed that there will be no more ongoing leaks to your unit, ZG Golden King Plumbing will come to your unit and repair the damage. They will confirm, as they do with all units, there is no mould. If mould is found, they will conduct remediation to rectify this.

Based on this e-mail, it is understandable that Ms. Ebegbuzie expected the plumber's April 21, 2024 report to note that mould was found. She submitted:

Due to nature of the water damage, I am expecting inspection reports to include picture evidence showing the full scope of the water damage for April 17, 2024, activities performed during inspections and results found in their entirety (e.g. documentation and evidence of mould found).

- [28] ZG Golden King Plumbing's April 21, 2024 report simply states that the plumbers attended, "did troubleshooting" and "cut the damaged ceiling." There is no mention of mould and no photographs. Ms. Ebegbuzie suggested that the report may have been written in this manner and that the photographs she witnessed being taken by the plumber may have been withheld in order to conceal the extent of mould that was discovered in her ceiling cavity.
- [29] Mr. Liu submitted copies of an e-mail thread between Ms. Ebegbuzie and senior condominium manager, Tony Chan, which begins on April 29, 2024, the subject of which is the likely date of repair of her unit. The e-mail refers to conversations they had. Given Ms. Ebegbuzie's concerns about mould, I find it unlikely that the issue of mould remediation was not discussed. Further, Ms. Ebegbuzie received a "Notice of Entry" form advising her that Executive Maintenance Services would

enter her unit on May 23, 2024, to assess and then prepare a quote for mould remediation. And, during the first week of June 2024, MTCC 1151 obtained two firms' quotes for mould remediation. When asked how the corporation was aware of mould given there is no reference to it in the plumber's report, Mr. Liu stated that when he took over from Ms. Gobind, he assumed that mould could be an issue and proceeded to ask for remediation quotes. Given Ms. Ebegbuzie's correspondence with Mr. Chan and the fact that the Notice of Entry form was sent before Ms. Gobind left her position, Mr. Liu's testimony is not entirely credible.

- [30] Ms. Gobind has left the condominium management services provider and therefore it is unknown why she apparently arranged for a mould remediation assessment to take place in May. It is possible that she followed up with the plumbers verbally after she received their April 21, 2024 report or after Ms. Ebegbuzie corresponded with Mr. Chan. It is also possible that she did in fact receive photographs and/or other correspondence from the plumber and that these no longer exist.
- [31] I acknowledge that it is questionable that there is no report and/or photographs on record which document the mould discovered during the investigation of the April 17, 2024 leak, particularly given a number of photographs were sent by the plumber following their investigation of the February 29, 2024 leak. However, I find that the corporation has provided Ms. Ebegbuzie with the plumber's quotes and reports which are in its possession. As noted above in paragraph 20, the Tribunal cannot order the production of records which do not exist.
- [32] I also find that the corporation is keeping adequate records. While I understand Ms. Ebegbuzie's concern that the reports she received do not fully describe the conditions in her unit, the corporation is not responsible for the content of reports prepared by its outside suppliers. Nor is it required, as Ms. Ebegbuzie suggested, to contact the plumber to obtain the photographs she believes should be appended to their April 21, 2024 report. The corporation is responsible for ensuring it keeps copies of the reports it receives and that its records document its decisions. In this case, it is only speculation that the corporation may have received further documentation of the April 17, 2024 leak from the plumbers. While the records of the plumber's visits do not explain why the corporation sought quotes for mould remediation, the quotes it did obtain, which Ms. Ebegbuzie sought and received in a Request for Records that is not before me, serve to document both the existence of mould and the corporation's subsequent expenditure for its remediation.

Issue No. 3: Did the Respondent refuse to provide records without a reasonable

excuse? If so, should a penalty be awarded, and in what amount?

- [33] Section 1.44 (1) 6 of the Act provides that the Tribunal may order a penalty to be paid if it finds that a corporation has, without reasonable excuse, refused to permit an owner to examine or obtain copies of records. Ms. Ebegbuzie requests a penalty of \$3,000 be awarded.
- [34] The evidence is that MTCC 1151 did not provide either the complete Record of Owners and Mortgagees or the incident and plumbing reports to Ms. Ebegbuzie until this matter was before the Tribunal.
- [35] While MTCC 1151 did provide Ms. Ebegbuzie with a record in response to her request for the Record of Owners and Mortgagees on May 16, 2024, that record was not in accordance with the requirements of the Act as it did not include unit numbers or addresses for services. Ms. Ebegbuzie pointed this out to Ms. Gobind in an e-mail dated May 21, 2024. Ms. Gobind's response, which she indicated was from MTCC 1151's Board of Directors, was:

According to CAO, the Board of Directors may withhold some of the personal and confidential Owner information if a reasonable reason is provided. In this case some owners have indicated they do not want any solicitation. If you absolutely need this info we will advise Owners that an Owner of MTCC 1151 is requesting their address for unknown reasons and to let the office know if they do not want their address to be shared. Note that some Owners may ask who is requesting the info and will have to let them know.

When Ms. Ebegbuzie disputed the corporation's position, Ms. Gobind wrote the following:

Regarding your specific request, an address is considered personal information and has become sensitive information not be given lightly and some owners have already let the office know they do not want their personal info to be shared. It would fall under "information that identifies specific units."

- [36] MTCC 1151 apparently relied on the exemption under section 55 (4) (c) of the Act as a reason for withholding the Record of Owners and Mortgagees notwithstanding that section 55 (5) (c) of the Act states that this exemption does not apply to the Record of Owners and Mortgagees. However, an amended version of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees was provided during the Stage 2 – Mediation in this matter.
- [37] None of the non-core records Ms. Ebegbuzie requested were provided before she filed her case with the Tribunal. Mr. Liu testified that the corporation "assumed"

Ms. Ebegbuzie had received these in May when she was sent the incomplete version of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees. He cited her May 16, 2024 e-mail to Ms. Gobind in which she indicates she would pick up the core record (that is, the Record of Owners and Mortgagees) if it was ready and asked if the non-core records would also be available. There is no evidence of any response to her inquiry about the availability of the non-core records. In his closing submission, Mr. Liu maintained that the corporation had provided the records in May. I do not find this submission credible. Ms. Ebegbuzie advised Mr. Liu that she had yet to receive these records in an e-mail dated June 11, 2024. She advised him again in an e-mail dated July 11, 2024. The evidence is that no non-core records were provided until July 18, 2024.

[38] The evidence is that MTCC 1151 withheld the full Record of Owners and Mortgagees when it initially responded to Ms. Ebegbuzie. I find this to be a refusal to provide records; that the corporation's Board of Directors did not understand their statutory obligation to provide this record is not a reasonable excuse. With respect to the non-core records, in past decisions, the Tribunal has found that a delay in responding to a Request for Records may be a refusal to provide them, albeit a temporary one. In this case, no non-core records were provided until Ms. Ebegbuzie made two written inquiries about their status, both of which were sent after she filed her application with the Tribunal. And, while some were provided on July 18, 2024, others were not provided until the Stage 2 – Mediation. I find the delay in providing both a complete copy of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees and the non-core records to be a refusal without reasonable excuse which warrants the assessment of a penalty.

[39] One of the purposes of a penalty is to deter future similar action. In determining the amount of penalty to be awarded, I have reviewed the cases to which Ms. Ebegbuzie referred me. In particular, she referred me to *Zamfir v. York Condominium Corporation No. 238*, 2021 ONCAT 118 (CanLII), a case in which a change in condominium managers may have contributed to what was found to be a refusal to provide records without reasonable excuse and in which the Tribunal awarded a penalty of \$1,000. In each of the cases cited by Ms. Ebegbuzie, the Tribunal ordered the provision of records. In this case, the corporation did provide an incomplete version of the Record of Owners and Mortgagees. It also provided the balance of the records in its possession after this case was brought to the Tribunal and did not charge a fee. In these circumstances, I find a penalty of \$500 to be appropriate.

[40] I am also ordering the members of MTCC 1151's board of directors to take Module 6, Records, of the Condominium Authority of Ontario's online director training. The

corporation's response to Ms. Ebegbuzie's Request for Records demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of its obligations under the Act. Not only did the corporation incorrectly rely on the exemption in section 55 (4) (c) of the Act to initially refuse to provide the Record of Owners and Mortgagees but it also failed to apply that exemption when it inappropriately provided identifying information and photographs of another owner's unit to Ms. Ebegbuzie when it did produce the non-core records.

- [41] The directors shall complete the required training within 60 days of the date of this decision and submit proof of completion to Mr. Liu or whomever is site condominium manager at that time. Proof may be in the form of a screen shot. The directors shall instruct the condominium manager to provide copies to Ms. Ebegbuzie when all of the directors have completed the training.

Issue 4: Is either party entitled to costs or filing fees?

- [42] Ms. Ebegbuzie was successful in this matter; I am ordering the corporation to pay a penalty for refusing to provide records without reasonable excuse. Therefore, I am ordering MTCC 1151 to pay her \$200 in respect of her Tribunal fees, in accordance with Rule 48.1 of the Tribunal's Rules of Practice:

If a Case is not resolved by Settlement Agreement or Consent Order and a CAT Member makes a final Decision, the unsuccessful Party will be required to pay the successful Party's CAT fees unless the CAT member decides otherwise.

Ms. Ebegbuzie requested no other costs in this matter.

- [43] MTCC 1151 requested I order Ms. Ebegbuzie to pay \$180 which it submits were its costs to produce the copies of the non-core records. I am not considering this request. Not only is this not a cost of participating in this proceeding but any request the corporation had for fees should have been raised before the non-core records were provided.

D. ORDER

- [44] The Tribunal Orders that:

1. Under section 1.44 (1) 4 of the Act, within 30 days of the date of this decision, MTCC 1151 shall pay Beverly Ebegbuzie costs of \$200.
2. Under section 1.44 (1) 6 of the Act, within 30 days of the date of this decision, MTCC 1151 shall pay a penalty of \$500 to Beverly Ebegbuzie.

3. Under section 1.44 (1) 7 of the Act, within 60 days of the date of this decision, the members of MTCC 1151's Board of directors shall complete Module 6 of the Condominium Authority of Ontario's director training. The directors shall submit documentary proof of completion of the training to MTCC 1151's site condominium manager who they shall instruct to then provide a copy to Ms. Ebegbuzie.

Mary Ann Spencer
Member, Condominium Authority Tribunal

Released on: January 6, 2025