

CONDOMINIUM AUTHORITY TRIBUNAL

DATE: October 23, 2025

CASE: 2025-00383R

Citation: Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973, 2025
ONCAT 180

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

Member: Nicole Aylwin, Vice-Chair

The Applicant,

Robert Currie

Self-Represented

The Respondent,

Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973

Represented by Natalia Polis, Counsel

Hearing: Written Online Hearing – July 18, 2025 to October 14, 2025

REASONS FOR DECISION

A. INTRODUCTION

- [1] Robert Currie is the owner of a unit of Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973 (“MTCC 973 or the “corporation”). On January 13, 2025, Mr. Currie submitted a Request for Records to the corporation. He alleges that the corporation has refused to provide him records to which he is entitled to under the *Condominium Act, 1998* (“the Act”), failed to keep adequate records and charged an unreasonable fee to provide records. He asks that the Tribunal order MTCC 973 to pay a penalty of \$4500, provide him with specific records, order them to maintain others, and order an investigation into the “falsified records and ledgers” with the findings of the investigation required to be reported back to the Tribunal.
- [2] The corporation’s position is that it has not refused to provide records without a reasonable excuse and has provided Mr. Currie with all the records to which he is entitled. The corporation argues that Mr. Currie is on a “fishing expedition” and has filed this application with the Tribunal for an improper purpose. They request that the Tribunal dismiss his application, award the corporation its legal costs on a

substantial indemnity basis and that Mr. Currie be declared a vexatious litigant pursuant to the Tribunal's Rules of Practice.

- [3] For the reasons set out below, I find the corporation has provided Mr. Currie with all the records to which he is entitled. I further find that he has pursued this application to Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision for an improper purpose and I award costs to MTCC 973 in the amount of \$6000. I further find that there has been a pattern of conduct by Mr. Currie that created a burden on the Tribunal and unfairly requires the corporation to participate in cases with little merit. I order that going forward Mr. Currie will need to obtain permission from the Tribunal before filing any future applications. As noted further in this decision, I do not take this step lightly, as I recognize that such an order limits Mr. Currie's right to access the Tribunal. However, based on the evidence before me, I have sufficient reason to conclude that without such an order, the pattern of conduct would continue.
- [4] Finally, while I have reviewed all the submissions and evidence provided to me, I refer only to those necessary and relevant to making my decision.

B. BACKGROUND

- [5] Since January 2025, Mr. Currie has filed seven Tribunal applications against the corporation.¹ I will discuss the substance of these applications later in this decision; however, for the purposes of understanding this particular dispute what is important to highlight is that this records request arises within the context of a protracted and ongoing dispute between the parties over the rental of a locker by Mr. Currie, payment for that locker and issues related to the maintenance and repair of the locker; all of which are issues over which the Tribunal has no jurisdiction.
- [6] While I will not set out the details of this dispute as it is not the subject of this application – what is clear from the evidence and submissions is that the events surrounding the dispute over the locker have resulted in Mr. Currie becoming angry and distrustful of the corporation, and has led him to be skeptical of all manner of decisions made by the corporation and its manager and led him to make allegations of fraud, mismanagement and harassment against the corporation and its staff. It is against this backdrop that Mr. Currie made the

¹ See: *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 145; *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 125; *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 85 (dismissing four applications); *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 61.

records request of January 13, 2025, which is the subject of this application.

- [7] At the outset of the hearing, the corporation made a motion to dismiss this application on the grounds that Mr. Currie had received all the records to which he was entitled, arguing that this application was an abuse of the Tribunal process and evidence of vexatious conduct by Mr. Currie. After providing Mr. Currie the opportunity to respond, I determined that it would be premature to dismiss the case at an early stage as there did appear to be some issues that would require me to hear evidence to decide them. I indicated I would hear the application, but also that MTCC 973 could make its arguments regarding vexatious conduct and improper purpose as part of its submissions in the hearing.
- [8] At that time, I also advised Mr. Currie that I would not be determining any issues related to governance of the condominium and/or allegations regarding harassment by the condominium manager – as these are not issues over which the Tribunal has jurisdiction. This was not the first time Mr. Currie had been advised of this. As noted in the Stage 2 – Mediation Summary and Order, the Tribunal member at the mediation gave Mr. Currie this same information. I issued this reminder again to Mr. Currie as a great deal of his submissions in response to the MTCC 973 motion related to his allegations of “abuse and harassment” by the Respondent and its employee(s).

C. ISSUES & ANALYSIS

Issue No. 1: Has the Applicant been refused records to which he is entitled without a reasonable excuse? If so, should a penalty be assessed?

- [9] Mr. Currie requested the following records in his January 13, 2025 request:
 1. The Corporation’s Declaration;
 2. The Corporation’s By-laws;
 3. The Corporation’s Rules;
 4. The budget for the corporation’s current fiscal year, including any amendments.
 5. The most recent approved financial statements
 6. The most recent auditor’s report;
 7. Mutual-use agreements;

8. Minutes of board meetings within the last 12 months;
9. Incident regarding Dale Wilson and Robert Currie – May 10, 2024 -present;
10. Locker maintenance records – 2021 to present.

[10] Although Mr. Currie initially denied that the corporation responded to his request within the timeframes mandated by the Act, he did confirm during the hearing that MTCC 973 did, in fact, respond on February 11, 2025. The corporation's response indicated that it would provide all of the records to Mr. Currie at no cost other than the locker maintenance records, which it indicated it did not maintain. According to the corporation, when it responded on February 11, 2025, the corporation inadvertently did not include copies of the core records, which it agrees it ought to have done.

[11] Regarding the non-core records, the corporation submits that Mr. Currie never replied to its response and did not submit a completed copy of the response form to confirm he wished to proceed with the request for the non-core records, which the onus was on him to do. Thus, they did not proceed with fulfilling this portion of the request.

[12] During mediation MTCC 973 provided Mr. Currie, at no cost, with all the records requested, except for the “locker maintenance records”, which MTCC 973 submits they do not maintain. It did, however, provide Mr. Currie with all records that pertained to his specific locker at no cost.

[13] Mr. Currie did not dispute that these records were provided in mediation; however, he indicated at the start of the hearing that some records remained outstanding. When asked by me to clarify which records these were, he listed the following 12 additional records (in Mr. Currie's words):

1. Modified locker contract April 1, 2023.
2. Recognition acceptance cheque for Lockers A and B (Ledger Record of accounts 2023)
3. Board minutes allowing Property Manager to modify locker contract terms.
4. In camera minutes related to the mold, and new locker agreement April 2023
5. Board minutes or in camera minutes discussing arrears 2023 (when did the locker go into areas exactly? Every monthly board meeting starts with an arrears discussion)

6. The false ledger of account provided to RBC Bank- April -May timeframe - 2024
7. The false ledger of account provided to the applicant 2025
8. Records of why the locker cheque was not cashed originally, or communication
9. Records why the cheque was attempted to be cashed in January 2024 before the mold and water issues were fixed and board discussion records surrounding the cheque that was provided 10 months prior.
10. No email communication records between the property manager and the board regarding this issue, this owner and this contract. Necessary to provide clarity on the issue.
11. The applicant made request for the mold report and HST (records), which were delivered via legal response with no fee schedule attached prior to delivery. The board's decision to allow outsourcing of property managers duties for delivery of a record related to this owner.
12. The ledger of record that shows the cheque incoming 2023 and ledger record that show unit owner in area 2023? The cheques were never rejected or returned by the property manager prior to January 2024, absent are any communication records.

[14] Mr. Currie argues he is entitled to these records, and they have been refused.

[15] MTCC 973 submits that many of these requests are for information not records, and regardless – none of these items were properly requested. MTCC 973 submits these records have been requested for the first time in this hearing and only after Mr. Currie was prompted to be more specific about the records he believed had not been provided. It submits that this list suggests that Mr. Currie is on a “fishing expedition” and he has attempted to expand the scope of his request for the purposes of using this Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision process to continue his larger dispute with the corporation over his locker.

[16] I agree with MTCC 973 on these points. First, putting aside, for a moment, whether these items have been properly requested, several of them are not requests for records but information (see for example, #8, #9, #11 of the list). While an owner has a right to examine records of a corporation under s. 55 of the Act, an owner has no specific right under s. 55 to information or explanations from the board about records or other disputes between them, a point that was, according to the

Summary & Order, made to Mr. Currie by the during the Stage 2 – Mediation.

- [17] Second, I agree with MTCC 973 that most of these items, even they are a record that the corporation holds – a point on which I make no determination – were not properly requested and thus have not been refused. There is no mention of these specific records in the Summary and Order produced at the end of Stage 2 – Mediation which listed the records at issue in the case. They are not listed or even referenced in the initial application, nor are they listed on the original records request form. I note that based on the fact that Mr. Currie has made several previous records requests, he is familiar with the records request process and could have made a proper and specific request for the records he was seeking; there is no evidence that he did so.
- [18] Nonetheless, even if I were to accept Mr. Currie’s argument that some of these records such as, for example, the in-camera minutes listed (#4 and #5) and the ledgers (#6 and #7) were records that should have been provided in response to his January 2025 request, there is no evidence before me that the additional minutes or ledgers beyond those which have already been provided do or ought to exist.
- [19] I am persuaded by MTCC 973’s arguments that suggest that Mr. Currie has attempted to use a Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision hearing to expand his request for records and engage in a “fishing expedition”. As stated in the Tribunal’s decisions *Martynenko v. Peel Standard Condominium Corporation No.935*, 2021 ONCAT 125, the term fishing expedition is used in law to describe a search or investigation – which can include demands for records or information – undertaken for the purposes of discovering facts that might be disparaging to the other party or form the basis for some other claim against them, that the seeker merely hopes or imagines exist.
- [20] In this case, many of the records listed as outstanding by Mr. Currie, are not, as noted, records at all – they are broad demands for information that appear to relate to Mr. Currie’s dispute with the corporation about his locker and his unsubstantiated allegations that the condominium manager has engaged in harassment or fraud. Mr. Currie’s own submissions state that “[e]ssentially the applicant has been denied any records which relate to the property manager’s actions concerning this [locker] contract, the property manager embarked upon a campaign of deception.”
- [21] It is also a stretch to consider, as Mr. Currie would like me to, that the additional records listed by him as ‘outstanding’ ought to have been provided in response to a request for “locker maintenance records.” A request for “false” ledgers, and

overly broad requests for minutes that he believes ought to exist and contain information such as when the board decided to allow the condominium manager to modify locker contract terms, are more akin to attempting to ‘cast a wide net’ in the hopes of learning a fact or detail that could substantiate his allegations of impropriety, rather than an actual clarification of records he was seeking when he listed “locker maintenance records.”

- [22] I do not wish to suggest that all broad requests for records, or all situations where a unit owner clarifies a request by naming more specific records amounts to a fishing expedition. Each application has its own factual context. In this case, the facts, in context, make it clear that Mr. Currie, is seeking evidence of “fraud, deception and extortion” and that Mr. Currie has attempted to expand his records request in the hopes of garnering some proof of his harassment and fraud allegations against the corporation and manager and ‘prove’ wrongdoing. This is not appropriate and a point I return to later in this decision.
- [23] Regarding the “locker-maintenance records” as actually listed in his January 13, 2025, request, I find there is no evidence that such records are maintained by the corporation, and it cannot provide records it does not have. I note that in arguing that MTCC 973 had refused to provide him with the locker maintenance records, Mr. Currie sought to challenge the credibility of the statement made by the condominium manager who indicated the records did not exist. He suggested the statement was “false” and “designed to be deceptive.” There was no evidence to substantiate the claim.
- [24] This does however leave the question of whether the core-records requested were refused without a reasonable excuse. The evidence is that when the corporation responded to Mr. Currie’s request for records, it indicated that it would provide the core-records at no cost. However, these records were not provided until mediation. MTCC 973 submits that this was an oversight and that it inadvertently did not provide them along with the response.
- [25] It is the responsibility of the corporation to ensure it meets its obligation to provide owners with records which they are entitled to in accordance with the requirements and timelines as set out in the Act. I accept in this case that MTCC 973 did not provide the core-records within the timeframes set out by the Act. However, in this case there is no evidence that corporation is unaware of its responsibilities to provide these records or that they willfully sought to withhold these records. Rather the evidence is that the corporation made a mistake in not providing them when they responded to the request. When that mistake was realized, the corporation sought to correct it by providing Mr. Currie with all the core-records to which he

was entitled. So, while there was a delay in providing Mr. Currie with the core-records requested, I do not find, in this case, this delay amounts to a refusal without a reasonable excuse.

- [26] Finally, while I wish to stress that the onus remains on the corporation to meet its obligation to provide records in accordance with the Act, the evidence in this case is that after receiving the corporation's response to his request – Mr. Currie sent no further communications to the corporation about the request before this case was filed. Had Mr. Currie replied to the corporation's response and indicated to them they did not provide the core-records as they indicated, while also indicated he would like to proceed with fulfilling the non-core portion of the request (which is required to do), these records issues – at least those related to the core-records – may have resolved quite quickly and without cost to either party.
- [27] Mr. Currie has asked that I impose a penalty on the corporation as a “deterrent”. Section 1.44 (6) of the Act allows the Tribunal to impose a penalty on a corporation only if it refuses to provide records to which an owner is entitled without a reasonable excuse. In this case, there has been no refusal without a reasonable excuse, and no penalty is warranted.

Issue No. 2: Was an unreasonable fee charged by the Respondent to produce the records?

- [28] Mr. Currie argued that a chargeback in the amount of \$650 related to a legal letter sent to him by the corporation amounted to a charge to produce records. Although it was explained to him that the issue of this chargeback was not an issue to be addressed in this hearing, Mr. Currie persisted in providing arguments of the nature described above, thus I address them for completeness.
- [29] Fees to produce records refer to fees either estimated on the Board's Response to Records Form and/or fees directly charged and paid by a requestor to the corporation to obtain records. There were no fees charged to Mr. Currie. There is no basis on which to conclude that because a compliance letter sent to Mr. Currie mentions records (among other issues), it ought to be considered a ‘charge’ to produce records.

Issue No. 3: Has the Respondent failed to keep adequate records?

- [30] Mr. Currie submits that because the corporation has submitted it “does not maintain” the locker maintenance records requested by Mr. Currie, they are failing to keep adequate records under the Act. Mr. Currie submits that documents related to the ‘maintenance’ of the lockers including all correspondence, decisions

related to the lockers and the “alteration of contract terms” constitute a “maintenance file” or “log” that is a record that ought to be retained and provided by the corporation. He asserts that this record ought to capture the “entire and complete “picture” surrounding the locker …” Notwithstanding the fact that the records Mr. Currie suggests should make up this log have little to do with the actual maintenance of the lockers and more to do with the very specific information he seeks, such “log” or “file” is not listed as a record the corporation is required to keep under s. 55 of the Act. While this list is not exhaustive, there is no evidence before me that the corporation has or ought to have maintained a ‘log’ in the way suggested by Mr. Currie. In this case, not having what Mr. Currie asserts should be a record does not equate to a failure to keep adequate records under the Act.

Issue No. 4: Is any party entitled to costs?

- [31] Section 1.44 (1) 4 of the Act states that the Tribunal may make “an order directing another party to the proceeding to pay the costs of another party to the proceeding.”
- [32] Section 1.44 (2) of the Act states that an order for costs “shall be determined ...in accordance with the rules of the Tribunal”.
- [33] The cost-related rules of the Tribunal’s Rules of Practice relevant to this case are:

48.1 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.

48.2 The CAT generally will not order one Party to reimburse another Party for legal fees or disbursements (“costs”) incurred in the course of the proceeding. However, where appropriate, the CAT may order a Party to pay to another Party all or part of their costs, including costs that were directly related to a Party’s behaviour that was unreasonable, undertaken for an improper purpose, or that caused a delay or additional expense.

- [34] The Tribunal’s “Practice Direction: Approach to Ordering Costs” provides guidance regarding the awarding of costs. Among the factors to be considered are whether a party or representative’s conduct was unreasonable, for an improper purpose, or caused a delay or expense; whether the case was filed in bad faith or for an improper purpose; the conduct of all parties and representatives; the potential impact an order for costs would have on the parties; the indemnification provisions in a corporation’s governing documents and whether the parties attempted to resolve the issues in dispute before the CAT case was filed.

[35] Mr. Currie requested costs for his Tribunal filing fees and “all expenses related to the failure to maintain adequate and accurate records” with interest of 5.85%. MTCC 973 has requested costs in the amount of \$9316.85.

[36] Mr. Currie was not successful in this case and is not entitled to costs.

[37] MTCC 973 submits that Mr. Currie commenced this application and pursued it to a Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision for an improper purpose. Specifically, it asserts that Mr. Currie did not file this application and pursue it to seek records but to annoy, frustrate, and harass the corporation and management and to continue to pursue his own interpersonal issues and allegations of fraud and misconduct by the corporation and condominium manager. It submits he did this despite being advised on by the Tribunal on several occasions that such matters were not within the authority of the Tribunal to address.

[38] I find the evidence before me supports MTCC 973’s submissions.

[39] Costs awards are discretionary. I find in this case there is no reason for this dispute to have continued to Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision. The evidence is that Mr. Currie was in possession of records he requested at the end of Stage 2 – Mediation and that he attempted to use the hearing to expand the scope of records he requested to keep this dispute alive as a means to pursue issues unrelated to records, issues he was advised were not before the Tribunal.

[40] Thus, I find in this case it would not be fair that Mr. Currie’s fellow unit owners be forced to bear the complete costs of this application. I find it appropriate that Mr. Currie pay, on a substantial indemnity basis, the costs incurred by MTCC 973 in having to participate in this Stage 3 – Tribunal Decision process. Based on the corporation’s bill of costs, this amounts to approximately \$6000. Mr. Currie will be ordered to pay MTCC 973 this amount. Mr. Currie indicated during the hearing that he would be without internet access until early December 2025. Thus, to accommodate this, I will order that he have 60 days, rather than the typical 30 days, from the date of this decision to pay the corporation.

Issue No. 5: Has Mr. Currie engaged filed a vexatious application and/or used the Tribunal for an improper purpose? If so, what remedy is appropriate?

[41] MTCC 973 has asked that pursuant to the Tribunal’s Rule 4.6, the Tribunal find that Mr. Currie has filed a vexatious application and has attempted to use the Tribunal in a vexatious manner. It has asked that the Tribunal require Mr. Currie to obtain the Tribunal’s permission before filing any future applications.

[42] The Tribunal's Rule 4.6 provides that:

If the CAT finds that a Party has filed a vexatious Application or has participated in a CAT Case in a vexatious manner, the CAT can dismiss the proceeding as an abuse of the CAT's process. The CAT may also require that Party to obtain permission from the CAT to file any future Cases or continue to participate in an active Case. The CAT may also require a Party to agree to an undertaking that they will comply with the Rules and with any CAT Orders.

[43] As noted above, MTCC 973 submits this application was not motivated by concerns over records, but rather to annoy, frustrate and harass the corporation, the board and its management staff – and to continue his dispute with the corporation in this forum. To support its claim, MTCC 973 points to the fact that within the past year brought Mr. Currie has filed at least seven Tribunal applications² against the corporation, the majority of which have been dismissed for various reasons including no reasonable prospect of success and at least one, *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 145 that was dismissed as it was found to have been filed for an improper purpose. In this last decision, Mr. Currie was specifically cautioned about the improper use of the Tribunal, and it was noted that prior orders of the Tribunal established that the Applicant had

1. repeatedly brought legal actions about the same or similar issues;
2. had brought actions that have no reasonable prospect of success; and
3. had engaged in conduct that is intended to harass, annoy, or cause expense to others.

[44] They submit this case is another example of such behavior. They cite, for example, Mr. Currie's insistence on making arguments regarding his unsubstantiated claims of fraud and harassment by the condominium manager and the board, and his attempt to suggest the lien placed on his unit as a result of locker payment arrears was a records issue despite being advised that it was not. They further submit that despite having been provided all the records to which he was entitled during the mediation, Mr. Currie continued with his application in the hopes of continuing his locker dispute when the issues related to the application

² See: *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 145; *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 125; *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 85 (dismissing four applications); *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 61.

had logically reached its conclusion. MTCC 973 submits that unless the Tribunal limits Mr. Currie's access to the Tribunal he will continue to file frivolous applications that all unit owners end up paying to defend.

[45] In his reply submissions, in response to MTCC 973's arguments on this issue, Mr. Currie stated that this was not an issue before the Tribunal. This is incorrect. As noted, MTCC 973 raised this issue as part of a preliminary motion, which I indicated I would not address at that time, but would address as part of my decision. Thus, Mr. Currie was aware of this issue and did have an opportunity to reply to MTCC 973's arguments on it and did so. He argues that this request and application was legitimate as he was attempting to get to the bottom of "a simple issue" the "locker record continuum". However, his submissions suggest otherwise. After stating this, rather than make arguments as to why he was entitled to records, he argued that MTCC 973's failure to provide him with the records he believes ought to exist and with the information he wanted about his locker, was an attempt to hide "criminal fraud." This is only one such example of the allegations of dishonesty that were the focus of Mr. Currie's arguments.

[46] MTCC 973 referred me to *Manorama Sennek v. Carleton Condominium Corporation No. 166*, where the Tribunal adopted the criteria for identifying vexatious conduct as outlined in *Lang Michener et al v. Fabian et al* (1987) 1987 CanLII 172 (ON SC), 59 O.R. (2nd) 353. The criteria are:

1. bringing of one or more actions to determine an issue which has already been determined;
2. where it is obvious that an action cannot succeed, or if the action would lead to no possible good, or if no reasonable person can reasonably expect to obtain relief;
3. bringing a proceeding for an improper purpose, including the harassment and oppression of other parties by multifarious proceedings brought for purposes other than the assertion of legitimate rights;
4. rolling forward grounds and issues into subsequent actions; and
5. persistently taking unsuccessful appeals from judicial decisions.

[47] As noted, Mr. Currie has filed to date, seven applications before this Tribunal within the past year. The number of applications alone is not sufficient to consider them vexatious. However, there is a theme across these cases. They demonstrate Mr. Currie's deep mistrust of the corporation and his frustration with the way in

which the corporation and its staff have dealt with ongoing dispute over his rental of a locker and payment for that locker. While Mr. Currie's first application to this Tribunal may have begun with a legitimate application, which was resolved by a consent order,³ Mr. Currie has continued to pursue this dispute and his distrust appears to have escalated into allegations of fraud, mismanagement, harassment and poor governance, all claims over which the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to address; a fact Mr. Currie has been advised of on multiple occasions – both in this proceeding and in other decisions by the Tribunal. When this application is considered alongside the others, it demonstrates a pattern of conduct whereby Mr. Currie has been attempting to "roll over" issues related to his locker in the hopes of using the Tribunal to continue his dispute with the corporation. In this case, in particular, the evidence supports the finding that Mr. Currie was attempting to use a records request to pursue these governance concerns and his allegations of misconduct, rather than legitimately exercising his rights as an owner to access records.

[48] Based on the information before me, I find that that there has been a pattern of conduct by Mr. Currie that is vexatious, improperly requiring MTCC 973 to participate in cases with little or no merit. It is reasonable to conclude that without intervention this conduct will continue. The Tribunal has the authority to control its processes to ensure cases are reasonably pursued for a proper purpose. Therefore, I grant MTCC 973's request to require Mr. Currie to obtain permission from the Tribunal before filing any future applications.

D. ORDER

[49] The Tribunal Orders that:

1. This application is dismissed.
2. Within 60 days of the date of this decision Mr. Currie shall pay MTCC 973 \$6000 in costs.
3. Pursuant to the Tribunal's Rule of Practice 4.6, Mr. Currie must obtain permission from the Tribunal before filing any new applications.

³ *Currie v. Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 973*, 2025 ONCAT 61.

Nicole Aylwin
Vice-Chair, Condominium Authority Tribunal

Released on: October 23, 2025