

*The Applicant and her husband have been given a copy of Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. responses via emails in regards to the HRTTO application that has been filed against them by the Applicant and her family.*

*The Applicant and her family had decided at this time to only address a couple of issues that were brought up by the 3 respondents.*

*Stella Reddy stated “ When they got their vehicle in March 2018, when Ms. Read texted the office for a parking spot I informed her we had none, which we didn’t, and that there was a waiting list of current tenants waiting for parking. At the time, we had 2 tenants parking off site as we had nothing to give them. As we only have 6 available spaces for Visitors Parking in front of the building, we couldn’t give these spaces to tenants as we wouldn’t have any spots left for guests. So when they asked for a visitors parking pass, I couldn’t give them one or I would have to give it to the rest waiting in order to fair to all tenants. We cannot do for one that we couldn’t do for them all. I sent them a blank parking form to complete to be dropped off to the office to be added to the waiting list. I did not receive the form ”*

*Reviewing this first part of Stella Reddy statement “ As we only have 6 available spaces for Visitors Parking in front of the building, we couldn’t give these spaces to tenants as we wouldn’t have any spots left for guests. So when they asked for a visitors parking pass, I couldn’t give them one or I would have to give it to the rest waiting in order to fair to all tenants. ”*

*Stella Reddy clarifies that tenants of the building are not allowed to park their personal vehicles in Visitor/Guest parking as it is only for overnight guest.*

*“ As we only have 6 available spaces for Visitors Parking in front of the building, we couldn’t give these spaces to tenants as we wouldn’t have any spots left for guests. “*

*Stella Reddy clarifies that tenants of the building are not allowed to have a Visitor Parking Pass for their personal vehicles as it is only for overnight guest visiting the building.*

*So when Stella Reddy stated “ So when they asked for a visitors parking pass, I couldn’t give them one or I would have to give it to the rest waiting in order to fair to all tenants. ” When you review the picture taken on March 14, 2018 by the Applicant labelled*

- *Picture - - Visitor Parking Pass March 14, 2018.*

*You can clearly see in the picture that the all-white unit , has a Visitor Parking Pass for their 1st vehicle ( WHITE IN COLOUR ) that is parked in the Visitor/Guest parking area.*

*This same Visitor Parking Pass was given by Stella Reddy to all-white unit at the beginning of March when they first moved into the building.*

*Reviewing the attached picture taken on March 14, 2018 by the Applicant labelled*

- *Picture - Unit - Spot 29 Tenant Parking Pass March 14, 2018.*

*You again can clearly see in the picture that the all-white unit #, also had a Tenant Parking Pass for their 2nd vehicle ( BLACK IN COLOUR) for parking space # in the tenants parking area.*

*This same Tenant Parking Pass was given by Stella Reddy to all-white unit # at the beginning of March when they first moved into the building.*

*You can clearly see in the picture that the all-white unit #, 2nd vehicle is also parked right next to their 1st vehicle while in the Visitor/Guest parking area.*

*Reviewing the attached video taken on March 14, 2018 by the Applicant labelled*

- *Unit - Visitor And Tenant Parking Pass For Both Cars March 14, 2018*

*It confirms that the all-white unit #, had two vehicles parked in Visitor/Quest parking area the same day that Stella Reddy told the Applicant they had to park offsite.*

*Watching this video there can be no doubt that all-white unit # was allowed to park both their vehicles onsite, despite claims by Stella Reddy to the Applicant that Visitor Parking Passes cannot be given out to tenants.*

*Watching this video there can be no doubt that all-white unit # was allowed to park both their vehicles in the Visitor Parking Passes /Guest parking is for only overnight guest and not for tenants.*

*Also watching this video there can be no doubt that all-white unit # was allowed by Stella Reddy to park their 2nd car onsite and in Visitor/Quest parking, despite having a designated parking space (#) assigned to them.*

*Stella Reddy also stated “ and that there was a waiting list of current tenants waiting for parking. ”*

*What is absolutely amazing about this statement made by Stella Reddy is that the “ 2 tenants parking off site as we had nothing to give them ” had been living and parking their 2nd vehicles off site for close to 2 years before the all-white unit # moved into the building.*

*Yet. what Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTTO, is that the all-white unit # was immediately given a Tenant Parking Space #for their 1st vehicle upon moving in at the beginning of March.*

*And Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTTO is that is that the all-white unit # was immediately given a Visitor Parking Pass for their 2nd vehicle upon moving in at the beginning of March.*

*What Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTTO is that she allowed the all white unit # to jump from the bottom of the waiting list to the top of that same list.*

*What Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTTO is that she eventually gave the all-white unit #, a Tenant Parking Space #5, for their 2nd vehicle, despite units # and # being in the first two spots on the waiting list for Tenant Parking Spaces for their 2nd vehicles.*

What Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTO is that units # and # were still forced to continue park to pay for offsite parking all the while still living in the building after the all-white unit # was given a Tenant Parking Space (5) for their 2nd vehicle ahead of them.

What Stella Reddy deliberately does not state in her response and to the HRTO is that she refused to give the Applicant and her husband, unit # and # any Visitor Parking Passes, despite her giving one to the all-white unit # for their 2nd vehicle.

The Applicant and her husband feel that their needs to be some clarification as to the importants of referring to the unit # as all-white.

Unit # was like the Applicant and her husband. Unit # consists of a Caucasian male and a Black female and they had a bi-racial child.

Unit # were a Caucasian couple, who had 1 child, but they had a lot of Black friends and company that use to come by and visit on a very regular basis.

So viewing Stella Reddy's behaviour in regards to issuing Parking Spaces and Visitor Paring Passes, and forcing everyone to park offsite, resulting in them to pay extra. It appears that Stella Reddy again allow for her prejudice against interracial relationships, bi-racial children and blacks in general, to influence her preference for who was entitled to the special/white privilege of being able to parking onsite.

Stella Reddy goes on to state " I sent them a blank parking form to complete to be dropped off to the office to be added to the waiting list. I did not receive the form "

First, the Applicant would like to state that Stella Reddy NEVER forwarded a " blank parking form " to her. The Applicant went to the front lobby and took a Tenant Service Request Form to file out and hand in.

Second, reviewing the attached .PDF file made on March 16, 2018 by the Applicant labelled - Parking Pass Request.

You can see that on March 16, 2018 at 6:00 pm the Applicant filled out a Tenant Service Request Form requesting a

" Temporary/Visitor Parking Pass. Year: 2018, Make: Nissan, Model: Qashqai, Colour< Nitro Green, Plate: CDVR 807. Please place Temporary/Visitor parking pass in out mailbox as you have previously done in all other occasions when we would rent a car. "

Stella Reddy stated " I did not receive the form "

Reviewing the attached video taken on March 16, 2018 by the Applicant and her husband labelled " Parking Pass Office - March 16, 2018 " It shows the Applicant show and placing the same Tenant Service Request Form through the mailbox slot in the office door of Stella Reddy.

Again it appears that Stella Reddy has once again trying to muddy the waters with her deliberate lies in hopes that once again it would become a he said/she said situation as to what happen in regards to the parking request.

It appears that Stella Reddy's statement " We cannot do for one that we couldn't do for them all. " should have been written as - What we do for unit #, we cannot do for all!

*Stella Reddy also stated on August 15, 2018 in her response " The property owners were concerned over BBQ and as it is their property I was enforcing it. It has always been my belief that as long as the property owners follow all rules they should, they are able to say what they are willing to have on their property. As tenants are only renting the apartment they live in, they don't own it so therefore have no say in what they can and can't do. They are still the only tenants with a BBQ on their balcony. "*

*Again reviewing the pictures and videos attached to this email that were taken on August 15, 2018, the very same day that Stella Reddy forward her response to the HRTTO, the Applicant and her husband.*

*The Applicant and her husband took pictures of 4 other long term tenants that have been in the building for years that also have BBQ's.*

- Southside of building Units #
- Video of unit# BBQ
- Northside of building Unit # Video of unit# BBQ
- Northside of building Unit #
- Video of unit# BBQ

What Stella Reddy amazingly and deliberately does not state in her response sent to the HRTTO is that not only does unit # have a BBQ, but that tenant is her very her own sister!

It is absolutely astounding how Stella Reddy conveniently forgot to mention this to the HRTTO!

*The Applicant would now like to address a couple of issues raised by of Alto Properties Inc. owners in their response.*

Upon review the response of Alto Properties Inc. owners it is clear that they have not taken any position, nor do they even acknowledge anything in regards to the behaviour of Stella Reddy or themselves.

Not once do they address any of the issue that have been laid out against them in the application made by the Applicant.

*What Alto Properties Inc. owners do is discuss the LTB hearing held on September 26, 2017.*

What owners do **not mention** is that at no time does the adjudicator [REDACTED] allow the Applicant to explain her case and defense in full. In fact the adjudicator [REDACTED] continues to try and rush the hearing along.

What the owners do not mention is that the adjudicator [REDACTED] did allow the Applicant to hand in a stack of Stella Reddy documents, but he never allowed the Applicant to explain how they were relevant to the application filed against them.

In fact the Applicant and her husband stated to the adjudicator [REDACTED] that the evidence they handed in was “directly related ” to the application filed against them by Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. owners .

*If the LTB hearing was being held the same way with the HRTO, it would be the equivalent of the Applicant handing in her 148 pieces of documents as evidence and not giving her 107 Statement Of Fact as to the significances and importants of the paper work.*

It is absolutely ridicules for anyone to believe that the LTB or the HRTO could even begin to understand what all this paper work could mean without some clarification and explanation from the Applicant.

*Looking at the attached transcripts from the LTB hearing, you can see that the Applicant and her husband given very limited opportunity to explain the evidence ., You can clearly see that the Adjudicator [REDACTED] allows them to hand in their evidence, but limits and rushes the Applicant or her husband to speak on it. The adjudicator refused to allow the Applicant and her husband to elaborate on the connection between the evidence and Stella Ready and Properties Inc. owners.*

*Also reviewing the HRTO Application filed by Stella Reddy herself on the Applicant and her husband file #2018-32928-I, form 1.*

- Stella Reddy Page file #2018-32928-I

*Stella Reddy stated under section “ Other Proceeding – IN PROGRESS ” checks yes to “ A claim before another board, tribunal or agency. ” and “ other ” with the explanation “ Divisional Court Appeal for LTB*

*Order issued Oct. 3, 2017 of an eviction. Waiting on court date for appeal still, was informed may be in Sept. or Oct. by lawyer retained for the case. ”*

It is clear that Stella Reddy acknowledges that the Appeal by the Applicant is ongoing, yet she still expects the HRTO to allow her own application against the Applicant and her husband to continue to go forward despite the ongoing Appeal.

*Even in all of Stella Reddy’s emails and response to the HRTO, the Applicant and her husband. Stella Reddy is more than excited and willing to bring this current application against her to a hearing level.*

*Whereas Properties Inc. owners would much more prefer it be dismissed. It appears that 5 of the 7 parties involved in this application are more than willing to allow this application to move forward and run its course.*

What the Applicant wants to clarify is that the Appeal in Divisional court has absolutely nothing to do with Stella Reddy or Alto Properties Inc. owners.

*The Appeal is based on the fact that the Adjudicator [REDACTED] had an obvious bias against the Applicant and her family when making his order for eviction.*

*Therefore the claims made by Alto Properties Inc. owners that the Application filed by the applicant should be dismissed are unfounded and implausible.*

*At the hearing the respondents do not discussed the evidence that was handed in by the Applicant.*

*Therefore there can be no issue as to the weight of the evidence as it was never discussed or specifically addressed by the adjudicator [REDACTED] in his Order.*

*It was essentially just a giant paper weight for the Adjudicator [REDACTED] to place on his desk, as there was never any explanation of its relevance or connection to the current case in front of the LTB at the time.*

*Again the Appeal is strictly based on the behaviour and bias of the adjudicator [REDACTED] and not the evidence that was handed in by the applicant.*

*Reading the Order created by the adjudicator [REDACTED], nowhere does he address any of the evidence presented by the Applicant. It is clear that the adjudicator [REDACTED] could not address the evidence handed in by the Applicant as there was never any explanation give for it.*

*So to sum this up, it is clear that Stella Reddy has continued to lie to the HRTO. It is clear by reading the response of Stella Reddy that she continues to try and play the pity-card for all of her negative past life experiences, in only what one can assume is for sympathy.*

*It is also clear that Alto Properties Inc. owners do not wish to address anything in regards to the claims made in the applicants 107 page " Statement Of Facts " against them or Stella Reddy.*

*It appears that Alto Properties Inc. owners are hoping that the HRTO will just sweep the Applicants application out to sea, like at the LTB. And the HRTO will just forget about it, without ever asking about the many questions the Applicant has raised, or the many questionable actions performed by all the respondents involved.*

*Again reviewing the previous attempts by Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. owners to alter and create fake documents after the fact.*

*Along with Stella Reddy's current outright and deliberate lies in her newest response. The Applicant and her husband again want to reiterate the importants of getting a complete copy on their tenant file in the hands of the HRTO before addressing any further accusations made by Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. owners, in an attempt to get some form of early insight to the Applicants case before the actual hearing.*

*At this time the Applicant and her family do not think that there is any need to address the respondent's response.*

*At this time the Applicant and her family are positive that the HRTO has seen Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. owners for who they are.*

**The Applicant and her family are comfortable with the idea that the HRTO by now has acquired more questions than they have answers.**

*The Applicant and her husband also would like to reserve their rights to elaborate more on the responses of Stella Reddy and Alto Properties Inc. owners in the future if they feel there is a need for it. The Applicant and her family request that they should not be limited to only the above text when explaining their case.*

*Thank you very, very much for all if your time.*

*K and A*