



**Social
Benefits
Tribunal**

APPELLANT
Appellant's Representative

Sean House von Dehn
Self-Represented

RESPONDENT
Respondent's Representative

Administrator, Ontario Works
Caroline Forget

PRESIDING MEMBER

Elizabeth Kirby

Hearing Date
SBT File No.

August 19, 2026 (Administrative Hearing)
2512-08602

DECISION

ISSUE

[1] The Appellant disagrees with a decision made by the Administrator to pay rental subsidies for utilities and rental insurance directly to his landlord, who the Appellant claims does not pay utility expenses.

DECISION

[2] The appeal is dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND

[3] A hearing was scheduled for June 4, 2026 to discuss the issue of jurisdiction, given the Administrator's position that the amount overpaid to the landlord was refunded to the Appellant in the amount of \$1,018.00 on July 22, 2025. Due to this reimbursement, the Administrator submits that the issue under appeal has been resolved

[4] A case management ruling was issued on June 10, 2026, directing the parties to make submissions on the issue of jurisdiction, namely whether there was a decision of the Administrator affecting eligibility (given the Respondent's position that the Appellant had been made whole as a result of a reimbursement).

[5] A second case management ruling was issued on July 20, 2026, asking the parties to make submissions regarding whether the Appellant had been made whole for the entire 6-year period that the Appellant claims he was underpaid income support. The Tribunal issued this case management ruling because the Administrator previously provided a ledger showing an underpayment to the Appellant and a corresponding overpayment to his landlord, but only for the period of August 1, 2023, to February 1, 2025.

[6] A third administrative hearing was held to consider the respective submissions of the parties in this regard, resulting in this decision.

REASONS

[7] In the Appellant's Form 1 Appeal, they indicate that they had been entitled to receive rental subsidies for utilities and rental insurance through a "Home for Good" subsidy program over a six-year period.

[8] In the Administrator's initial Form 3 Response, it indicates that an overpayment had occurred to the Appellant's landlord for the period of November 2023 to June 2025. The Administrator indicates that this overpayment occurred because shelter benefits were on a pay direct to pay the Appellant's rent to the landlord, but that at the time same time, the landlord was receiving the subsidy from the Home for Good program. The Administrator provides a ledger to demonstrate the amount overpaid to the landlord for this time period, which was reimbursed to the Appellant.

[9] In previous submissions, the Appellant claimed that this ledger covered only part of the six-year period he alleges he has been underpaid. A case management ruling issued accordingly, seeking submissions on the period prior to November 2023. However, in the Administrator's most recent submissions, it indicates that the Appellant only began receiving

the Home for Good supplement in November 2023. The Administrator indicates that the Home for Good supplement program is not administered by Ontario Works.

[10] In the Appellant's supplemental submissions, he submits that the Administrator failed to process his subsidy for this program for a period of six years. However, the Tribunal is not satisfied that this grievance is an appealable issue within the scope of the Tribunal's jurisdiction. While the Tribunal has jurisdiction over an underpayment of shelter costs and basic needs, it is not satisfied that the Appellant's grievance regarding delay in the processing of this subsidy (which is not administered by Ontario Works) is an appealable decision.

[11] The underpayment in this case arose because when the Appellant's landlord began receiving the Home for Good subsidy, the amount of the Appellant's pay direct from Ontario Works was not adjusted to reflect this. Accordingly, no such underpayment by Ontario Works could have occurred before this Home for Good subsidy began for the Appellant in 2023. Given this, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Appellant was, more likely than not, made whole for the period of the underpayment that occurred between November 2023 and June 2025.

[12] Given that the Appellant has been reimbursed for the underpayment that occurred during this period, the Tribunal is satisfied that there is no longer an appealable issue before the Tribunal and the appeal is moot.

ORDER

[13] The appeal is dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction.



Signed by Elizabeth Kirby

**Date issued
September 15, 2026**