

CITATION: Latino Wall Street, LLC v. Ontiveros, 2026 ONSC 4439
COURT FILE NO.: CV-26-0584 (Brampton)
DATE: 2026-07-31

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:

LATINO WALL STREET, LLC

Applicant

-and-

MARIA ALEXANDRA ONTIVEROS

Respondent

Matt Maurer, for the applicant
Maria Alexandra Ontiveros, self-represented

Date: July 31, 2026

ENDORSEMENT

[1] In a prior endorsement (2026 ONSC 3982), I found that the respondent had established she did not have any notice of the Puerto Rican proceedings. However, she had agreed to the Puerto Rican court having jurisdiction in any dispute arising from the contract. I found that the respondent would have to pursue her remedies to have the Puerto Rican judgment set aside in Puerto Rico. I found that a judgment should issue in Ontario to enforce the Puerto Rican judgment. I invited submissions on whether to temporarily stay granting the Ontario judgment to allow time for the respondent to pursue a remedy in Puerto Rico. I also invited submissions on costs. This endorsement addresses those two issues.

[2] I decline to grant a stay of the Ontario judgment. Beyond conducting research as to what she needs to do in the Puerto Rican proceedings, the respondent has done little

towards advancing the required motion in Puerto Rico. In similar circumstances in *Marx v. Balak*, 2008 BCSC 222, Myers J. declined to grant a stay.

[3] I also decline to award any costs to the applicant in the Ontario proceeding. Again, I found that the respondent had had no notice of the Puerto Rican proceedings. There is no evidence to suggest the applicant even attempted to notify the respondent of the Puerto Rican proceedings by email, regular mail, or a courier service, even though the applicant had the respondent's email and physical addresses. Such an approach should be discouraged. Declining costs might help to discourage others from taking the same approach.

[4] In addition, when it commenced and pursued the Puerto Rican proceeding knowing that the respondent was resident in Ontario, the applicant ought to have anticipated the concerns that the courts in Ontario would have with enforcing the Puerto Rican judgment. Many, if not all, of the issues raised in this enforcement proceeding could likely have been avoided had the applicant taken the simple step of providing notice by email, regular mail, or courier. Had it done so, I would not have hesitated to award costs of enforcing the Puerto Rican judgment in Ontario. Instead, the applicant chose an approach that would inevitably lead to arguments that have nothing to do with the merits of the dispute.

[5] While the applicant has succeeded on the application, the respondent's challenge arose largely because she had no notice of the Puerto Rican proceeding. In those circumstances, I conclude that the appropriate costs disposition is that each party bear their own costs.

DISPOSITION

[6] The draft judgment has been revised to reflect these reasons and has been signed.

Chown J.