In the Matter of

The *FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT*
(RSBC 1996, c. 141)
(the "Act")

And

INSURANCE COUNCIL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
("Council")

And

LONNY QUENTIN LADOUCEUR
(the "Former Licensee")

ORDER

Pursuant to section 237 of the Act, Council convened a hearing at the request of the Former Licensee to determine if the allegations in its Notice of Hearing, dated June 16, 2026, would be established.

The Hearing Committee conducted a hearing on June 26, 2026, wherein the Former Licensee admitted to the conduct at issue and addressed the Hearing Committee on the issues of penalty and costs.

The Council and the Former Licensee were each given further opportunity to address costs in writing after the hearing.

The Hearing Committee then prepared its Reasons for Decision, dated November 2, 2026.

In accordance with the decision-making powers delegated to the Hearing Committee pursuant to section 223 of the Act, Council makes the following orders:

1. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's investigation costs in the amount of $1,812.50, to be paid by February 1, 2027;

2. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's hearing costs in the amount of $6,175.44, to be paid by February 1, 2027; and

3. Council will not consider an application for any insurance licence from the Former Licensee for a period of two (2) years from the date of this Order and until Council's investigation costs and hearing costs are paid in full.

This order takes effect on the **2nd day of November, 2026.**

Barbara Price
Chair of the Hearing Committee

In the Matter of

The *FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT*
*(*R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 141)
(the "Act")

and

THE INSURANCE COUNCIL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
("Council")

and

LONNY QUENTIN LADOUCEUR
(the "Former Licensee")

Date:	June 26, 2026 9:30 a.m.	
Before:	Barbara Price, Chair Rhonda Palmer Maureen Kurenoff	
Location:	Virtual	
Present:	David McKnight	Counsel for Council
	Lonny Ladouceur	Appearing on his own behalf
	Michael Shirreff and Jessica Lithwick	Counsel for the Hearing Committee

REASONS FOR DECISION OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE

BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

Overview

1. On March 10, 2026, Council issued an Intended Decision in relation to allegations that the Former Licensee failed to comply with the Act, the Council Rules and Council's Code of Conduct. The Former Licensee was provided with written reasons and notice of the Intended Decision on March 30, 2026.

2. The next day, on March 31, 2026, pursuant to section 237 of the Act, the Former Licensee sought a hearing to dispute the Intended Decision.

3. The hearing occurred by video on June 26, 2026. In advance of the hearing, Council and the Former Licensee executed a detailed Agreed Statement of Facts, dated June 10, 2026 (the "ASF"). The hearing proceeded cooperatively and, through the admissions in the ASF, the Former

Licensee acknowledged that he had not complied with aspects of the Act, Council Rules and Council's Code of Conduct during the course of his licensing application with Council in 2023, as well as during the course of events that took place when he was licensed in Alberta.

4. Where Council and the Former Licensee departed was with respect to whether there was a need for any sanctions, given the unique circumstances of this matter, including the laudatory changes that the Former Licensee has made to his personal and professional spheres in recent years; the absence of any professional conduct issues in British Columbia since 2023; the Former Licensee's cooperation with Council during the investigation and the hearing process; and the reputational harm that the Former Licensee has already experienced as a result of an earlier decision from the Alberta Insurance Council (the "AIC").

5. Council accepts that there are several mitigating factors in this matter but takes the position that it remains necessary for the protection of the public for the Former Licensee to be sanctioned.

6. For the reasons outlined below, the Committee agrees with Council and would have cancelled his general insurance licence (his "Licence") if he had not allowed it to lapse since the hearing making such an order unnecessary. The Committee has concluded that the appropriate order is as follows:

    a. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's investigation costs in the amount of $1,812.50, to be paid within 90 days of Council's order;

    b. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's hearing costs in the amount of $6,175.44, to be paid within 90 days of Council's order; and

    c. Council will not consider an application for any insurance licence from the Former Licensee for a period of two years from the date of this order and until Council's investigation costs and hearing costs are paid in full.

Summary of the allegations in the Notice of Hearing

7. As set out in detail in the Notice of Hearing, the Hearing Committee was asked to determine whether the Former Licensee breached section 231(1)(c) of the Act, Council Rules 7(3) and/or 7(8), and/or the Council's Code of Conduct (the "Code") section 3 ("Trustworthiness"); section 4 ("Good Faith"); section 7 ("Usual Practice: Dealing with Clients"); section 8 ("Usual Practice: Dealing With Insurers"); and/or section 12 ("Dealing with the Insurance Council of British Columbia") by:

    a. Making false and/or material misstatements and/or misrepresentations on his insurance licence application with Council or in reply to an inquiry by Council;

    b. Failing to disclose to Council that the Former Licensee was the subject of an investigation by another regulatory body; and

    c. Acting contrary to the usual practice of the business of insurance in the Former Licensee's dealings with clients and insurers.

8. The Hearing Committee will address each of these matters in the decision below.

EVIDENCE

Witnesses and Exhibits

9. There were no witnesses called at the hearing. The evidence was entered by way of the detailed ASF, which was agreed to by Council and the Former Licensee. The ASF, which was marked as Exhibit 1, canvassed the material facts in detail.

10. In addition to the ASF, three further documents were entered into evidence by agreement: Council's Book of Documents (Exhibit 2); some recent health information relating to the Former Licensee (Exhibit 3); and a letter that the Former Licensee had prepared, in relation to his Alberta matter, that he read into the record at the hearing (Exhibit 4).

11. In response to Council's submissions, the Former Licensee provided additional context and guidance to the Hearing Committee about the underlying events. The Former Licensee was also asked questions by the Hearing Committee at the conclusion of his submissions.

Licence history

12. The Former Licensee obtained his General Insurance Agent Level 2 licence with Council on October 18, 2023. He also held a general insurance licence with Council from January 26, 2015 to August 6, 2016.

13. The Former Licensee's Licence became inactive in June 24, 2025, and was cancelled for failure to renew on July 31, 2026.

14. The Former Licensee previously resided in Alberta and held a general insurance agent licence in that province. The Former Licensee also at one point held a general insurance agent licence in Saskatchewan.

15. The Former Licensee has worked in the insurance industry since 1989, with breaks and relicensing over the years. The Former Licensee holds certain designations, including Chartered Service Professional and Certified Risk Management, and he most recently worked in British Columbia with an agency until his employment ended in 2025 after his conduct issues emerged, as described in more detail below.

16. At the time of the hearing, the Former Licensee was not licensed in any other province. He was running a non-profit housing initiative in [redacted] for individuals recovering from addiction.

AIC Order – May 2, 2025

17. On May 2, 2025, the AIC issued a decision addressing allegations that on forty (40) occasions the Former Licensee committed misconduct with respect to insurance transactions in

Alberta. The AIC concluded that the Former Licensee was guilty of misrepresentation, fraud, deceit, untrustworthiness or dishonesty, as contemplated by section 480(1)(a) of the *Insurance Act,* RSA 2000, Chapter 1-3 (Alberta) (the "AIC Order").

18. In brief, the AIC found that the Former Licensee provided false or misleading information to clients and insurers when he collected broker fees from clients without having written broker fee agreements in place. The Former Licensee also submitted false client addresses to insurers to obtain lower rates for his clients, prevented insurers from adequately underwriting insurance business and exposed insureds to risk from a lack of insurance coverage and the potential denial or cancellation of coverage.

19. The Former Licensee had self-reported these matters to the AIC on July 31, 2023. The AIC Order quoted from the correspondence prepared by the Former Licensee, as follows:

> *As you are aware, my 2023-24 Level II General insurance License renewal is currently under review. I need to advise you of additional matters concerning my conduct as an insurance representative. There have been applications of auto insurance that I have completed with clients and falsified addresses of residence for the clients to receive a lower premium. I thought I was helping the clients as they were at the dealership at time of application and they wanted to get the car that day and I also wanted to be their broker. I am ashamed of this behavior and how I allowed myself to go down this road knowing that integrity is of utmost importance not only to my oath as a broker but my oath that accompanies my FCIP status. I can assure both [the Agency] [redacted] and the AIC that this matter of dishonesty has been addressed and I can assure you it will never occur again.*

20. The Former Licensee explained at the hearing that his mentor and manager had encouraged him to report these matters to the AIC after the issues had been noted by the agency. He said that his conduct was motivated by his desire "to take care of my family financially. Unfortunately I did carry on this practice up until my license was suspended in June of 2023."

21. The AIC viewed the Former Licensee's conduct as intentional and concluded that he had acted in a manner that was fraudulent, deceitful, dishonest and which reflected on his untrustworthiness as a Former Licensee. The AIC ordered the Former Licensee to pay a penalty of $5,000 per demonstrated offence, resulting from forty (40) offences, for a total penalty of $200,000.

22. The Former Licensee has yet to make payment to the AIC, but he explained that he plans on reaching out to the AIC to set up a schedule for payments to be made. As he has not worked since 2025, he has been unable to make any payments to date. But he said that he does intend to pay the AIC penalty.

The Former Licensee's former British Columbia agency

23. On June 24, 2025, the Former Licensee advised Council about the AIC Order. Although the AIC Order had been issued on May 2, 2025, it had not been served on the Former Licensee by the AIC, so there was no issue taken in this hearing about delay in reporting the AIC Order.

24. Within a day of the Former Licensee notifying Council, the Former Licensee's agency also informed Council that it had received notification that the Former Licensee was the subject of an investigation conducted by the AIC which resulted in a "judgment" against him. The agency advised Council that the investigation had not been previously disclosed to them and indicated that it was unaware that the Former Licensee was under investigation. The agency requested that the Former Licensee's authorization to represent the agency be revoked immediately.

25. The Former Licensee's employment with the agency was terminated shortly thereafter.

26. Following the Former Licensee's termination, the agency undertook an extensive review of his files and transactions. The agency was able to confirm to Council that, while employed at the agency, the Former Licensee's work met the agency's "standards of accuracy, integrity, and compliance, and that no issues or irregularities were identified." Put another way, the Former Licensee had not continued with the conduct that resulted in the AIC Order.

The Former Licensee's application to Council and disclosure of the AIC matter in July 2023

27. In light of the AIC Order being brought to Council's attention, a review was undertaken of the information that the Former Licensee had provided to Council when he applied for a licence in July 2023.

28. On July 4, 2023, the Former Licensee applied for a general insurance licence, level 2. In response to the question: Are you currently under investigation by any organization, the Former Licensee responded "Yes", and disclosed that the AIC "has postponed the renewal of my 2023/24 level II as they review the [redacted]."

29. The Former Licensee's application contained no reference to the professional allegations that the Former Licensee self-reported to the AIC weeks later, on July 31, 2023.

30. [redacted]

31. As part of its review, Council sought information about the Former Licensee's licensing history in both Alberta and Saskatchewan and his application was eventually referred to Council's Licensing Committee. That Committee met with the Former Licensee on October 12, 2023 to discuss his application.

32. During this meeting, the Former Licensee did not disclose that he was under investigation by the AIC and did not provide any information regarding the conduct subsequently detailed in the AIC Order.

33. Council's Licensing Committee granted the Former Licensee a level 2 general insurance licence.

Further interviews with Council

34. As part of its investigation, on September 10, 2025, a Council investigator interviewed the Former Licensee.

35. The Former Licensee stated that when he had applied to renew his British Columbia licence on July 4, 2023, he had not known the AIC was investigating him. The Former Licensee stated he only found out about the investigation in September or October 2023.

36. In explaining why he had not disclosed the AIC investigation to Council in the fall of 2023, the Former Licensee said that he did not interpret the Alberta matter as being part of a formal investigation. The Former Licensee stated that he had been told that the AIC just had some questions about the applications he was completing and:

> *…So I answered those questions to the best of my ability. And then that was it, I didn't hear from them for like a year and a half. And all of a sudden the, what would you call it, conviction, I don't know, the reprimand from the AIC came through. But I didn't hear nothing from them for a year and a half, just about.*
>
> *So I don't know if I was being investigated or what was going on. Nobody gave me anything…*

37. When asked why he did not disclose the AIC investigation during the licensing meeting held on October 12, 2023, he said that did not believe the Alberta matter was pertinent. He regarded the AIC investigation as an informal inquiry, not a formal investigation. However, the Former Licensee also acknowledged, in hindsight, that the lack of disclosure was "a poor judge of decision making on my part."

38. Council also followed up with the AIC during the investigation. On November 28, 2025, an AIC Compliance Investigator advised that the Former Licensee had been notified by email on August 14, 2023, that "an investigation was opened", and that the Former Licensee was also interviewed by the AIC on August 15, 2023.

39. These events occurred long before the Licensing Committee meeting in October 2023.

40. As part of this matter, the Former Licensee also attended a Review Committee meeting with Council on February 10, 2026. The transcript from that meeting was included in Council's Book of Documents.

41. When asked how the Former Licensee's Alberta misconduct was initially discovered, the Former Licensee stated that his "employer went into the files and noticed the changing of the addresses to get clients lower rates." The Former Licensee stated that "I knew it was wrong against the insurance code, being an insurance broker and integrity and going against the Insurance Act. It was wrongful information."

42. When asked why he did not disclose the AIC investigation to Council during the Licensing Meeting in October 2023, the Former Licensee stated:

> *It was driven by fear. I was afraid that I wouldn't be able to provide for my family and that I wouldn't have an income, which eventually did happen. So it was driven by fear, but again, I fully admit that that was wrong. I still should have admitted, at the time, because it was coupling with - well this guy just now* [redacted] *but then now this came up and now this* is *coming up and I have - I felt there's no way I was going to get a B.C. licence. So it was driven by fear.*

SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

Council's position

43. Council submitted that the Former Licensee committed misconduct in failing to advise Council about the Alberta investigation during the licensing process in British Columbia. Council also submitted that the AIC Order proved that the Former Licensee had acted contrary to the usual practices of insurance in his dealings with clients and insurers, with his Alberta conduct needing to be addressed as part of Council's reciprocal enforcement policies.

44. Council submitted that the Former Licensee's conduct breached section 231(1)(c) of the Act, Council Rules 7(3) and 7(8), as well as the Code, section 3 ("Trustworthiness"); section 4 ("Good Faith"); section 7 ("Usual Practice: Dealing with Clients"); section 8 ("Usual Practice: Dealing With Insurers"); and section 12 ("Dealing with the Insurance Council of British Columbia").

45. As a result of the misconduct, Council sought an order that the Former Licensee pay a $5,000 fine, asked that the Former Licensee's general insurance licence be cancelled for a period of three years from the date of the order and also sought an order for both investigation and hearing costs, to be paid within 90 days of the date of the order.

46. It was Council's position that the provisions of the AIC Order were clear and the Former Licensee's admissions in the hearing process established the alleged breaches of the Act, Council Rules and Code in terms of his failures to disclose those matters to Council. Similarly, Council submitted that the conclusions in the AIC Order also established quite serious misconduct in relation to the Former Licensee's practices in Alberta.

47. When there have been serious breaches of professional conduct, Council submitted that there must be an appropriate penalty in order to ensure that it is meeting its public interest mandate, both in terms of ensuring no further similar acts by the Former Licensee but also in sending the appropriate message to other Former Licensees, as well as members of the public, that misconduct of this nature will be addressed by Council.

48. In setting out its position with respect to penalty, Council referred the Hearing Committee to the usual factors influencing penalty, addressed by James T. Casey in The Regulation of Professions in Canada, which include deterrence, rehabilitation of the respondent, the need to

maintain public confidence in the regulatory process and the desire to ensure that any sanction is consistent with orders made in prior decisions.

49. In terms of prior decisions, Council referred the Hearing Committee to four decisions: Noel Francine Smith (February 2015); Rey Orlando Sua Carreno (March 2019); Amarpal Singh Atwal (March 2021); and Prince Martin Ola (August 2024).

50. In each of these decisions, the licensee received a period of licence cancellation. In three of the four decisions, the licensee was also required to pay a fine. The Hearing Committee regards Smith and Martin Ola as the most applicable decisions to this matter. In Smith, prior to applying to Council for licensing in British Columbia, Smith had been subject to two disciplinary actions by the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario. Smith had also been subject to personal bankruptcy twice. When she submitted applications to Council in 2010, she answered "no" to questions regarding whether she had previously been the subject of disciplinary action or subject to bankruptcy proceedings. Additionally, the licensee was disciplined by the Financial Services Commission of Ontario in 2014.

51. Council terminated both Smith's life and accident and sickness agent licence and general insurance licence for one year and fined her $5,000. She was also assessed Council's investigation costs and hearing costs.

52. In Martin Ola, a life and accident and sickness insurance agent who applied for a licence in March 2023 answered "no" to the question on the application asking if he had a criminal record. Council later obtained the former licensee's FBI Criminal Record Check from the United States, which stated that the former licensee was charged with fraud by wire, mail fraud and fraud by wire-radio or television on August 12, 2013. The sentence for the conviction was 30 months imprisonment and 36 months supervised release and restitution.

53. Council noted that it is a licensee's responsibility to ensure that all licence applications and responses to Council are made truthfully and accurately and that licensees must take the necessary steps to ensure the accuracy of those forms before making a declaration or submitting forms. Council also concluded that Martin Ola would likely not have met the licensing requirements at the time his licence was issued. Council ordered his licence be cancelled with no opportunity to reapply for three years.

54. Council submits that the comments in these earlier decisions about trustworthiness and good faith are equally relevant to the present case. In this matter, the Former Licensee made a material misstatement in his application for a licence with Council. He also failed to disclose the Alberta investigation during the Licensing Meeting in October 2023. By that date, there was no question that the Former Licensee was being formally investigated in Alberta.

55. Council submits that it is a licensee's responsibility to ensure that all licence applications and responses to Council are truthful and accurate. The Former Licensee eventually admitted that he did not disclose this information, as he said that he feared his application would be rejected. Although the Former Licensee initially stated he was unaware that the AIC investigation was a

formal investigation that needed to be disclosed, he also accepted at the RC meeting that he should have made disclosure.

56. Council also emphasized that the Former Licensee had not disclosed the Alberta matter to his agency in British Columbia.

57. With respect to the AIC matter, as it related to fraud and misrepresentations to insurers, Council submits that the facts and allegations of the AIC investigation are directly relevant to the Former Licensee's suitability to hold an insurance licence.

58. Additionally, Council submits that the AIC Order impacts the Former Licensee's suitability to hold an insurance licence in British Columbia. Specifically, the AIC's findings that the Former Licensee provided false or misleading information to clients and insurers is conduct that is contrary to the fundamental requirement of trustworthiness that all licensees must possess.

59. As Council described, the public and insurers rely on licensees to conduct insurance business in good faith and in a trustworthy manner. The Former Licensee misrepresented client addresses in a manner that may have financially benefited his clients, but which was detrimental to the insurers. In addition, the Former Licensee's conduct may have placed the clients at risk because they may have held invalid insurance or may not become insurable in the future as the insurer may have viewed the clients as participating in fraud.

60. Given the serious nature of the misconduct documented in the AIC Order and the number of occasions the Former Licensee engaged in this behaviour (40 occasions as identified by the AIC), Council submits there is a significant risk to the public should the Former Licensee continue to hold an insurance licence. Council also took the position that the Former Licensee's conduct raised serious concerns about his trustworthiness.

61. Council did note the presence of a number of mitigating circumstances that it accepted should be considered by the Hearing Committee at this stage of the process. The Former Licensee was cooperative in both the investigation and hearing processes and made admissions about these matters that allowed the hearing to complete in less than one day.

62. Further, the Former Licensee's agency in British Columbia confirmed that there were no concerns about the Former Licensee's professional practices and conduct while licensed between 2023-2025. That showed that the Former Licensee had in fact learned from what he did in Alberta and had taken steps to ensure that he did not repeat his earlier misconduct.

63. Finally, Council also noted that the Former Licensee appears to have made a number of laudatory changes to his life. He is actively giving back to his community and he was able to provide medical information that offered significant context to some of the underlying events. In recent years, the Former Licensee has made significant strides with respect to his health and he is now at a point where some of the factors that may have influenced his conduct in the past have now been addressed.

64. Council accepts that all of this information must be taken into account in determining a penalty.

65. However, even with a recognition of these important mitigating factors, Council submitted that the Former Licensee's conduct still requires a serious disciplinary order.

The Former Licensee's response submissions

66. The Former Licensee responded to Council's position at the hearing. He described himself as a person who knows when they've done something wrong and a person who is willing to accept the consequences. As soon as his issues were uncovered in Alberta, with the help of his mentor at the agency, he self-reported his conduct to the AIC.

67. Then later, in British Columbia, as soon as he was aware of the AIC Order, he immediately updated Council.

68. The Former Licensee spoke passionately about his history in the insurance industry, as well as a number of challenging personal factors that have impacted him personally and professionally in the past decades. He explained that, at times, he has experienced very challenging health problems, including [redacted] at times. The Former Licensee attributes many of his decision-making lapses to those challenges. [redacted]

69. The Former Licensee provided the Hearing Committee with background information about his work in the insurance industry and how much he values being a Former Licensee. He explained that, at one point, he was homeless. In his early 30s, he started to make some positive improvements to his life. He enrolled in a post-secondary education program, with the hope that he might obtain an insurance licence. At that time, as a result of his past, he was not sure if would be able to obtain an insurance licence.

70. He described a small agency in Alberta that was willing to take a chance on him and how the owner developed into an important mentor and father-figure for the Former Licensee as his career progressed. Despite his challenges, the Former Licensee said that the owner of the agency in Alberta was always kind and understanding. The Former Licensee also conceded that he let his mentor down with his professional conduct in Alberta. In his words, the Former Licensee took advantage of his mentor's generosity and kindness. It was clear that the Former Licensee was remorseful about the events in Alberta.

71. Things came to a head in Alberta when he self-reported his misconduct to the AIC. As those events were unfolding, the Former Licensee described that his conduct was heavily influenced by his health issues. He said that he had yet to receive the benefit of some medical diagnoses that he later obtained in or around 2024, which have been very positive impacts on his life. When he was explaining why he committed misconduct in Alberta, he described to the Hearing Committee that his health issues were such that he did not have the ability to apply the "brakes" that a normal person does. He knew he was not making the right decisions at the time, but he said he was unable to regulate his actions. He no longer has those issues as a result of the improvements he has made in his health. He pointed to his work as a licensee in British Columbia since 2023 as evidence of the positive changes he has made in terms of his

professional practices. He said when he was at the agency in British Columbia he did everything right.

72. During the course of his submissions, the Former Licensee took some time to read a letter that he had prepared to a family member of his mentor (who had passed away before the Former Licensee was able to speak with him). It was a compelling letter and it was clear to the Hearing Committee that the Former Licensee accepted responsibility for the mistakes he made prior to moving to British Columbia.

73. Since these issues came to light, the Former Licensee has not been able to work in British Columbia. He lost his job at the agency. He has not been employed since. He explained that he cares deeply about people and he started a non-profit organization where he is helping other people deal with addiction issues. It was obvious how meaningful that work is for the Former Licensee.

74. He said publication of the AIC order has, in his mind, made it effectively impossible for him to obtain another job in the insurance industry. When someone "googles" his name, the AIC Order and decision show up on the first page of results. The loss of his employment has also been very difficult for him, including financially. He explained that he has plans to start a new career, possibly involved in public or motivational speaking, but his focus in recent months has been the non-profit.

75. Overall, the Former Licensee's submissions were appropriately measured and contrite. He said to the Hearing Committee even though he has accepted where he fell short of his professional conduct in relation to the application process in British Columbia, he has already suffered enough harm as a result of these events. He politely and respectfully asked the Hearing Committee to show him grace and mercy and to not make any additional disciplinary order in this proceeding. The Former Licensee emphasized his [redacted], as well as the improvements he is continuing to his medical issues, and he suggested there to be no need for any further punishment beyond that in the AIC order.

76. With respect to the Alberta matter, the Hearing Committee asked the Former Licensee if he had made any payments towards the fine in Alberta. The Former Licensee confirmed that he had not made any payments to date, but he maintained that he intends to start making payments to the AIC as soon as he has found new employment.

77. At the end of the day, the Former Licensee articulated to the Hearing Committee how much he loved working in the insurance industry. He described his passion for the industry and he explained that he believes he has made a lot of changes to his life that would allow him to be a successful licensee should he get the chance to return to the industry in the future. He appreciated that he may not have any options to obtain a licence, but he was not closing the door to a possible return to the industry and he hopes that someone will give him another opportunity when the time is right.

78. On January 9, 2026, the Former Licensee provided Council with medical records and a doctor's reference note that provided information about his health issues. In order to protect the Former

Licensee's privacy, the Hearing Committee will not discuss that information in the decision, but has reviewed it carefully. The medical evidence did show a link between some of the Former Licensee's earlier conduct and his untreated health conditions. It certainly appears from the medical evidence that the Former Licensee has made some very positive progress on his health, dating back to at least 2024.

DECISION OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE

Overview

79. Although the Hearing Committee accepts what the Former Licensee described about the positive changes he has made in recent years, this is still a matter where there is a need for a disciplinary response by Council.

80. As Council accepted during its submissions, there are a number of factors in this matter that must be said to mitigate the appropriate penalty. In addition to the changes that have been made by the Former Licensee, it is also notable that his British Columbia agency independently confirmed that his professional practices in recent years met the expected standards. Further, the Former Licensee's cooperation in the investigation and hearing process allowed this matter to proceed efficiently and economically. The Former Licensee admitted the underlying conduct, which allowed the hearing to focus on the question of whether a penalty is required in these circumstances.

81. As noted earlier, the Former Licensee also appears to be making a positive contribution to his community with his efforts to help others [redacted] His work with the non-profit is reflective of a person who is trying to learn from his mistakes and better himself.

82. Finally, the Hearing Committee accepts the Former Licensee's submissions about the impact of the AIC Order. That decision is readily available on the internet when one conducts a search of the Former Licensee's name and the misconduct addressed by the AIC is serious and will no doubt impact the Former Licensee's ability to obtain employment in the insurance industry in the years ahead. However, those negative impacts of the AIC Order must also be balanced against the decisions made by the Former Licensee not to disclose the Alberta investigation during the British Columbia licensing process.

83. Despite the articulate and thoughtful submissions made by the Former Licensee, the Hearing Committee is of the view that the underlying misconduct requires there to be a disciplinary order made by Council.

84. The Former Licensee made a series of material misstatements and/or misrepresentations to Council when he withheld information about the Alberta investigation in 2023-2024. It is a licensee's obligation to ensure that Council is provided accurate and complete information on all issues that might impact a licensee's suitability to hold a licence. In this instance, even if one accepts that the Former Licensee was not aware that there was an ongoing Alberta investigation

when he applied to Council in July 2023, he was advised by the AIC in August 2023 that an investigation had been opened. He was also formally interviewed by the AIC that same month.

85. The Hearing Committee does not accept the Former Licensee's explanations that he did not understand that he was under investigation in Alberta when he was interviewed by Council in October 2023. By that date, there should have been no question at all about the status of that matter. As the Former Licensee later admitted when interviewed in 2025, he did not disclose information to Council about the Alberta investigation as he was concerned that his application in British Columbia might be rejected. That explanation makes sense.

86. In addition to the failure to disclose to Council, the Hearing Committee is also concerned about the Former Licensee's failure to alert his British Columbia agency to the fact that he was being investigated in Alberta. Although the Former Licensee had changed his practices by that point, his attempts to keep the Alberta matter secret reveal some serious concerns about his trustworthiness and judgment. It should have been obvious to the Former Licensee that there was likely to be some public disciplinary outcome with the AIC.

87. Having considered the prior decisions referred to by Council (Smith and Martin Ola, in particular), the Hearing Committee is of the view that this matter is another instance where a licence would likely have been denied if full and complete disclosure had been made. The Former Licensee already had a number of matters from his past that he reported to Council which impacted his application. Had he also included the fact that he was under investigation in Alberta for serious misconduct as a licensee, it is difficult to envision a scenario where his application would have been approved in British Columbia. That speaks to the seriousness of the matters addressed in the AIC Order.

88. Council also asks the Hearing Committee to take into account the findings in the AIC Order in terms of assessing the necessary penalty in this matter. Taking guidance from the reciprocal enforcement policy, the Hearing Committee accepts that the order in this matter must also address the Alberta misconduct, given its seriousness and the manner in which the findings strike at key aspects of a licensee's suitability. Council must be seen to be addressing licensee misconduct, particularly that which has the potential to place insurers and clients at risk.

89. Taking all of the above into account, this is a matter where the penalty order must reflect the seriousness of the Former Licensee's conduct while also accounting for the mitigating features addressed at the outset of this section.

90. Council has sought a licence cancellation with a 3-year period before the Former Licensee can reapply, together with a $5,000 fine. The Former Licensee has submitted that there is no need for any order.

91. The Hearing Committee has concluded, but for the fact that the Former Licensee has let his licence lapse, cancellation of his Licence would have been appropriate. With respect to the period of time during which the Former Licensee is not able to reapply, the Hearing Committee has determined that a 2-year period is sensible and reflective of a balancing of the above factors. In the result, the Hearing Committee orders that Council not consider an application for any insurance licence from

the Former Licensee before the passing of two years from the date of the Hearing Committee's order. In addition to taking into account the unique circumstances of this matter, the Hearing Committee believes that this period of prohibition is consistent with the ranges established in the prior decisions referred to by Council.

92. With respect to the $5,000 fine sought by Council, the Hearing Committee does not see this as being a matter where a fine is required in addition to the licence cancellation. The Former Licensee also faces a significant fine in Alberta. He has explained that he has been unable to make any payments towards that penalty given his unemployment since he was terminated by his agency. Adding a further $5,000 fine in this matter would appear unnecessary in these circumstances and would be perhaps overly punitive given the provisions of the AIC Order. For these reasons, the Hearing Committee declines to order a fine against the Former Licensee.

Investigation costs

93. As set out in Council's policy J.21 (the "Policy"), Council is permitted to assess investigation costs against a licensee, former licensee or other person who was the subject of an investigation.

94. In this matter, Council has sought investigation costs in the amount of $1,812.50, which was calculated based on 14.5 hours of investigator time and an hourly rate of $125 per hour. This is the prescribed rate as set out in the Costs Assessment Schedule in the Policy.

95. The Hearing Committee has noted that investigation costs are typically ordered in matters that proceed to hearing that result in a disciplinary action against a licensee. In this matter, the Hearing Committee believes it to be appropriate and in keeping with the Policy to order the Former Licensee to pay Council's investigation costs.

Hearing costs

96. After the hearing, on August 6, 2026, the Council provided a costs package to the Hearing Committee, seeking hearing costs of $6,725.44.

97. On August 7, 2026, Council confirmed that the package was forwarded to the Former Licensee and it was reforwarded to the Former Licensee by the Hearing Committee's counsel on that date as well, along with her request that the Former Licensee advise as to whether he intended to make submissions regarding the costs package.

98. The Former Licensee responded to the email but did not answer counsel's question and so counsel repeated her question by email on August 11, 2026.

99. On Monday August 24, 2026, the Hearing Committee's counsel made one final overture to the Former Licensee, asking him to confirm that he was declining to provide further materials or argument in response to the Council's hearing costs package. He was given until Friday, August 28, 2026, to respond and he did not do so.

100. As per s. 241.1 (1)(b) of the Act, the Hearing Committee may award costs or partial costs of this hearing.

101. Pursuant to s. 241.1(2)(a), those costs must not exceed actual costs incurred and may include remuneration for employees, officers or agents of the Council to have engaged in the hearing.

102. As per Policy J.21, these costs awards are not intended to be punitive but based on the principle that a Former Licensee whose improper activities cause the Council to incur costs ought to bear some or all of those costs. Barring exceptional circumstances, costs are assessed not based on full indemnity for actual costs but based on the Council's Costs Assessment Schedule.

103. The Council's costs claimed are in accordance with the Costs Assessment Schedule except that the amount payable for the costs of Hearing Committee's counsel's attendance at the half-day hearing of this matter should be reduced to $275 as opposed to the $825 claimed.

104. As such, costs are awarded to the Council in the sum of $6,175.44.

ORDERS OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE

105. The Hearing Committee makes the following orders:

a. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's investigation costs in the amount of $1,812.50, to be paid within 90 days of Council's order;

b. The Former Licensee is assessed Council's hearing costs in the amount of $6,175.44, to be paid within 90 days of Council's order; and

c. Council will not consider an application for any insurance licence from the Former Licensee for a period of two years from the date of this order and until Council's investigation costs and hearing costs are paid in full.

Dated at Vancouver, British Columbia, on the **2nd day of November, 2026.**

Barbara Price
_____
Barbara Price, Chair of the Hearing Committee