

DISCIPLINE DECISION

REVIEWING PANEL: Greg Flude, Public Member
Chris Pinelli, Registrant Member
Paul Repar, Registrant Member

IN THE MATTER OF A DISCIPLINE HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE *MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS ACT, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.30, Sch. B*

B E T W E E N :

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|---|
| ONTARIO MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY COUNCIL |) |
| - and - |) |
| PETRIE FORD SALES (KINGSTON) LTD. |) |
| - and - |) |
| LISA MARLENE PETRIE |) |
| - and - |) |
| NATHAN ALEXANDER PURVES |) |
| - and - |) |
| NATASHA C. VANDERSPANK |) |
| - and - |) |
| PAUL RAY ANDRESS |) |

This matter proceeded by way of Rule 1.07 of the Rules of Practice before the Discipline Tribunal and the Appeals Tribunal. This Reviewing Panel has reviewed and considered written materials from the Parties together with a waiver of the requirement for an oral hearing and hereby makes the following Order:

Date of Decision: December 29, 2025

Findings: **Petrie Ford Sales (Kingston) Ltd. (the “Dealer”) has breached the following:**

- Sections 4(1), 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08

Lisa Marlene Petrie has breached the following:

- Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08

Nathan Alexander Purves has breached the following:

- Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08

Natasha C. Vanderspank has breached the following:

- Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08

Paul Ray Andress has breached the following:

- Sections 4(1), 4(2), 6(2), and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08

Order:

1. Petrie Ford Sales (Kingston) Ltd. (the “Dealer”) shall pay a fine in the amount of **\$3,500** no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
2. Lisa Marlene Petrie (“Petrie”) shall successfully complete the MVDA Key Elements Course no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
3. Nathan Alexander Purves (“Purves”) shall successfully complete the MVDA Key Elements Course no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
4. Natasha C. Vanderspank (“Vanderspank”) shall successfully complete the MVDA Key Elements Course no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
5. Paul Ray Andress (“Andress”) shall successfully complete the MVDA Key Elements Course no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
6. The Dealer shall **offer** to all current and future salespersons, employed by the Dealer, to **fund** their completion of the Automotive Certification Course, no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.

Overview

This matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts, dated November 5, 2025, a jointly proposed disposition and a waiver of oral hearing, pursuant to Rule 1.07 of the Rules of

Practice before the Discipline Tribunal and the Appeals Tribunal. The Agreed Statement of Facts states in relevant part as follows:

Background

1. The Dealer was first registered as a motor vehicle dealer in and around April 1983.
2. Petrie was first registered as a salesperson in and around October 2009. At all material times, Petrie has been a General Manager and Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.
3. Purves was first registered as a salesperson in and around August 2016. At all material times, Purves has been a General Manager and Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.
4. Vanderspank was first registered as a salesperson in and around September 2019. At all material times, Vanderspank has been a Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.
5. Andress was first registered as a salesperson in and around March 2025.

Educational Resources

6. Since the Act was proclaimed in 2010, OMVIC has issued various educational materials, including publications, webinars and guidelines, reminding registrants of their all-in price advertising obligations. Educational resources continue to be available on OMVIC's website.

Reminders to Comply

7. On or about November 26, 2020, a representative of the Registrar sent a warning letter to the Dealer, reminding the Dealer and staff of its all-in price advertising obligations pursuant to section 36(7) of O. Reg. 333/08.

Dealer's Non-Compliance

8. On or before June 9, 2025, the Dealer published an advertisement for a 2022 Ford Bronco Sport Big Bend, stock# 24M37A (VIN# *E05777), with an advertised price of \$28,995 plus taxes and licensing.
9. On or about June 11, 2025, an OMVIC Representative made inquiries about the vehicle, while posing as a member of the public (also known as a mystery shop).
10. Andress, acting on behalf of the Dealer, provided the OMVIC Representative with a printed worksheet for the vehicle. The worksheet showed a selling price of \$28,995, but also the following additional charges added to the price of the vehicle:
 - a. BG/Tire & rim fee of \$499
 - b. Fuel fee of \$50

11. After providing the OMVIC Representative with the worksheet, Andress then stated that they “might be able to do something better.” Andress did not clearly represent these fees to be optional.
12. As such, the Dealer’s advertised vehicle price was not all-inclusive nor was it represented in a clear and truthful manner. This is contrary to section 36(7) of O. Reg. 333/08, as well as sections 4(1) and (2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

Petrie’s Non-Compliance

13. Petrie failed to ensure that the Dealer conducted its business in compliance with the Act, its regulations, and the Code of Ethics and thus personally contravened sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

Purves’ Non-Compliance

14. Purves failed to ensure that the Dealer conducted its business in compliance with the Act, its regulations, and the Code of Ethics and thus personally contravened sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

Vanderspank’s Non-Compliance

15. Vanderspank failed to ensure that the Dealer conducted its business in compliance with the Act, its regulations, and the Code of Ethics and thus personally contravened sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

Andress’ Non-Compliance

16. In regard to the above-noted 2022 Ford Bronco Sport Big Bend, Andress failed to represent the price of the vehicle and its additional fees in a legal manner and thereby violated sections 4(1) and (2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics. Andress also failed to ensure that the Dealer conducted its business in compliance with the Act, its regulations, and the Code of Ethics and thus personally contravened sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

Code of Ethics Violations

17. As particularized above, the Dealer and Andress have violated the following sections of the Code of Ethics:

Disclosure and marketing

s. 4(1) A registrant shall be clear and truthful in describing the features, benefits and prices connected with the motor vehicles in which the registrant trades and in explaining the products, services, programs and prices connected with those vehicles.

s. 4(2) A registrant shall ensure that all representations, including advertising, made by or on behalf of the registrant in connection with trading in motor vehicles, are legal, decent, ethical and truthful.

18. As particularized above, the Dealer, Petrie, Purves, Vanderspank, and Andress have violated the following section of the Code of Ethics:

Professionalism

s. 9(3) A registrant shall use the registrant's best efforts to prevent error, misrepresentation, fraud or any unethical practice in respect of a trade in a motor vehicle.

19. As particularized above, Petrie, Purves, Vanderspank, and Andress have violated the following section of the Code of Ethics:

Accountability

s. 6(2) A registered salesperson shall not do or omit to do anything that causes the registered motor vehicle dealer who employs or retains the salesperson to contravene this Regulation or any applicable law with respect to trading in motor vehicles.

Decision of the Reviewing Panel

Having reviewed and considered the Agreed Statement of Facts and written submissions provided by the Parties, the Reviewing Panel is satisfied that the evidence contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts substantiates the allegations that:

- a. The Dealer has breached Sections 4(1), 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics;
- b. Petrie has breached Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics;
- c. Purves has breached Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics;
- d. Vanderspank has breached Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics and
- e. Andress has breached Sections 4(1), 4(2), 6(2), and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

The Reviewing Panel accepted the parties' proposed resolution for the reasons below.

Reasons for Decision

1. In reviewing the joint submission on penalty, the Reviewing Panel must determine if the proposed resolution is in the public interest or if it is so unhinged from the circumstances of the impugned behaviour that a reasonable person would believe that the justice system has broken down. In doing this analysis, the Reviewing Panel must bear in mind the aims of levying an administrative penalty: specific deterrence of the offender, general deterrence for the motor vehicle sales industry, and rehabilitation and remediation for the offenders. Dealing with the last of these first, there is an education requirement the personal applicant that, it is hoped, will educate and encourage regulatory compliance in the future.
2. In considering the monetary penalty, the Reviewing Panel notes that this all-in pricing violation is a first appearance before the Discipline Tribunal for the dealership under its current management. An aggravating factor is that the Dealer was issued a warning letter on all-in pricing in 2020. To their credit, the Respondents have accepted responsibility for their actions as evidenced by entering into an agreed statement of facts and joint submission on penalty. The proposed penalty is in accordance with other penalties imposed by the Discipline Tribunal in similar cases. The amount is sufficient to signal to the industry that breaches of the all-in pricing regulations are serious offences.

3. The Reviewing Panel is satisfied that the agreed upon penalty satisfies the sentencing principles of specific and general deterrence, maintains public trust, meets the objectives of rehabilitation and remediation, and that the proposed penalty is in the public interest. The parties are thanked for working towards a resolution short of the need for a hearing.

Dated: December 29, 2025

Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council
Discipline Tribunal



Greg Flude, Public Member

On behalf of:
Chris Pinelli, Registrant Member
Paul Repar, Registrant Member