

DISCIPLINE DECISION

REVIEWING PANEL: Sherry Darvish, Discipline Tribunal Chair, Public Member
Jon Lemaire, Registrant
Paul Eros, Registrant

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 -)
)
TREMBLAY CHEVROLET BUICK GMC INC.)
)
- and -)
)
DANIEL TREMBLAY)
)
- and -)
)
MICHAEL PETER TREMBLAY)
)
)

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: February 13, 2025

Findings: Tremblay Chevrolet Buick GMC Inc. has breached the following:

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

Daniel Tremblay has breached the following:

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

Micheal Peter Tremblay has breached the following:

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

Order:

1. Tremblay Chevrolet Buick GMC Inc. (the “Dealer”) shall pay a fine in the amount of **\$2,500** no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
2. Daniel Tremblay (“D. Tremblay”) 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. Michael Peter Tremblay (“M. Tremblay”) 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. 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 October 16, 2024, 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:

Amendment:

1. The Notice of Complaint (“NOC”) dated February 7, 2024 is amended to reflect that the Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council (“OMVIC”) replaces the Registrar, *Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, 2002* as a party to this proceeding.

Background:

2. Tremblay Chevrolet Buick GMC Inc. (the “Dealer”) was first registered as a motor vehicle dealer in and around February 1983.
3. Daniel Tremblay (“D. Tremblay”) was first registered as a salesperson in and around March 1983. At all material times, D. Tremblay was an Officer and Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.

4. Michael Tremblay ("M. Tremblay") was first registered as a salesperson in and around March 1993. At all material times, M. Tremblay has been a Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.

OMVIC Publications:

5. Since the Act was proclaimed in 2010, OMVIC has issued various educational materials, including publications, webinars and guidelines, reminding registrants of their all-in pricing obligations. The dates of said publications are attached hereto as Schedule "A". Educational materials continue to be available on OMVIC's website.

Dealer's Non-Compliance:

6. On or before July 12, 2023, the Dealer published an advertisement for a 2022 black Cadillac XT5 Premium, stock# A-1464 (VIN# *119590) with an advertised price of \$64,995.
7. On or about the same date, an OMVIC Representative made inquiries about the vehicle, while posing as a member of the public (also known as a mystery shop).
8. A salesperson, acting on behalf of the Dealer, advised the OMVIC Representative that the selling price of the vehicle also included the following mandatory fees that were not mentioned in the total advertised price:
 - a. "Global I" fee of \$449
 - b. OMVIC fee of \$10
9. As such, the Dealer's advertised vehicle price was not all-inclusive. This is contrary to section 36(7) of O. Reg. 333/08, as well as sections 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

D. Tremblay's Non-Compliance:

10. D. Tremblay 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.

M. Tremblay's Non-Compliance:

11. M. Tremblay 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.
12. As particularized above, the Dealer has violated the following section of the Code of Ethics:

Disclosure and marketing

- 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.

13. As particularized above, the Dealer, D. Tremblay, and M. Tremblay 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.

14. As particularized above, D. Tremblay and M. Tremblay 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: (1) the Dealer has breached subsections 4(2) and 9(3) of the OMVIC Code of Ethics; (2) D. Tremblay has breached subsections 6(2) and 9(3) of the OMVIC Code of Ethics, (3) M. Tremblay has breached subsections 6(2) and 9(3) of the OMVIC Code of Ethics.

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

Reasons for Decision

The Reviewing Panel received and considered comprehensive written materials from the parties and was left satisfied that the proposed resolution has no risk of being contrary to the public interest. The outcome is clearly connected to the admitted breaches of the Code of Ethics and consistent with other outcomes ordered in this Tribunal in similar cases. In such circumstances, disposition under Rule 1.07 is appropriate and ordered accordingly.

Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council
Discipline Tribunal

Dated: February 13, 2025

S. Darwish

Sherry Darvish, Discipline Tribunal Chair,
Public member
On behalf of:

Jon Lemaire, Registrant
Paul Eros, Registrant

