

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 -)
DREAMFLEET INC.)
- and -)
TANIYA OBEROI)
- and -)
HARDIK OBEROI)
)

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: **Dreamfleet Inc. (the “Dealer”)** has breached the following:

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

Taniya Oberoi (“T. Oberoi”) has breached the following:

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

Hardik Oberoi (“H. Oberoi”) 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. The Dealer shall pay a fine in the amount of **\$3,000** no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
2. T. Oberoi 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. H. Oberoi 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 24, 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 August 2007.
2. The Dealer has two business locations registered with the Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council (“OMVIC”). The first location (the “Head Office Location”) is at 108 Cannifton Rd N, Belleville, ON, K0K 1K0. The second location (the “Branch Location”) is at 243 Queen St E, Brampton, ON, L6W 2B5, with a mailing address at the Head Office Location.
3. T. Oberoi was first registered as a salesperson in and around September 2022. At all material times, T. Oberoi has been an Officer of the Dealer and the Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer’s Head Office Location.
4. H. Oberoi was first registered as a salesperson in and around July 2024.

Educational Resources

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 price advertising obligations. Educational resources continue to be available on OMVIC’s website.

Reminders to Comply

6. During an inspection on or about September 12, 2023 at the Branch Location (located at 1000 Dundas Street East, Unit 3, Mississauga, ON, L4Y 2B8 at the time), a representative of the Registrar reminded the Dealer and T. Oberoi about the Dealer's all-in price advertising obligations pursuant to section 36(7) of O. Reg. 333/08.

Dealer's Non-Compliance

7. On or before May 15, 2025, the Dealer published an advertisement for a 2021 Toyota Prius Prime Auto, stock# 192905 (VIN# *192905), with an advertised price of \$25,899 plus taxes and licensing.
8. On or about the same date, an OMVIC Representative made inquiries about the vehicle at the Head Office Location, while posing as a member of the public (also known as a mystery shop).
9. H. Oberoi, acting on behalf of the Dealer, informed the OMVIC Representative that the vehicle was currently located at the Branch Location, but could be delivered to the Head Office Location. H. Oberoi then stated that he had to call the Dealer's Finance Manager at the Branch Location to obtain the vehicle's price.
10. After the phone call, H. Oberoi wrote down the vehicle's pricing breakdown on a printed copy of the vehicle's advertisement that was possessed by the OMVIC Representative. The pricing breakdown indicated the advertised price of \$25,899 along with an additional charge of \$499. H. Oberoi indicated that the \$499 was a Document fee that was for "licensing".
11. However, a \$499 fee could not be for licensing and instead represented an additional mandatory charge on top of the advertised price.
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.

T. Oberoi's Non-Compliance

13. T. Oberoi 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.

H. Oberoi's Non-Compliance

14. In regard to the above-noted 2021 Toyota Prius Prime Auto, H. Oberoi 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. H. Oberoi 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

15. As particularized above, the Dealer and H. Oberoi 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.

16. As particularized above, the Dealer, T. Oberoi, and H. Oberoi 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.

17. As particularized above, T. Oberoi and H. Oberoi 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 sections 4(1), 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics; (2) T. Oberoi has breached sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics; and (3) H. Oberoi 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

these particular offenders. Dealing with the last of these first, there is an education requirement for each of the personal applicants 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 offence for a dealership that has been in business for over 18 years. It also notes that the Dealer was reminded of its all-in pricing obligations in 2023. 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 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 remedial action, 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.

Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council
Discipline Tribunal

Dated: December 29, 2025



Greg Flude, Public Member

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