

## DISCIPLINE DECISION

REVIEWING PANEL: Greg Flude, Public Member  
Jon Lemaire 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 -	)
2812952 ONTARIO INC.	)
O/A GRAN TURISMO AUTO GROUP	)
- and -	)
VINCENTS ANTONIPILLAI	)

---

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:** April 2, 2026

**Findings:** **2812952 Ontario Inc. o/a Gran Turismo Auto Group (the “Dealer”)**  
**has breached the following:**

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

**Vincents Antonipillai (“Antonipillai”) has breached the following:**

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

**Order:**

1. The Dealer shall pay a fine in the amount of **\$5,000** no later than one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal's Order.
2. The Dealer shall **offer** to all current and future salespersons, employed by the Dealer, to **fund** their completion of the MVDA Key Elements Course, no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal's Order.
3. Antonipillai shall successfully complete a one-on-one OMVIC Advertising Compliance Webinar no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal's Order.

**Overview**

1. This matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts, dated February 25, 2026, 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 under the Act in and around September 2023.
2. Antonipillai was first registered as a salesperson in or around July 2015. At all relevant times, Antonipillai was registered as a salesperson with the Dealer and was the Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer to ensure compliance with the Act and Regulations thereunder.

**Dealer's Non-Compliance:****Unregistered Salesperson**

3. On or before November 18, 2024, the Dealer published an advertisement for a 2014 Toyota RAV4 LE (VIN\*\*\*196116) ("2014 Toyota"), with an advertised price of \$11,488 plus sales taxes and licensing.
4. On November 19, 2024, OMVIC investigators ("Investigators") made inquiries about the vehicle, while posing as a member of the public. The salesperson acting on behalf of the Dealer (the "Salesperson"), provided a handwritten note on pricing for the vehicle to the Investigators.
5. Upon Investigators' request, the Salesperson provided a business card identifying himself as "Vince Antonipillai".
6. As the result of further investigation, it was determined that the Salesperson who assisted the Investigators on November 19 was not Antonipillai.
7. The individual who assisted investigators was Antonipillai's father, a former OMVIC registrant, who used shared office space with Antonipillai and acted independently

without his authorization.

8. No other salespeople other than Antonipillai were registered to the Dealer on or about November 19, 2024, and therefore the Dealer failed to prevent his father from acting on its behalf.

9. This is contrary to section 9(1) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, Ontario 332/08.

**All-in pricing violation:**

10. On March 5, 2024, a consumer viewed an advertisement on the Dealer's website for a 2017 Toyota Highlander Limited AWD (VIN \*\*\*370337), listed at \$27,888, plus HST and licensing.

11. The consumer contacted Antonipillai by phone to inquire about the out-the-door cash purchase price. Antonipillai advised that the total price would be \$32,290, inclusive of safety certification, a 36-day warranty, licensing, registration, and taxes. He further stated that a \$52 fee would apply for a new number plate, if required.

12. On March 11, 2024, the consumer confirmed with Antonipillai that the quoted out-the-door price was \$32,290. Following negotiations, the price was reduced to \$32,000.

13. Payment arrangements were made whereby the consumer would provide a \$1,000 cash deposit, with the remaining \$31,000 to be paid via certified bank draft.

14. On March 14, 2024, the consumer attended the dealership in person to pick up the vehicle. On that date, Antonipillai provided the Bill of Sale, along with the ownership documents and other related documents.

15. The Bill of Sale included an additional charge above the advertised price in the amount of \$10 for the OMVIC fee.

16. Moreover, the Bill of Sale listed the total purchase price of \$31,976.74, however, the consumer was charged a total of \$32,000, resulting in an overcharge of \$23.26.

17. As a result, the Dealer's advertised vehicle price was not all-inclusive. In doing so, the Dealer violated section 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

**Antonipillai's Non-Compliance:**

18. Antonipillai 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), 9(1) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

**Code of Ethics Violations**

19. As particularized above, the Dealer have 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.

20. As particularized above, the Dealer and Antonipillai have violated the following section of the Code of Ethics:

*Professionalism*

s. 9(1) In carrying on business, a registrant shall not engage in any act or omission that, having regard to all of the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unbecoming of a registrant.

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.

21. As particularized above, Antonipillai 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**

2. 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(2), 9(1) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, and
- b. Vincents Antonipillai has breached Sections 6(2), 9(1) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics.

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

### **Reasons for Decision**

4. 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.

5. In considering the monetary penalty, the Reviewing Panel notes the following:

### **Aggravating Factors**

- a. There is one impugned trade at issue involving a breach of the all-in pricing regulations where the consumer was charged in excess of the advertised price.
- b. The Dealer permitted an unregistered salesperson to trade in cars. This factor is aggravated by the fact that the unrepresented salesperson impersonated a registered salesperson.

**Mitigating Factors**

- a. The Applicants have accepted responsibility for their actions as evidenced by entering into an agreed statement of facts and joint submission on penalty.
- b. The Applicants have made full restitution to the consumer.
- c. This is the Applicants' first appearance before the Discipline Tribunal

6. Having considered all of the factors, the Reviewing Panel finds that the proposed penalty is in line with other penalties imposed by the Discipline Tribunal for similar behaviour. The amount is sufficient to signal to the industry that breaches of the regulations are serious offences.

7. 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: April 2, 2026



---

Greg Flude, Public Member

On behalf of:  
Jon Lemaire, Registrant Member  
Paul Repar, Registrant Member