

DISCIPLINE DECISION

REVIEWING PANEL: Greg Flude, Public Member
Paul Eros, Registrant
Jon Lemaire, 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 -)
LEGGAT DISCOVERY MOTORS)
INC. o/a LEGGAT DISCOVERY)
FORD)
- and -)
ROBERT RYAN LEGGAT)
- and -)
MICHAEL JOHNSON)

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: July 24, 2025

Findings: Leggat Discovery Motors Inc. o/a Leggat Discovery Ford (the "Dealer") has breached the following:

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

Robert Ryan Leggat (“Leggat”) has breached the following:

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

Michael Johnson has breached the following:

- Sections 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 **\$2,500** no later than ninety (90) calendar days from the date of the Discipline Tribunal’s Order.
2. Leggat 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. Johnson 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 June 26, 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. Leggat Discovery Motors Inc. o/a Leggat Discovery Ford (the “Dealer”) was first registered as a motor vehicle dealer in and around September 2019.
2. Robert Ryan Leggat (“Leggat”) was first registered as a salesperson in and around October 2003. At all material times, Leggat has been the Managing Partner, General Manager, and Person in Charge of the day-to-day activities of the Dealer.
3. Michael Johnson (“Johnson”) was first registered as a salesperson in and around October 2024.

OMVIC Publications

4. 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. The dates of said publications are attached hereto as Schedule “A”. Educational materials continue to be available on OMVIC’s website.

Prior OMVIC Warning Letter

5. On or about February 1, 2024, the Registrar sent a warning letter to the Dealer to remind the Dealer and staff of the Dealer's all-in price advertising obligations pursuant to section 36 of O. Reg. 333/08.

Dealer's Non-Compliance:

6. On or before January 8, 2025, the Dealer published an advertisement for a 2024 Ford Bronco Sport Free Wheeling, stock# BS24-56855 (VIN# *E56855) with an advertised "Leggat Price" of \$39,185 (price of \$48,685 minus a discount of \$9,500), plus taxes and licensing. The discount consisted of a "Leggat Discount" of \$3,500 and a "Cash Rebate" of \$6,000.
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. Johnson, acting on behalf of the Dealer, provided the OMVIC Representative with a printed quote. The quote showed a selling price of \$48,685 along with a "Leggat Discount" of \$3,500, resulting in a price of \$45,185 for the vehicle. The following additional charges were also added to the price of the vehicle:
 - a. "Platinum Security Protection" Fee of \$349
 - b. Fuel Fee of \$100
 - c. OMVIC Fee of \$12.50
 - d. "Platinum Tire and Rim 12M" Fee of \$199
 - e. "Tint Front 2 Windows to Match" Fee of \$349
9. Shortly after leaving the Dealer's premises, the OMVIC Representative sent a text to Johnson to inquire if the "Platinum Security Protection" Fee, the "Platinum Tire and Rim 12M" Fee, and the "Tint Front 2 Windows to Match" Fee are mandatory or optional. Johnson replied, stating that "[t]hey wouldn't be mandatory, but I would definitely recommend them. The tint is already installed so that comes with the vehicle."
10. Adding the Fuel Fee of \$100, the OMVIC Fee of \$12.50, and the "Tint Front 2 Windows to Match" Fee of \$349 to the vehicle's price of \$45,185 results in a sum of \$45,646.50. This sum is \$6,461.50 greater than the advertised "Leggat Price" of \$39,185.
11. After receiving the Notice of Referral to Discipline dated April 2, 2025, the Dealer indicated that the advertised price of \$39,185 was intended as a cash price, as the \$6,000 "Cash Rebate" was only available for consumers paying for the vehicle by cash. The quote provided by Johnson to the OMVIC Representative included a bi-weekly payment plan, suggesting that the price indicated on the quote was intended as a financing price.
12. Factoring out the \$6,000 "Cash Rebate", the sum would instead be \$39,646.50. This sum is \$461.50 greater than the advertised "Leggat Price" of \$39,185.
13. 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.

Leggat's Non-Compliance:

14. Leggat 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.

Johnson's Non-Compliance:

15. In regards to the above-noted 2024 Ford Bronco Sport Free Wheeling, Johnson failed to represent the price of the vehicle and its additional fees in a legal manner and thereby violated sections 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics. Johnson 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.
16. As particularized above, the Dealer and Johnson 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.

17. As particularized above, the Dealer, Leggat, and Johnson 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.

18. As particularized above, Leggat and Johnson 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) Dealer has breached Sections 4(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08; (2) Leggat has breached Sections 6(2) and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08; and (3) Johnson has breached Sections 4(2), 6(2), and 9(3) of the Code of Ethics, O. Reg. 332/08.

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

Reasons for Decision

The Reviewing Panel has considered the proposed resolution. It finds that the penalty achieves the goals of adequate punishment for the offence, specific deterrence of the Dealer, Leggat and Johnson against future breaches of the code of ethics, and general deterrence for the industry showing that such breaches are considered serious and will be treated accordingly. In this particular matter, the parties agreed to the resolution. The Reviewing panel finds that the resolution is within the range of penalties for similar acts in other matters before this Tribunal and is not contrary to the public interest.

Dated: July 24, 2025

Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council
Discipline Tribunal

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Flude", is written above a horizontal line.

Greg Flude, Public member
On behalf of:

Paul Eros, Registrant
Jon Lemaire, Registrant