

CPA Alberta Conduct Case Summaries

October 2025 – May 2026

October 2026

Arnal (Re), 2025 ABCPA 9

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Stephanie Dawn Arnal CPA, and Stephanie Arnal CPA Professional Corporation, the registrants against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

In February 2023, Kathryn Goodwin (“Goodwin”) retained Stephanie Dawn Arnal CPA (“Arnal”) and Stephanie Arnal CPA Professional Corporation (“Arnal PC”) to prepare personal T1 and corporate T2 tax returns for Goodwin, her family, and her corporation, COMMUNIKATEGOOD Inc. (“COMMUNIKATEGOOD”).

Between February and July 2023, Arnal became difficult to reach and did not respond to Goodwin's communications in a timely manner. Arnal did not complete the tax returns that Goodwin had retained her to prepare.

FINDINGS

Arnal and Arnal PC admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that they:

1. Failed to complete and submit the 2023 personal and corporate tax returns of Kathryn Goodwin and her firm, COMMUNIKATEGOOD, after being retained to do so; and
2. Failed to communicate with Kathryn Goodwin in a timely manner between February and July 2023.

OUTCOME

Arnal and Arnal PC, and the Complaints Inquiry Committee, agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. A written reprimand;
2. Payment of 50% of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
4. If Arnal or Arnal PC fail to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, their registrations will be cancelled.

Arnal (Re), 2025 ABCPA 10

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Stephanie Dawn Arnal CPA, and Stephanie Arnal CPA Professional Corporation, the registrants against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

In March 2022, Doug Morrison (“Morrison”) retained Stephanie Dawn Arnal CPA (“Arnal”) and Stephanie Arnal CPA Professional Corporation (“Arnal PC”) to prepare the 2015-2022 corporate T2 tax returns for his consulting company, 1583693 Alberta Ltd. (the “Corporation”). Morrison delivered his corporate records to Arnal in May 2022. Between July and August 2022, Arnal requested additional records from Morrison, which Morrison provided.

In November 2022, Arnal advised Morrison that a bank statement was missing from the records provided. Between December 2022 and January 2023, Morrison repeatedly sought clarification from Arnal about the bank statement and an update on the engagement. Morrison wrote to Arnal expressing concern that she had been non-responsive. Arnal apologized for the delay and advised that she had located the missing bank statement.

In March 2023, Morrison provided Arnal with additional records. Arnal advised Morrison that she had received the records and would complete the first few years of the Corporation’s tax returns.

Between July and September 2023, Morrison repeatedly contacted Arnal for updates on the status of the Corporation’s tax returns and whether he should retain another accountant. Arnal did not respond.

In November 2023, Morrison's successor accountant retrieved Morrison's corporate records from Arnal. Arnal did not complete or submit the Corporation’s tax returns despite being retained to do so.

FINDINGS

Arnal and Arnal PC admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that they:

1. Failed to complete and submit the 2015-2022 corporate tax returns for the Corporation despite being retained to do so; and
2. Failed to communicate with Doug Morrison in relation to the engagement to complete the 2015-2022 corporate tax returns for the Corporation after March 21, 2023.

OUTCOME

Arnal and Arnal PC, and the Complaints Inquiry Committee, agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. A written reprimand;
2. Payment of 50% of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
4. If Arnal or Arnal PC fail to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, their registrations will be cancelled.

Wallace (Re), 2025 ABCPA 11

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and David Beatty Wallace CPA, CA and David B. Wallace Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant, the registrants against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

In October 2022, CPA Alberta's Practice Review Committee ("PRC") notified David B. Wallace Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant ("DWPC") that it was required to undergo a practice review. DWPC submitted the required scheduling and administrative forms in February 2023.

The PRC scheduled a review for March 2023 and advised DWPC of the client files selected for review. Between March and July 2023, the PRC repeatedly requested the selected files by email, telephone, and letter. The PRC also rescheduled the review and repeatedly advised DWPC that a failure to provide the files could result in a referral to the Complaints Inquiry Committee ("CIC").

DWPC did not provide the requested client files.

In October 2023, the CIC Secretary notified David Beatty Wallace CPA, CA ("Wallace") and DWPC that a complaint had been received from the PRC and requested a response within 30 days. In November 2023, the CIC Secretary advised that no response had been received and requested a response by December 4, 2023.

Neither Wallace nor DWPC provided a response.

FINDINGS

Wallace and DWPC admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that they:

1. Failed to cooperate with the requirements of CPA Alberta's practice review process by failing to respond to communications from the Practice Review department that required a response between February 15, 2023 and July 25, 2023; and
2. Failed to cooperate with the requirements of CPA Alberta's Complaints Inquiry process by failing to respond to communications from the CIC Secretary that required a response.

OUTCOME

Wallace and DWPC, and the Complaints Inquiry Committee, agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. Payment of a fine in the amount of \$1,000 within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;

2. Payment of the costs of the investigation within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
4. If Wallace or DWPC fail to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, their registrations will be cancelled.

Kaushik (Re), 2025 ABCPA 12

IN THE MATTER OF a Discipline Tribunal Decision involving Rakesh Kaushik, against whom allegations were made:

FACTS

In July 2018, a Discipline Committee of CPA Saskatchewan found Kaushik guilty of unprofessional conduct relating to his failure to cooperate with a practice inspection and deficiencies in assurance engagements. In November 2018, the Discipline Committee issued its decision on penalty and costs. Kaushik failed to notify CPA Alberta of the Saskatchewan findings within 21 days of the decision. He appealed the decision to the CPA Saskatchewan Board. The Board upheld the decision in December 2019. Kaushik subsequently appealed to the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench.

In July 2020, CPA Saskatchewan notified CPA Alberta of its findings. CPA Alberta initiated a complaint for Kaushik's failure to report. The Complaints Inquiry Committee ("CIC") Secretary notified Kaushik of the complaint and requested a response. Kaushik responded in August 2020. However, he did not acknowledge his requirement to report the Saskatchewan findings nor explain why he had failed to do so.

In May 2021, the CIC Chair directed an investigation and appointed an Investigator. The Investigator requested that Kaushik explain why he had failed to report the Saskatchewan findings. After a follow-up request, Kaushik acknowledged the findings but denied that he had acted unprofessionally.

In October 2021, the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench dismissed Kaushik's appeal.

Kaushik's CPA Alberta registration was cancelled in January 2022 for non-payment of member dues.

FINDINGS

The hearing proceeded based on an Agreed Statement of Facts.

Allegations 1 and 2: Failure to Report Saskatchewan Findings and Failure to Maintain the Good Reputation of the Profession

The CIC alleged that Kaushik failed to notify CPA Alberta of the Saskatchewan findings and consequently failed to maintain the good reputation of the profession.

The Tribunal found that Kaushik failed to report the Saskatchewan findings to CPA Alberta as required by the Rules of Professional Conduct. The Tribunal concluded that ignorance of the reporting requirement was not an excuse for non-compliance. The Tribunal further found that Kaushik failed to uphold the good reputation of the profession.

Allegation 3: Failure to Respond to Communications from CPA Alberta

The CIC alleged that Kaushik failed to respond to communications from the CIC Secretary and Investigator that required a response.

The Tribunal found that Kaushik failed to respond to requests that he acknowledge the reporting requirement and explain why he had not complied with it. The Tribunal also found that he failed to comply with response deadlines imposed by the CIC Secretary and Investigator. However, the Tribunal found that Kaushik was otherwise generally responsive and cooperative throughout the investigation and discipline process.

OUTCOME

The Tribunal concluded that Allegations 1 and 2 arose from the same underlying conduct. Accordingly, it determined that only one sanction should apply to both allegations.

The Tribunal considered mitigating factors, including:

1. Kaushik's acceptance of responsibility;
2. His generally cooperative participation in the regulatory process;
3. The absence of any demonstrated harm to the public; and
4. The significant financial consequences arising from the Saskatchewan proceedings.

The Tribunal ordered:

1. Payment of a fine of \$1,000 in relation to Allegations 1 and 2 within one year of the statement of costs being served;
2. A written reprimand in relation to Allegation 3;
3. Payment of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders in the amount of \$5,000 within one year of the statement of costs being served;
4. Publication of the CPA Saskatchewan Board decision dated December 13, 2019 by posting a link to the decision; and
5. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557.

Sian (Re), 2025 ABCPA 13

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Gursharn (Guru) Singh Sian CPA, the registrant against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

At the time of the relevant conduct, Gursharn (Guru) Singh Sian (“Sian”) was registered in CPA Alberta's Professional Education Program through the CPA Western School of Business. He became a Chartered Professional Accountant in July 2025.

Sian was employed by Josh Spurrell Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountants (“JS PC”) from February 2020 to January 2022.

Sian was the principal of GSR Enterprises Inc. (“GSR”), a corporation established to operate a trucking business. Sian sold his truck in March 2020 and did not provide trucking services thereafter. In April 2021, GSR changed its name to Guru's Accounting and Tax Services Inc (“Guru”).

In June 2020, the Government of Alberta introduced the Small and Medium Enterprise Relaunch Grant (“SMERG”), an emergency relief program for businesses affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Sian completed SMERG applications on behalf of JS PC clients, GSR, and Guru.

Sian submitted SMERG applications that contained incorrect and inflated revenue amounts. He also supplied documents that were misleading or not credible in support of those figures. The purpose of the inflated revenues was to obtain higher SMERG funding up to the maximum available grant. The applications involved GSR, Guru, Dog Jogs Ltd., 1865212 Alberta Ltd., 2139597 Alberta Ltd. o/a Blooms Grow Tech, 2139554 Alberta Ltd. o/a Blooms Grow Tech, and Lexmedia Inc.

Sian was aware of false or misleading statements that he and other JS PC employees made in the SMERG applications. He did not take any steps to correct those statements with the Government of Alberta, nor did he report the conduct to CPA Alberta.

Sian used the grant funds received by GSR and Guru to supplement his income at JS PC. He did not attempt to repay the improperly obtained funds.

FINDINGS

Sian admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that he:

1. Completed or was associated with SMERG applications that contained material misstatements and misrepresentations, including:
 - a. Submitting false or misleading supporting documentation for GSR Enterprises Inc., Dog Jogs Ltd., and 1865212 Alberta Ltd.; and
 - b. Making false or misleading statements on SMERG applications, including inflating the revenues of JS PC clients to obtain SMERG funding for GSR

Enterprises Inc., Dog Jogs Ltd., 1865212 Alberta Ltd., 2139597 Alberta Ltd. o/a Blooms Grow Tech, 2139554 Alberta Ltd. o/a Blooms Grow Tech, and Lexmedia Inc.

2. Was aware of false or misleading statements made by himself and other JS PC employees on SMERG applications and failed to rectify those statements with the Government of Alberta or report them to CPA Alberta; and
3. Failed to repay amounts improperly obtained from the Government of Alberta through GSR Enterprises Inc. and/or Guru's Accounting and Tax Services Inc. after realizing those funds were improperly obtained.

OUTCOME

Sian and the Complaints Inquiry Committee agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. A written reprimand;
2. Within one year, completion of a course acceptable to the Complaints Inquiry Committee Secretary on the topic of ethics, with proof of completion to be provided to the Tribunal Secretary;
3. Payment of a fine of:
 - a. \$500 for Allegation 1;
 - b. \$500 for Allegation 2; and
 - c. \$500 for Allegation 3;payable within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
4. Payment of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
5. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
6. If Sian fails to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, his registration will be cancelled.

Sawchuk (Re), 2025 ABCPA 14

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Elizabeth Ada Sawchuk CPA, CMA, the registrant against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

Since 2015, Elizabeth Ada Sawchuk CPA, CMA (“Sawchuk”) had reported an exemption from Continuing Professional Development (“CPD”) requirements on the basis that she had permanently withdrawn from practice.

Sawchuk operated a business under the trade name Taxes 'N More (“TNM”). TNM was not registered as a professional accounting firm (“PAF”). Sawchuk did not otherwise have a registered PAF. The issuance of a review or audit report required registration as a PAF, which in turn required the completion of CPD requirements.

Around May 2023, Sawchuk signed and issued an “Independent Auditors Review” for Bergen Springs Condominium Association No. 9111945 under the name “Taxes 'N More Chartered Professional Accountant”. The report contained several deficiencies, including:

1. The review did not contain information about management responsibility, firm responsibility, how the opinion was formed, what work an audit/review encompasses, and the basis of the opinion.
2. The document was referred to as an “auditor's review”, which is not a recognized report type and creates uncertainty as to whether an audit or a review was completed.
3. The document did not contain a balance on the balance sheet.
4. The document contained note disclosures that did not comply with audit standards.
5. The document included “review findings”, which is not compliant with audit or review standards.
6. Segregation of duties and control weaknesses were not disclosed in the notes.
7. Significant accounting policies missed note disclosures associated with an audit or review engagement.
8. The cash flow statement did not tie to cash on the balance sheet. The cash flow statement showed \$351,000, but the balance sheet showed \$114,000.
9. The revenue recognition note was incomplete.
10. The deferred method was not fully explained.
11. Interest revenue recognition was not disclosed.
12. Estoppel and other revenue recognition were not disclosed.
13. Risk assessment was missing in note disclosures.

FINDINGS

Sawchuk admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that she:

1. Provided accounting services without being registered as a PAF;
2. Prepared and issued an assurance report that was not in compliance with relevant professional standards; and
3. Reported an exemption from CPD when providing professional services to the public that required taking and reporting CPD.

OUTCOME

Sawchuk and the Complaints Inquiry Committee agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. A written reprimand;
2. Payment of a fine of \$1,000 for each of Allegations 1, 2, and 3 within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Payment of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
4. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
5. If Sawchuk fails to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, her registration will be cancelled.

Ayodele-Bamisaiye (Re), 2025 ABCPA 15

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Ayomidotun Ibukun Ayodele-Bamisaiye CPA, and Dexteritas Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant, the registrants against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

Ayomidotun Ibukun Ayodele-Bamisaiye CPA (“Ayodele-Bamisaiye”) was the principal of Dexteritas Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant (“Dexteritas”).

In October 2020, Dexteritas underwent an initial practice review and received a “non-comply” assessment which identified serious deficiencies in the areas of:

- Compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on audit engagements, quality control, and compilation engagements.

In October 2021, Dexteritas underwent a first follow-up practice review and received a “non-comply” assessment which identified serious deficiencies in the areas of:

- Compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on audit engagements, quality control, and compilation engagements.

In October 2022, Dexteritas underwent a second follow-up practice review and received a “non-comply” assessment which identified serious deficiencies in the areas of:

- Compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on audit engagements, quality control, and compilation engagements.

In October 2023, Dexteritas underwent a third follow-up practice review and received a “non-comply” assessment which identified serious deficiencies in the areas of:

- Compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on audit engagements, quality control, and compilation engagements.

In October 2024, Dexteritas underwent a fourth practice review that was limited to compilation engagements. The review resulted in a “comply” assessment.

FINDINGS

Ayodele-Bamisaiye and Dexteritas admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that they:

1. Failed to sustain professional competence in all the areas in which they were providing professional services, in that:
 - a. In three practice reviews conducted of Dexteritas, serious deficiencies were identified in the following areas:
 - i. Compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on audit engagements; and

- ii. Compliance with Canadian standards on quality control;
- b. In two follow-up practice reviews conducted of Dexteritas, serious deficiencies were identified in compliance with Canadian generally accepted standards on compilation engagements.

OUTCOME

Ayodele-Bamisaiye and Dexteritas, and the Complaints Inquiry Committee, agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. Payment of a fine in the amount of \$1,000.00 within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
2. Payment of the costs of the investigation within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
4. If Ayodele-Bamisaiye or Dexteritas fail to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, their registrations will be cancelled.

***Kwasney (Re)*, 2025 ABCPA 16**

IN THE MATTER OF a Discipline Tribunal Decision under section 108 of the *CPA Act* involving Derek Nicholas Kwasney:

FACTS

Derek Nicholas Kwasney (“Kwasney”) was a member of CPA Alberta. In June 2024, Kwasney was convicted of fraud over \$5,000. This is an indictable offence. The conviction arose from a scheme in which Kwasney defrauded the Lake Louise Ski Resort as its Chief Financial Officer between November 1, 2010, and April 1, 2016. Kwasney was sentenced to 4.5 years' imprisonment and ordered to pay restitution of \$669,589.94. Kwasney appealed his sentence but not the conviction itself. The appeal was dismissed in May 2025.

In June 2025, Kwasney's CPA Alberta membership was cancelled for failing to report his Continuing Professional Development activities.

After becoming aware of the conviction, CPA Alberta requested that a Discipline Tribunal be convened under section 108 of the *CPA Act* to determine whether Kwasney's registration should be suspended or cancelled. The Tribunal provided Kwasney with multiple opportunities to make submissions. Kwasney did not respond or participate.

FINDINGS

The Tribunal accepted that Kwasney had been convicted of an indictable offence and had defrauded the Lake Louise Ski Resort of \$669,589.94 over a period of approximately five and a half years. It found that the conduct was shocking and extremely serious. The fraud occurred over an extended period and was directly connected to the accounting profession. Kwasney's actions were most harmful to the reputation of the profession and a serious blow to the public's confidence.

OUTCOME

The Tribunal concluded that Kwasney's conduct called for the highest type of denunciation available to the profession.

The Tribunal ordered:

1. Cancellation of Kwasney's registration under Part 5 of the *CPA Act*; and
2. Publication of the matter pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and CPA Alberta Bylaws 1523 and 1550.

The Tribunal noted that Kwasney's membership had already been cancelled for administrative reasons. However, it emphasized that his registration was also cancelled because of his conduct underlying the conviction. Section 108 of the *CPA Act* does not authorize the imposition of fines or costs.

Chen (Re), 2026 ABCPA 1

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between the Complaints Inquiry Committee and Albert Chen, against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

Albert Chen (“Chen”) was registered in the CPA Western School of Business (“CPAWSB”) Professional Education Program (“PEP”). Chen unsuccessfully attempted the Common Final Examination (“CFE”) three times. After a re-mark, Chen was advised on February 5, 2024, that there was no change to his results.

On February 6, 2024, Chen sent three emails to CPAWSB personnel. The first sought information on next steps. The second and third emails contained insulting language directed at CPAWSB personnel.

On February 8, 2024, CPAWSB advised Chen that he had been expelled from the CPAWSB PEP after failing the CFE within the permitted number of attempts. Chen responded with an email containing insulting language.

On February 12, 2024, CPA Alberta advised Chen that his Candidate registration would be cancelled because of his expulsion from CPAWSB. The next day, Chen responded to CPA Alberta with an email containing insulting language. Later that day, he forwarded his February 8 email containing insulting language to CPAWSB.

On February 16, 2024, CPA Alberta requested that Chen communicate in a more professional manner. Chen responded with a further email containing insulting language.

On February 23, 2024, the Complaints Inquiry Committee (“CIC”) Secretary advised Chen that a complaint had been received against him and that he was required to respond within 30 days. Chen replied seeking clarification regarding the complaint process. The CIC Secretary explained CPA Alberta's jurisdiction over his conduct and advised that he was required to respond to the complaint.

On April 8, 2024, the CIC Secretary advised Chen that his response was overdue and requested that it be provided by April 22, 2024. Chen did not respond to the complaint.

On July 9, 2024, Chen was advised that an investigator had been appointed to investigate the complaint. On July 15, 2024, Chen spoke with the Investigator and agreed to attend a virtual meeting. The following day, Chen advised that he would not attend the meeting and requested that communications occur by email instead.

On July 22, 2024, the Investigator sent Chen a series of questions on his conduct and his failure to respond to the complaint. Chen provided certain background information regarding his education and employment history but did not substantively answer questions concerning his conduct. Later that day, the Investigator requested additional information and follow-up responses. Chen expressly declined to answer.

FINDINGS

Chen admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that he:

1. Failed to maintain the good reputation of the profession in his communications with the CPA Western School of Business and the Registration Department of CPA Alberta; and
2. Failed to cooperate with the requirements of the Complaints Inquiry Process of CPA Alberta in that he failed to provide a response to communications of the CIC Secretary and the Investigator that required a response.

OUTCOME

Chen and the Complaints Inquiry Committee agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. Cancellation of Chen's candidate registration under section 95(1)(l) of the *CPA Act*;
2. Payment of a fine of \$1,000 within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Payment of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders, in accordance with bylaw 1601, within 30 days of the statement of costs being served; and
4. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557.

Chopra (Re), 2026 ABCPA 2

IN THE MATTER OF a Sanction Agreement between Vandana Chopra CPA, CGA, and Chopra Accounting & Tax Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant, the registrants against whom a complaint was made:

FACTS

Chopra Accounting & Tax Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant (“Chopra PC”) was authorized to provide certain accounting services excluding review engagements. Rupinder Kaur (“Kaur”) was a non-registrant employee of Chopra PC. Manning Bottle Depot Ltd. (“MBD”) was a client of Chopra PC and required a review engagement for its 2022 fiscal year.

In 2023, Vandana Chopra CPA, CGA (“Chopra”) became ill and temporarily stopped attending the offices of Chopra PC. The firm did not have policies or procedures to address her absence. Kaur attempted to perform a review engagement for MBD despite lacking the qualifications and authorization. In March 2023, Kaur prepared and issued a Review Engagement Report (“Report”) for MBD's 2022 year-end. The Report identified Gauthier Professional Corporation, Chartered Professional Accountant (“Gauthier PC”) as the issuing firm. However, the Report displayed Chopra PC's contact information.

Radhika Gauthier CPA, CA learned that her firm's name had been used on the Report and submitted a complaint to CPA Alberta. Kaur admitted to Chopra that she had prepared and issued the Report using Gauthier PC's name and immediately resigned. Chopra PC implemented measures after the complaint to address similar issues in the future.

FINDINGS

Chopra and Chopra PC admitted to unprofessional conduct, in that they:

1. Associated with false and misleading statements, in that a non-CPA employee of Chopra PC issued a Review Engagement Report dated March 16, 2023 for the December 31, 2022 fiscal year-end of MBD, a client of Chopra PC, using another registrant's registered professional accounting firm letterhead when:
 - a. Chopra PC was not qualified or authorized to perform review engagements; and
 - b. Chopra did not review the financial statements or file in any way.
2. Failed to establish, maintain, and uphold appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that:
 - a. Professional services were performed in accordance with the generally accepted standards of the practice of the profession; and
 - b. Employees of Chopra PC carried out professional services in compliance with the relevant standards and the CPA Alberta Rules of Professional Conduct.

OUTCOME

Chopra and Chopra PC, and the Complaints Inquiry Committee, agreed that the sanctions to be imposed in consequence thereof will be:

1. A written reprimand;
2. Payment of a fine of \$5,000 within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
3. Payment of the costs of the investigation, hearing, and compliance with the orders, in accordance with bylaw 1601, within 30 days of the statement of costs being served;
4. Mandatory publication pursuant to section 98 of the *CPA Act* and bylaws 1550-1557; and
5. If Chopra or Chopra PC fail to comply with the Tribunal's orders within the time specified, their registrations will be cancelled.

Registrant B (Re), 2026 ABCPA 3

IN THE MATTER OF a Discipline Tribunal Decision involving Registrant B and Firm K, the registrants against whom allegations were made:

FACTS

Registrant B was the accountant for Party A (the "Corporation") and prepared its financial statements. They also prepared tax returns for the Corporation and its manager, Party B. Witness J was a shareholder of the Corporation.

The Corporation sold a commercial property in January 2018. The sale resulted in an overall financial loss. Witness J sought information regarding the Corporation's financial affairs following the sale. They contacted Registrant B regarding the sale and the losses incurred.

The Corporation's shareholders were presented with a proposal intended to resolve matters arising from their investment in the Corporation. The proposal was discussed at a shareholders' meeting in January 2018 that Registrant B chaired. It included releases and a partial recovery of the shareholders' investment. Most shareholders ultimately accepted the proposal and signed releases. Witness J and two other shareholders declined the proposal and commenced litigation against Party B relating to losses arising from several investments.

In July 2018, Registrant B prepared a memorandum to shareholders ("Memorandum"). They also prepared an undated document entitled "Some Things to Think About as You Prepare for Tomorrow Meeting" ("Pre-Meeting Document"). Both documents discussed financing costs incurred by the Corporation.

The litigation continued through the court process. A Judicial Dispute Resolution conference ("JDR") occurred in April 2021.

FINDINGS

Allegation 1: False and Misleading Statements

The Complaints Inquiry Committee ("CIC") alleged that Registrant B associated themselves with false and misleading statements regarding interest rates and carrying charges in the Memorandum and the Pre-Meeting Document. The allegation focused on references in those documents to a stated interest rate of 15% and carrying charges. The CIC's position was that the references were misleading because the mortgage documents for the sold commercial property instead reflected interest rates of approximately 8% to 10%.

The Tribunal dismissed the allegation. It found that the documents could not be fairly assessed in isolation. Whereas the CIC alleged the Pre-Meeting Document was prepared for and distributed during the 2018 settlement process, the Tribunal accepted Registrant B's evidence that it was instead for the JDR in 2021. The Tribunal accepted

that the version before it was incomplete and did not include the supporting charts referenced therein. Similarly, it found that the Memorandum was an unsophisticated summary meant to facilitate settlement discussions rather than an in-depth analysis.

The Tribunal found that the CIC had not provided sufficient evidence to determine whether either document was false or misleading. As a result, the Tribunal could not determine whether Registrant B knew or ought to have known that either document contained false or misleading statements.

Allegation 2: Failure to Perform Professional Services with Due Care

The CIC alleged that Registrant B failed to perform professional services with due care with Party B's personal tax filings for the years 2015 to 2018 in relation to a shareholder loan balance between Party B and the Corporation. The CIC's position was that Party B owed funds to the Corporation through an outstanding shareholder loan and Registrant B failed to properly report the resulting tax implications.

The Tribunal dismissed the allegation. It found that the CIC did not produce evidence establishing the scope of Registrant B's engagement with Party B, enter Party B's personal tax returns into evidence, or call evidence from Party B regarding the services Registrant B had been retained for. The Tribunal could not determine whether Registrant B had failed to perform professional services with due care.

OUTCOME

The Tribunal dismissed the allegations and ordered that the decision be published in accordance with the *CPA Act* and CPA Alberta Bylaws.