

**IN THE MATTER OF *THE MOTOR DEALER ACT*, R.S.B.C. 1998, c.316 and  
*THE BUSINESS PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT*, S.B.C. 2004, c.2**

BETWEEN:

**THE VEHICLE SALES AUTHORITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

THE AUTHORITY

AND:

**KARAN SHARMA**

RESPONDENT/SALESPERSON

---

**DECISION OF THE REGISTRAR OF MOTOR DEALERS**

---

**Date and location of decision: November 28, 2025, at Langley, British Columbia**

**By way of written submissions**

**I. Introduction**

1. The Vehicle Sales Authority of British Columbia (“the Authority”) alleges that Karan Sharma has breached provisions of the *Motor Dealer Act* (“MDA”) and the *Motor Dealer Act Regulations* (“MDAR”) and as a consequence it seeks the suspension, or alternatively the cancellation of Mr. Sharma’s salesperson license.
2. Mr. Sharma is the holder of salesperson license S302815 issued by the VSA with an expiry date of November 10, 2026. Mr. Sharma’s license has been inactive since November 1, 2024 meaning he has not been employed since that date as a salesperson by a motor dealer.

**II. Procedural History**

3. A Hearing Notice in this matter was issued by the Authority on September 9, 2025. Mr. Sharma is the sole Respondent. The Hearing Notice was amended by the Authority on

September 10, 2025. In the Amended Hearing Notice (“AHN”), the Authority alleges that Mr. Sharma on two occasions breached section 35(3)(a) of the MDA and that he further breached section 33(2)(a) of the MDAR.

4. The Authority relies on three affidavits filed in support of the AHN as follows:
  - a. The affidavit of Joel Jordan sworn September 9, 2025 (“the Jordan Affidavit”);
  - b. The affidavit of Hong Wong sworn September 4, 2025 (“the Wong Affidavit”); and
  - c. The affidavit of Alan Mullen sworn September 10, 2025 (“the Mullen Affidavit”).
5. On September 29, 2025 after receipt of written submissions from both parties, I issued a decision in which I ordered that Mr. Sharma’s license be suspended pending further order of the Registrar (“the Suspension Decision”).
6. Mr. Sharma applied to have the Suspension Decision reconsidered and in reasons dated November 7, 2025 I dismissed that application.

### **III. Background Facts**

7. In reviewing the facts, I remind myself that the burden of proof lies with the Authority to prove the allegations in the AHN on a balance of probabilities. The question to be asked is whether it is more likely than not that the alleged conduct occurred: *F.H. v. McDougall* [2008] 3 S.C.R. 41 at paragraph 44.

#### **a. Joel Jordan**

8. Mr. Jordan is an Investigation Officer with the Authority. He deposes that the Authority began its investigation of Mr. Sharma in January 2024 when it was alleged by a motor dealer that had previously employed him that Mr. Sharma had committed fraud and theft from the motor dealer and its customers. That matter has been referred to the RCMP for investigation and the motor dealer has commenced litigation against Mr. Sharma in connection with the matter. Both the RCMP investigation and the litigation are ongoing. Mr. Jordan attached to his affidavit a copy of the filed Notice of Civil Claim in the litigation which names Mr. Sharma as a defendant.

9. On January 21, 2025, the following conditions were placed on Mr. Sharma's salesperson license pursuant to section 6(3) of the *Salesperson Licensing Regulation* ("SLR"). These were confirmed by Mr. Wong in his affidavit:
- a. Karan Sharma cannot be employed in the Finance Office of any Motor Dealer;
  - b. While employed by a Motor Dealer, Karan Sharma may not act as a loan broker as defined in the *Business Practices and Consumer Protection Act*, or in any way act on behalf of consumers to obtain or facilitate financing, including a lease, in respect of a vehicle purchase; may not act as a loan broker as defined in the *Business Practices and Consumer Protection Act*, or in any way act on behalf of consumers to obtain or facilitate financing, including a lease, in respect of a vehicle purchase;
  - c. Karan Sharma, while employed by a Motor Dealer, may not handle any consumer monies;
  - d. Karan Sharma, while employed by a Motor Dealer, must not be unsupervised while acting as a salesperson;
  - e. Any vehicle transactions facilitated by Karan Sharma must be reviewed by and signed off by a senior manager of the dealership who is not a relative of his;
  - f. Karan Sharma must, within two (2) days of the date of these conditions, provide a copy of these conditions to any Motor Dealer with whom he is currently employed;
  - g. Karan Sharma must notify the Authority prior to any change in his employment in any capacity with any Motor Dealer;
  - h. Karan Sharma, prior to commencing employment with a Motor Dealer, provide a copy of these conditions to the Motor Dealer; and
  - i. Karan Sharma, within two (2) days of commencing employment with a Motor Dealer, provide the Authority with proof, the sufficiency of which will be determined by the Authority, that he has complied with paragraph 7 [g] above.

("the Conditions")

10. On July 30, 2025, Mr. Jordan and another of the Authority's Investigation Officers attended Biswas Automotive Services Ltd ("Biswas") as part of an unrelated investigation. Biswas is a motor dealer licensed by the Authority. While there, Mr. Jordan observed a person who he thought he recognized as Mr. Sharma although he could not recall his name. This person was observed to be sitting at a desk and working on a computer. Mr. Jordan approached the person and asked his name to which he replied, "Matt [unintelligible]". Mr. Jordan asked the person to spell their last name but they declined to do so. Mr. Jordan asked the person for identification, but they refused to provide that. Mr. Jordan then turned away and began to speak briefly with another person in the office and when he turned around, the person he had previously recognized as Mr. Sharma had left the office.
11. Mr. Jordan approached the desk where the person he recognized as Mr. Sharma had been working and he observed two computer monitors. One displayed a credit application platform used by finance managers called Dealertrack that had been left open. The other monitor on the desk displayed an Excel spreadsheet that was populated with details of a consumer transaction. Mr. Jordan further observed food and an open alcoholic beverage on the desk. Mr. Jordan attached two photographs to his affidavit documenting his observations of the desk. These photographs are as described by Mr. Jordan but on plain view one cannot make out any details such as names, addresses or other information that are on the two screens.
12. As no one at Biswas was able to identify the person Mr. Jordan had recognized as Mr. Sharma, Mr. Jordan contacted the Authority office and a picture of Mr. Sharma was sent to him by text message. After having received that, Mr. Jordan was able to confirm that the person who identified himself to him as "Matt" was in fact Mr. Sharma.
13. The next day on July 31, 2025, the Authority received an Employment Authorization from Biswas seeking to add Mr. Sharma as an employee. The Authority's Manager of Licensing Hong Wong responded to Biswas and advised them that the application was being reviewed and that Mr. Sharma was not authorized to work as a salesperson. This was confirmed by Mr. Wong in his affidavit.

**b. Alan Mullen**

14. Mr. Mullen is the Authority's Director of Licensing and Investigations and he met with Mr. Sharma on August 6, 2025. During that meeting he reminded Mr. Sharma that he was not

permitted to work as a salesperson without complying with the conditions on his license and without approval from the Authority. At that time, Mr. Sharma denied being employed as a salesperson at Biswas or any other motor dealer.

15. On September 9, 2025, Mr. Mullen attended at Biswas and met with Marisa Mont who was one of the partners of the owner of that dealership. Ms. Mont confirmed to Mr. Mullen at that time that Mr. Sharma was employed by Biswas as a salesperson working Monday to Friday and was in fact present and working at Biswas' business location that same day.

**c. Karan Sharma**

16. As noted previously, an interim application was brought by the Authority seeking the suspension of Mr. Sharma's salesperson license. Mr. Sharma provided written submissions in response to that application and to the extent that those submissions comment on or relate to the allegations in the AHN, I will re-state them here.
17. Mr. Sharma says he has been licensed with the Authority since November 2021. He denies any involvement in the referenced litigation or the RCMP investigation which he maintains was ultimately dropped without his being arrested or charged.
18. He says that on July 30, 2025, he attended Biswas to visit its owner who was a friend. The purpose of his attendance was to discuss possible future employment there. He denies that he was working as a salesperson at that time and he says he was not on Biswas' payroll.
19. He says that when he was approached by Mr. Jordan, he panicked and provided a false name. While he says he regrets this decision, he does not provide any insight as to why he did so other than to characterize it as "a momentary lapse under stress." He says that he attended at the Authority's office the next day and admitted what he had done and apologized.
20. Mr. Sharma denies using the Dealertrack platform or handling consumer transactions while he was at Biswas. He says that another finance manager confirmed that the Dealertrack portal had been left open on the computer in question although Mr. Sharma does not identify that individual.

21. Mr. Sharma says that he has not engaged in conduct that is contrary to the conditions imposed on his salesperson license and that he has not been employed as a salesperson since November 2024.
22. In further written submissions dated October 20, 2025, Mr. Sharma re-stated his position that he “was not working at biswas [sic] auto” and he attached a number of letters as follows:
- a. An undated and unsigned letter from Kadisha Mont. The letter indicates that Ms. Mont is an employee of Biswas Auto Group, that Mr. Sharma has never worked for Biswas and any suggestion that Ms. Mont made a statement to the contrary is false;
  - b. An undated and unsigned letter from Summit Biswas. The letter indicates that Mr. Biswas is the owner of Biswas Auto and a friend of Mr. Sharma and that Mr. Sharma has never been employed by Biswas. The letter goes on to say that on July 30, 2025, Mr. Sharma attended at Biswas to discuss possible employment at Biswas but that he was not working with customers or performing dealership duties;
  - c. An undated and unsigned letter from Ryan Patel. The letter indicates that Mr. Patel is employed as a finance manager with Keywest Ford Sales. The letter indicates that on July 30, 2025, he had been working at a workstation at Biswas and had left his Dealertrack portal open before stepping away. The letter indicates that Mr. Patel denies Mr. Sharma accessed Dealertrack or processed any consumer applications;
  - d. An undated and unsigned letter from Khushwant Singh. The letter indicates that Mr. Singh has previously worked with Mr. Sharma and speaks to Mr. Sharma’s honesty, integrity and professionalism in working with customers; and
  - e. An undated and unsigned letter from Charles Laberge. The letter indicates that Mr. Laberge was a manager with Pioneer Auto Group at the time Mr. Sharma was employed there and that he supervised Mr. Sharma. The letter goes on to indicate that there were no observations of Mr. Sharma engaging in fraud, theft or misconduct and that he performed his duties with professionalism, honesty and dedication.

#### **IV. Cross-examination of Summit Biswas**

23. On October 27, 2025, the Authority applied under Rule 30.4 of the Registrars Rules to have this matter proceed as an oral hearing for the limited purpose of cross-examining Summit Biswas on his letter provided by Mr. Sharma. That application was granted on the condition that the cross-examination be scheduled to proceed on or before November 30, 2025. In addition, a schedule for further written submissions was set to follow Mr. Biswas giving his evidence.
24. The Authority elected to forego cross-examination of Mr. Biswas and no further submissions were made.

#### **V. Analysis**

##### **a. Section 35(3)(a) MDA – Supplying false or misleading information**

25. Section 35(3)(a) of the MDA provides that a person who supplies false or misleading information to a person acting under the MDA commits an offense. It is a defence to an allegation under this provision if at the time the information was provided, the person did not know that it was false or misleading and, with the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have known that it was false or misleading.
26. An individual who commits an offence under the MDA is liable to a fine of not more than \$100,000, imprisonment for not more than 6 months or both: section 35.1 MDA.
27. In a regulated profession, it is critically important that licensees provide accurate and truthful information to their regulatory body, as doing otherwise undermines the integrity of the profession and erodes public trust. Supplying false or misleading information can obstruct the regulator's ability to carry out its mandate to protect the public, ensure compliance with professional standards, and maintain accountability. Such conduct may also constitute professional misconduct, exposing the licensee to disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of their license. Ultimately, honesty and transparency are foundational to ethical practice and the proper functioning of any regulatory framework.
28. Mr. Sharma admits to having lied to Mr. Jordan when he misidentified himself at Biswas on July 30, 2025. He does not say why he chose to do so other than that he "panicked"

when asked to identify himself. At the time, Mr. Jordan was conducting an investigation in the course of his employment and therefore acting under the MDA. On this basis, I find that Mr. Sharma contravened section 35(3)(a) of the MDA. That finding does not end the analysis of this allegation however as it is further alleged that Mr. Sharma lied on a second occasion when he told Mr. Mullen on August 6, 2025 that he was not working at Biswas.

29. Mr. Mullen deposes that when he met with Mr. Sharma on August 6, 2025, he denied being employed as a salesperson at Biswas or any other motor dealer. However, Mr. Mullen states that he attended at Biswas on September 9, 2025 and spoke to Marisa Mont who advised him that Mr. Sharma was employed as a salesperson there, working Monday to Friday, and that he was working that day. There is no indication in the evidence as to when Mr. Sharma commenced employment with Biswas.

30. This evidence must be considered in light of the letters provided by Mr. Sharma, specifically:

- a. Kadisha Mont who denies Mr. Sharma was employed at Biswas and who further denies advising the Authority to the contrary;
- b. Summit Biswas who denies that Mr. Sharma had ever been employed at Biswas; and
- c. Ryan Patel who says that the workstation Mr. Sharma was observed at was in fact his and that he had left the Dealertrack platform open.

31. In considering the letters of Ms. Mont, Mr. Biswas and Mr. Patel, certain observations can be made. First, as noted previously, none of these statements are signed or dated. I also note that each of the statements uses the same format, the same font type and size. None of the statements provides any manner of contact information for the individuals. By comparison, Mr. Mullen's sworn evidence is that he attended at Biswas and spoke with Ms. Mont in person. On this basis, I find that the letters provided by Mr. Sharma lack the necessary reliability and I place little weight on them. Where there is a conflict between Mr. Mullen's evidence and the letters, I prefer the evidence of Mr. Mullen, particularly as to his discussion with Ms. Mont.

32. As noted previously, the Authority alleges in the AHN that Mr. Sharma breached section 35(3)(a) of the MDA "specifically by denying he was working at Biswas." It is trite to say that to prove this allegation, the Authority must prove on a balance of probabilities that in

denying that he was working at Biswas, he supplied Mr. Mullen with false or misleading information.

33. By telling Mr. Mullen on August 6, 2025 that he was not employed as a salesperson at Biswas or any other motor dealer did he supply false or misleading information? In my view, the evidence does not support such a finding. Mr. Mullen did not receive confirmation of Mr. Sharma's employment with Biswas from Ms. Mont until more than one month after his meeting with Mr. Sharma. The only other evidence is that of Mr. Jordan which is limited to his observation of Mr. Sharma sitting at a desk at Biswas one week earlier. While the circumstances surrounding Mr. Sharma's attendance at Biswas raise suspicions, those are not sufficient to prove this allegation. While I find that Mr. Sharma contravened section 33(3)(a) of the MDA by providing false or misleading information to Mr. Jordan, I dismiss the allegation that he similarly breached that provision by supplying false or misleading information to Mr. Mullen.

**b. Section 33(2)(a) MDAR – Failing to act with honesty and integrity in the course of business**

34. Section 33 of the MDAR is commonly referred to as the Code of Conduct. Section 33(2) sets out the requirements that a licensee or registrant must adhere to while acting in the course of business. Section 33(2)(a) specifically requires that a registrant or licensee act with honesty and integrity in the course of business.

35. In its reply submissions the Authority narrows its allegation of Mr. Sharma's breach of this provision, pointing to three specific conditions on his license that it says Mr. Sharma failed to adhere to and which constitutes a breach of section 33(2)(a) of the MDAR. I have summarized those conditions below, using the same paragraph numbers as in the Conditions:

- a. Mr. Sharma cannot be employed in the Finance Office of any motor dealer;
- b. While employed by a Motor Dealer, Mr. Sharma may not act as a loan broker or in any way act on behalf of consumers to obtain or facilitate financing, including a lease, in respect of a vehicle purchase; and
- g. Mr. Sharma must notify the Authority prior to any change in his employment in any capacity with any Motor Dealer.

36. Turning to the evidence, Mr. Jordan says he observed Mr. Sharma “sitting at a desk and working on a computer”. Mr. Jordan observed the computer’s two screens displaying the Dealertrack platform and an Excel spreadsheet which included details of a consumer transaction. While the Authority argues that this is sufficient to prove that Mr. Sharma was employed in Biswas’ finance office, it at the same time concedes that the specifics of what Mr. Sharma was working on is not in evidence.
37. Both Mr. Sharma and the Authority point to the letter from Ryan Patel in support of their respective positions. Mr. Sharma says that Dealertrack platform was logged in under Mr. Patel’s name and he refers to Mr. Patel’s letter as confirmation of this. The Authority says that as Mr. Patel is a finance manager, this is sufficient to prove that Mr. Sharma was working in a finance office. With respect, I disagree with both of these positions.
38. I have already noted in this decision that I place little weight on the letters provided by Mr. Sharma including that of Mr. Patel. Further, I note that Mr. Patel’s letter indicates that he is the finance manager of a different motor dealer, Keywest Ford Sales. Having considered all of the evidence, I disagree with the Authority’s position that Mr. Sharma breached condition (a) of the Conditions. The mere act of sitting at a computer and working in some unspecified manner is not sufficient to prove that Mr. Sharma was employed in a motor dealer’s finance office.
39. Turning to condition (b) of the Conditions, I similarly find there to be insufficient evidence to support a finding that Mr. Sharma was in breach of that condition. As with condition (a), the mere fact that Mr. Sharma was observed sitting at and working on a computer, the specifics of which are not in evidence, is not sufficient to prove that he was acting on behalf of consumers to obtain or facilitate financing, including a lease, in respect of a vehicle purchase.
40. Finally, I consider whether Mr. Sharma breached condition (g) of the Conditions by failing to notify the Authority prior to any change in his employment in any capacity with any motor dealer. It was Mr. Sharma’s evidence that when he attended at Biswas on July 30, 2025, he was seeking employment there as a salesperson. The next day, the Authority’s Manager of Licensing Mr. Wong received a request from Mr. Biswas to add Mr. Sharma as an employee although that request was not approved.

41. As noted previously, I accept Mr. Mullen's evidence that he was told by Ms. Mont on September 9, 2025 that as of that day, Mr. Sharma was employed as a salesperson at Biswas, working Monday to Friday. On that basis, I find that Mr. Sharma breached condition (g) of the Conditions by failing to notify the Authority of any change in his employment in any capacity with any motor dealer.
42. Having found that Mr. Sharma breached one of the conditions on his license, I must determine whether doing so constitutes a breach of section 33(2)(a) of the MDAR.
43. Here, Mr. Sharma's evidence is that he was aware of and accepted the Conditions. The language of condition (g) is broad in that it requires Mr. Sharma to notify the Authority prior to **any change** in his employment in **any capacity** with **any Motor Dealer** (emphasis added). Given this language, Mr. Sharma was not required to notify the Authority only if he were seeking employment with a motor dealer as a salesperson. It would require notification if he were seeking to work for a motor dealer in **any capacity**. This could, theoretically, include a variety of positions including administrative or service positions.
44. Section 33(2)(a) of the MDAR requires that licensees act honestly and with integrity in the course of business. At all material times, Mr. Sharma was a licensed salesperson. A failure to adhere to conditions on a license that are in place as a means by which to protect the public runs contrary to those requirements. Mr. Sharma was aware that he was required to notify the Authority of any change in his employment with any motor dealer and he failed to do so and on that basis I find that Mr. Sharma is in breach of section 33(2)(a) of the MDAR.

## **VI. Compliance action**

45. Having found that Mr. Sharma has breached both the MDA and MDAR, I must determine the appropriate compliance action. As noted in the AHN, the Authority takes the position that Mr. Sharma's salesperson license should be cancelled or in the alternative, suspended. Mr. Sharma has denied the allegations in the AHN and has not provided a position with respect to any potential compliance action.
46. Compliance action must be considered with a view to deterring future misconduct by the specific individual and by the industry generally. If I am of the view that the available

compliance options will not adequately deter Mr. Sharma from future misconduct, it is my responsibility to protect the public by revoking his salesperson license.

**a. License Cancellation or Suspension**

47. Section 7(2) of the SLR authorizes the revocation or suspension of a salesperson license if the authority considers, having regard to the conduct of the licensee, that it would not be in the public interest for the licensee to continue to be licensed.

48. As noted previously, in the Suspension Decision I ordered that Mr. Sharma's license be suspended pending further order of the Registrar. That suspension did not follow a full hearing on the merits however. Rather, the suspension was issued on an interim basis giving consideration to whether the public would be at a risk of harm if Mr. Sharma continued to be licensed pending the full hearing.

49. As I have now considered the merits of the allegations in the AHN as part of a full hearing, I must now consider whether cancellation or further suspension of Mr. Sharma's license or other compliance action is appropriate.

50. The established contraventions here are serious in nature. Mr. Sharma lied to Mr. Jordan by giving him a false name. He provided no reason for doing so other than that he panicked when asked. Similarly, Mr. Sharma became employed by a motor dealer as a salesperson without first notifying the Authority as required by the Conditions. These two contraventions share similar traits in that both demonstrate a pattern of dishonesty and evasion.

51. I note that the Authority alleges no previous compliance action concerning Mr. Sharma in the roughly four years since he first became licensed. I also note that Mr. Sharma appears to have responded to the concerns of the Authority by attending at their offices, communicating with staff and apologizing for lying to Mr. Jordan. He has also participated in this proceeding. These are factors that must be considered in determining what compliance action is best suited to this matter.

52. I have considered previous decisions of the Registrar in which salespeople have had their licenses either suspended or cancelled. Summaries of those cases are as follows:

- *Re: Lenux Auto Sales and Services Ltd. and Zahedian* (H-20-12-015, July 27, 2021). Salesperson provided a falsified vehicle inspection report. Prior compliance action included an undertaking, conditions and administrative penalty. Salesperson license cancelled due to ungovernability.
- *Re: Salame* (H-20-11-012, April 1, 2021). Salesperson stole funds from a consumer and a dealer. Salesperson lied about licensing history in another province. An active warrant for the salesperson's arrest had been issued due to fraud allegations. Salesperson license cancelled.
- *Re: 715 Motor Haus Ltd and Guo* (H-25-06-002, November 18, 2025). The salesperson was a dealer principal of the motor dealer and failed to ensure that consumer records were properly safeguarded as the records were altered and falsified as part of multiple financing applications. The salesperson's license was suspended for 21 days and an administrative penalty of \$25,000 was imposed.
- *Pham et al. v. Super Sale Auto Ltd. and Khoshbakht* (2019-BCRMD-021). The salesperson was the dealer principal of the motor dealer and was found to have committed a deceptive act and to have failed to cooperate with the Authority's investigation. The salesperson's license was suspended for four months.
- *Breezy Webster et al. v. Pioneer Garage et al.* 2017-BCRMD-013. The salesperson was found to have committed a deceptive act in respect of a consumer transaction contrary to the *Business Practices and Consumer Protection Act* and also providing a false statement to the investigating compliance officer. The salesperson's license was suspended for 30 days and a \$250 administrative penalty was imposed.

53. Given the circumstances, I do not consider that cancellation of Mr. Sharma's license is necessary to protect the public interest. As noted above, while his actions reflect a pattern of dishonesty and evasion, Mr. Sharma presents without previous enforcement in the four years he has been licensed with the Authority. That being said, any compliance action ordered must be sufficient to ensure that Mr. Sharma will be compliant with his statutory obligations in the future while communicating the same expectation to the industry generally. More specifically, the compliance action must impress upon Mr. Sharma and the industry the importance of not providing false or misleading information to the Authority.

54. Having considered the evidence as a whole, I find that given his past conduct it is in the public interest that Mr. Sharma's license be suspended for a period of 30 days commencing the date of this decision. The suspension will be at an end on December 28, 2025. I further order that the interim suspension of September 27, 2025 is at an end.

**b. Administrative penalty**

55. In assessing whether to impose an administrative penalty and if so, the amount, I am required to consider the legislative factors in the MDA while also considering common law principles including proportionality, the need for specific and general deterrence and that the penalty is not punitive in nature while not simply being the cost of doing business: Re: *Affordable Auto Sales and Services Inc.* 2019-BCRMD-030 at paragraph 2.

56. No administrative penalty is sought by the Authority and I decline to impose one on Mr. Sharma. It is the unchallenged evidence that he has not worked as a salesperson for over one year and I find that an administrative penalty, even at the low end of the scale, would be punitive in nature and not necessary to gain compliance given my order suspending Mr. Sharma's license.

**c. License conditions**

57. As noted previously, there are currently conditions imposed on Mr. Sharma's salesperson license. Section 6(2)(f) of the SLR authorizes me to impose "any other condition necessary for the authority to ensure that it is not contrary to the public interest for the licensee to be licensed as a salesperson." To that end I am of the view that the following condition should be added to the conditions currently on Mr. Sharma's license:

- a. Karan Sharma is to retake and successfully complete the VSABC Salesperson Certification Course at his own cost on or before January 15, 2026.

**VII. Costs**

58. The Authority seeks its investigation and hearing costs. Section 26.02(4) of the MDA authorizes the inclusion of costs in a compliance order as follows:

- (4) The registrar may include one or more of the following orders in a compliance order:

...

(d) that a person reimburse to the registrar all or part of the actual costs, including actual legal costs, incurred by the registrar for

(i) any inspection or investigation of the person.

59. The Authority has proven two of the three allegations in the AHN. I am of the opinion that Mr. Sharma should reimburse to the registrar its actual costs, including actual legal costs incurred for the investigation of Mr. Sharma.

60. As I do not have particulars of the costs sought by the Authority, I will adjourn that issue generally for the Authority and Mr. Sharma to discuss. If an agreement cannot be reached as to the quantum of costs to be reimbursed to the Authority by Mr. Sharma, I will accept brief written submissions from the parties on that issue for my consideration and further order.

**VIII. Compliance Order**

61. As I have found that Mr. Sharma has contravened the MDA, I am authorized under section 26.02 of the MDA to issue a Compliance Order. The following are the terms of my Compliance Order:

- a. Karan Sharma is to abide by the *Motor Dealer Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, s.316 and its regulations; and
- b. Karan Sharma is ordered to reimburse the Registrar its actual costs, including actual legal costs, incurred for its inspection or investigation of Mr. Sharma, in an amount to be agreed between the parties or by further order of the Registrar.

**IX. Summary**

63. In summary, given the aforementioned findings with respect to liability, the following compliance action is ordered:

- a. Karan Sharma's salesperson license is suspended for a period of 1 month effective upon receipt of this decision, ending on December 28, 2025;

- b. The suspension of Mr. Sharma's license ordered September 29, 2025 is at an end;
- c. The following condition is added to Karan Sharma's salesperson license pursuant to section 6(3) of the *Salesperson Licensing Regulation*:
  - i. Karan Sharma is to retake, at his own cost, and successfully complete the VSABC Salesperson Licensing Course within 30 days of the date of this decision
- d. A Compliance Order is issued pursuant to section 26.02 of the MDA which provides that:
  - i. Karan Sharma shall comply with the MDA and the regulations made thereunder; and
  - ii. Karan Sharma is ordered to reimburse the registrar its actual costs, including actual legal costs, incurred for its investigation of Mr. Sharma in this matter, the quantum of which is to be agreed upon by the parties or by further order of the Registrar.

**X. Right of Review of Decision**

- 64. Sections 26.11 and 26.12 of the MDA provide that a person may request the Registrar to reconsider a determination within 30 days of receiving the later of the determination or any written reasons respecting the determination. A Request for Reconsideration of this decision must be submitted in writing may be filed electronically to [hearings@vsabc.ca](mailto:hearings@vsabc.ca) or by mail to the Authority.
- 65. This decision may also be reviewed by petition to the BC Supreme Court pursuant to the *Judicial Review Procedure Act* within 60 days of receiving this decision: section 7.1 of the MDA and section 57 of *the Administrative Tribunals Act*.

Signed this 28<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025

"Original signed"



---

Patrick Poyner  
Registrar of Motor Dealers