

THE REAL ESTATE COUNCIL OF ALBERTA

IN THE MATTER OF a Hearing under Part 3 of the
REAL ESTATE ACT, R.S.A. 2000, c.R-5 (the "Act")

AND IN THE MATTER OF a hearing regarding the conduct of Daniel Patrick Stante, Real Estate Associate Broker, currently with Real Broker AB Ltd., o/a Real Broker and conduct brokerage Real Broker AB Ltd., o/a Real Broker, "Real Broker"

Hearing Panel Members: [G.F], Chairperson
[J.L]
[B.W]

Counsel for the Registrar: A. Bone, Barrister & Solicitor

Counsel for the Licensee: D. D. Sprake, Barrister & Solicitor

Hearing Date: August 26, 2025, via video conference

Hearing Panel Decision

Background

On July 25, 2025, a Notice of Hearing (Exhibit 2) was issued and according to the Affidavit of Service (Exhibit 3), on July 30, 2025, the Notice of Hearing was personally served on Daniel Patrick Stante, (the "Licensee"). The hearing was scheduled for August 26, 2025.

The Notice of Hearing alleged that the Licensee engaged in conduct deserving of sanction when:

1. In 2022, the Licensee failed to notify the Registrar upon becoming aware of misconduct of one of his associates, contrary to section 51(3)(g) of the *Real Estate Act* Rules when the Licensee:
 - a. In June 2022, became aware of an associate's past fraudulent conduct and did not report the conduct to the Registrar.

Decision

Pursuant to the Act, s. 43, it is the unanimous decision of this Hearing Panel that the Licensee engaged in conduct deserving of sanction when:

- a. The Licensee failed to notify the Registrar upon becoming aware of the misconduct of one of his associates related to fraud, contrary to s.51(3)(g) of the *Real Estate Act* Rules.
1. The Licensee was aware of [F.P]'s fraud since June 2022 and did not report said conduct to the Registrar.

The Hearing

On August 26, 2025, the hearing proceeded. The Registrar and the Licensee were represented by legal counsel. Neither the Registrar nor the Licensee objected to the composition of the Hearing Panel.

Phase 1 – Conduct Deserving of Sanction

On August 26, 2025, this hearing proceeded as a Section 46 admission of conduct hearing. The Admission of Conduct Deserving of Sanction (the "Admission") was admitted into evidence (Exhibit 1) as the agreed facts and breaches in the hearing of this matter. On August 26, 2025, this Hearing Panel made its findings of fact, breaches and conduct deserving of sanction based upon the Admission.

Counsel for each party orally confirmed that even though the Admission was not attached to the RECA Board of Directors Motion dated July 24, 2025, the Admission before the Panel was the same document as presented to the Board. The RECA Board of Directors Motion dated July 24, 2025, accepting the Admission, was admitted into evidence (Exhibit 4). The parties presented no additional evidence. Each party made their Phase 1 and Phase 2 submission.

After the hearing, the Panel noted that the agreed Admission had a deficiency, the details of which are provided below. The parties agreed by written submission that this matter should be determined based upon an agreement under Section 3, Part M, of RECA's Hearing and Appeal Practice and Procedures Guidelines, rather than by admission.

The Admission – Missing Page 5

On September 2, 2025, the Hearing Panel became aware that the Admission did not include Paragraphs 19 to and including Paragraph 24 (i.e. Page 5 of 10 was missing from the Admission). On September 3, 2025, counsel for the Registrar and counsel for the Licensee were invited to provide written submissions to address whether the

Admission was the:

1. complete Admission signed by the Licensee;
2. complete document reviewed by the Board; and
3. document the parties intended this Panel review.

The Registrar's Position - Missing Page 5

On September 11, 2025, counsel for the Registrar submitted that:

1. the Admission was not the full admission intended for the Board or the Panel's review;
2. the Admission was the agreement reviewed by the Board;
3. even with the missing paragraphs, the Admission reads clearly and addresses all key points;
4. Page 4 of the Admission as submitted outlines the essence of the fraud;
5. Paragraph 24, that discusses the Brokerage actions on the fraud, is not crucial to the Admission; and
6. the agreement presented to the Board included the necessary facts, breaches and conduct deserving of sanction in a form that was accepted and approved by the Board.

Counsel for the Registrar proposed that if the Licensee agrees, RECA will take no issue with the Panel accepting the Admission without Page 5 of 10.

The Licensee's Position - Missing Page 5

On September 12, 2025, counsel for the Licensee submitted that:

1. the Licensee concurs with the procedure proposed by the Registrar's counsel;
2. the Licensee consents to the variations as proposed by the Registrar's counsel;
3. the Admission sent to the Registrar's counsel was missing page 5;
4. the original Admission, including Page 5 of 10 and bearing the Licensee's initials for the purposes of authentication and confirmation of the agreement, is provided to the Hearing Panel. The document provided on September 12, 2025, represents the actual and complete Admission signed by the Licensee;

5. the Licensee accepts and concurs with the Registrar's counsel's submissions regarding the document that was reviewed by the Board; and
6. the complete Admission, including Page 5 of 10, is the document the parties intended this Hearing Panel review.

The Licensee's position is that this Hearing Panel can and should proceed by accepting the complete Admission as Exhibit 1, with the understanding that the missing page was an inadvertent transmission error that has now been rectified. The authentication by the Licensee's initials on Page 5 confirms his continued agreement with the contents of the complete document.

The Hearing Panel's Decision - Missing Page 5

On September 16, 2025, the Hearing Panel reconvened to consider the submissions of counsel relating to the Admission that did not include Paragraphs 19 to and including 24 (Page 5 of 10). The Hearing Panel finds that the addition of Page 5 of 10, bearing the Licensee's initials as provided by the Licensee's counsel, is the document the parties intended this Hearing Panel review.

This Hearing Panel concurs with both counsel that it may accept the Admission including Page 5 of 10 bearing the Licensee's initials as an "Agreement Between Parties", as provided for in RECA's Hearing and Appeal Practice and Procedures Guidelines, Part 3, Section M. The Agreement Between Parties shall be referred to in this decision, as the "Agreement" (Exhibit 1A).

Findings of Fact, Breaches and Conduct Deserving of Sanction

Based upon the decision to proceed by Agreement, Exhibit 1A, rather than by Admission, this Hearing Panel finds the following facts:

1. The Licensee has traded in real estate since 2010. The Licensee was first licensed as an Associate with 4th Street Holdings Ltd. o/a/ Re/Max Real Estate (Central).
2. From October 2019 until June 2021, the Licensee was licensed as the Associate Broker for 4th Street Holdings Ltd o/a Re/Max Real Estate (Central). From June 2021 until January 2023, the Licensee was licensed as the Real Estate Broker for Real Broker AB Ltd. o/a Real Broker. Subsequently, the Licensee was licensed as the Associate Broker for Real Broker from January 2023 until present.
3. The relevant conduct for this matter occurred while the Licensee was

registered as the Broker for Real Broker.

4. The Licensee had no direct knowledge of the facts contained within the following enumerated paragraphs 5 through 7.
5. Between November 1, 2019, and November 17, 2021, [F.P] ("[F.P]") was registered as a real estate associate with Redline Real Estate Group Inc o/a/ Greenleaf Property Management "Greenleaf".
6. On April 21, 2021, Greenleaf and [S.G] ("[S.G]") entered into an Exclusive Seller Representation Agreement for [S.G]'s property in Rocky View County (the "Listing"). [F.P] was the Greenleaf representative. The terms included the following:
 - Property: [ADDRESS] (the "Property")
 - List price: \$2,950,000
 - Term of agreement: April 20, 2021, to December 20, 2021
 - Brokerage Fee: 4% on entire sale amount
 - Brokerage offer to Buyer's Agent: 3.5% on the first \$100,000 and 1.5% on the balance.
7. On December 21, 2021, the Listing with Greenleaf expired. It was not renewed by [S/G].
8. On November 17, 2021, [F.P] left Greenleaf and registered with Real Broker. [S.G] did not transfer the listing to Real Broker.
9. On February 21, 2022, [F.P] advised [S.G] that he had been contacted by a real estate associate about an interested buyer (the "Buyer") for the Property. The associate wanted to book a showing. [F.P] stated he would be willing to assist [S.G], but she would need to sign a new listing agreement with Real Broker.
10. On February 21, 2022, [S.G] advised [F.P] that she would not sign a new listing agreement with Real Broker. [S/G] informed [F.P] that if the Buyer purchased the Property within 30 days, she would be willing to pay his expenses up to \$25,000 (the "Expenses") and a referral fee of \$5,000 (the "Referral Fee"). The parties agreed to proceed on this basis.
11. On February 24, 2022, the agreement between [S.G] and [F.P] with respect to both the expenses and the referral fee were agreed upon, in written format, by way of mutual emails confirming the conditions of the agreement.
12. On April 1, 2022, [S.G] advised [F.P] the property had sold to the Buyer and the closing was April 21, 2022. She advised him that after the closing he could prepare his invoice for the expenses and the Referral Fee, and her lawyer would take care of paying them.
13. On April 25, 2022, [S.G] informed [F.P] that the sale had closed. She asked

him to prepare an invoice which would include the receipts for the Expenses up to \$25,000 and the Referral fee.

14. On May 4, 2022, an invoice was sent to [S.G]. The invoice was authorized by Stante and sent from Real Broker. It included the following information:
 - To: [S.G], seller
 - Re: the Property
 - Commission: \$30,000 + \$1500 GST
 - Total Commission Due: \$31,500
15. On May 9, 2022, [S.G] contacted [F.P] and stated, regarding the invoice, the \$5,000 was a referral fee not a commission and the original receipts totaling \$25,000 should accompany the invoice. She requested a second invoice.
16. On or about May 9, 2022, [F.P] sent [S.G] an edited invoice from [F.P] Real Estate Group. It included the Referral Fee and 3 detailed receipts. Each receipt had a company name, invoice numbers and a description of the services provided including photos, videos and other marketing materials. The amounts and dates on the receipts were as follows:
 - [R.W] Signs \$8,951.40 dated April 30, 2021
 - [P.S] Media \$9,975.00 dated April 30, 2021
 - [P.S] Media \$7,350.00 dated June 1, 2021
17. The receipts totaled \$26,276.40. The receipts provided to [S.G] by [F.P] were fabricated by him. While [F.P] accrued some real expenses from [R.W] Signs and [P.S] Media, they did not total \$26,276.40.
18. The May 9, 2022, invoice was created and sent by [F.P] to [S.G]. Neither Real Broker nor the Licensee had any knowledge of, nor did they authorize the May 9th invoice.
19. On May 17, 2022, [S.G] contacted [F.P] and advised him she would not pay the Expenses without proof of payment by him. She also stated the expenses seemed excessively high.
20. On May 17, 2022, a second invoice was sent from Real Broker to [S.G]. The invoice was authorized by Stante. It included [S.G]'s name as Seller, Commission \$5,000 + \$250 GST, Total Commission Due: \$5,250.
21. On May 18, 2022, [F.P] provided [S.G] Visa statements for April and June 2021. The Visa statements included [F.P]'s name, a Visa number and other account information plus the following charges: [R.W] Signs \$8,951.40, [P.S] Media \$9,975.00, and [P.S] Media \$7,350.00.
22. The Visa statements were altered by [F.P] to show false payments made by him toward the fabricated expenses.
23. In or around May 2022, [S.G]'s friend contacted [B.B], owner of [R.W] Signs. [B.B] confirmed the expenses were fabricated and not created by him.

24. In or around early June 2022, the Licensee was first contacted by [B.B] who stated [F.P] had created a fraudulent invoice from his company. This was the first the Licensee became aware of the false invoice. The Licensee confronted [F.P], and he admitted to the false invoice. The Licensee told [F.P] to immediately retract the invoice and apologize to the vendor.
25. In or around early July 2022, the Licensee and Real Broker first received documentation from [F.P] on the Fraudulent Expenses.
26. On June 3, 2022, [B.B] emailed [F.P] and asked him to explain the fraudulent invoice. At this time, [F.P] did apologize and said he would retract the invoice.
27. On June 16, 2022, the Licensee was included in an email from [F.P] to Gibson where [F.P] stated that the invoice from [R.W] Signs in the amount of \$8,951.40 was false and that he was retracting the invoice. He stated he would be replacing this invoice with a proper one. Although the Licensee was aware of the falsified expense invoice, the Licensee also understood [F.P] would be replacing the falsified invoice with a proper, legitimate one. A proper invoice respecting expenses was never created.
28. On August 2, 2022, [S.G] and the Licensee spoke on the phone. The Licensee inquired if [S.G] intended to pay the \$5,000 Referral Fee that was invoiced by Real Broker May 17, 2022. She stated she did not. The Licensee did not pressure her regarding the fee or raise the matter again. [S.G] made it clear she was going to report [F.P]'s forgery to RECA. The Licensee did not attempt to discourage her.
29. At no time did [S.G] make any payment in respect of the requested fees or expenses.
30. At no time did the Licensee notify the Registrar of [F.P]'s falsified expenses invoice which is admitted as fraudulent conduct. At no time did [S.G] make any payment in respect of the requested fees or expenses.
31. Over the material period the Licensee was not aware the invoice from [P.S] Media was also false.
32. On September 14, 2022, RECA initiated an investigation into [F.P]'s conduct and a hearing regarding said conduct was held on October 15, 2024.
33. On November 12, 2024, the Hearing Panel decided to cancel [F.P]'s license, with no ability to reapply for a license for 4 years.

Agreed Breaches

This Hearing Panel accepts the Agreement, and agrees with the parties that the Licensee engaged in conduct deserving of sanction, and specifically:

- a) The Licensee failed to notify the Registrar upon becoming aware of the misconduct of one of his associates related to fraud, contrary to s.51(3)(g) of the *Real Estate Act* Rules.
1. The Licensee was aware of [F.P]'s fraud since June 2022 and did not report said conduct to the Registrar.

Phase 2 – Sanction and Costs

Sanction

This Hearing Panel has authority to impose sanction pursuant to its authority set out in the *Real Estate Act* ("the Act"), s.43(1) that provides, among other things that:

If a Hearing Panel finds that the conduct of a Licensee was conduct deserving of sanction, the Hearing Panel may make any one or more of the following orders:

- (a) cancelling or suspending any license issued to the Licensee by an Industry Council;
- (b) reprimanding the Licensee;
- (c) imposing any conditions or restrictions on the Licensee and on that Licensee's carrying on of the business of a Licensee that the Hearing panel in its discretion, determines appropriate;
- d) requiring the Licensee to pay to the Council a fine, not exceeding \$25,000, for each finding of conduct deserving of sanction;
- (d.1) prohibiting the Licensee from applying for a new license for a specified period of time or until one or more conditions are fulfilled by the Licensee;
- e) any other order agreed to by the parties.

This Hearing Panel adopts the facts set out in the Agreement (Exhibit 1A) at Paragraph 35, as relevant mitigating factors:

- a. The Licensee agreed to forego the time and expense of a hearing, saving witnesses the inconvenience and stress of appearing by making these admissions.
- b. The Licensee has been forthright and cooperative with the Regulator.
- c. The Licensee has expressed remorse for the conduct in question.
- d. There was no financial harm inflicted on the consumer.
- e. The Licensee has no disciplinary history.

- f. In recognition of the Licensee's failure to identify [F.P]'s conduct as fraudulent, the Licensee has undertaken, among others, eleven professional development programs, conferences and courses, specifically targeting ethical, leadership, professionalism and commercial contract responsibilities. The date, duration, place and content description of each learning activity described at Page 8, Schedule "A", of the Admission (Exhibit 1).
- g. Upon receiving the results of the investigation into his conduct, on or about January 21, 2025, the Licensee immediately resigned the Licensee's elected position of Director of the Calgary Real Estate Board.

The Agreement (Exhibit 1A) at Paragraph 36 sets out the following facts as relevant aggravating factors:

- a. For a broker, failing to report fraudulent conduct to the Registrar is a serious breach. It strikes at RECA's mandate to protect against, investigate, detect and suppress fraud.

The Joint Submission on Sanction (Exhibit 5) was that this Hearing Panel should issue:

- a) an order suspending the Licensee's Associate Broker License, for a period of 12 months, during which period the Licensee shall be prohibited from applying for an associate broker or broker's license. The Licensee may trade in real estate over this period but only at the level of associate; and
- b) a \$4,000 fine for the breach of Rule 51(3)(g).

In addition to reviewing the agreed mitigating and aggravating factors, the Joint Submission on Sanction (Exhibit 5) emphasized that public confidence in the profession is of utmost importance, and in this matter, the public must be assured that all Licensees are required to play their part in reporting fraud. The Joint Submission on Sanction (Exhibit 5) is that there is no RECA precedent for Rule 51(3)(g) breach; and this Hearing Panel may look to Rule 51(3) precedents for guidance.

In determining sanction, this Hearing Panel considered the aggravating and mitigating factors set out in the Agreement (Exhibit 1A), in the context of the relevant factors outlined in *Jaswal v Newfoundland (Medical Board)*¹:

- a. The nature and gravity of the proven allegations
The Licensee failed to report fraud to the Registrar; a serious matter.

¹ 1996 Can LII 11630 (NLSC) at paragraph 36

RECA's mandate includes a duty to "protect against, investigate, detect or suppress fraud."² The Licensee's misconduct is outside the range of permitted conduct. This factor is aggravating.

b. The age and experience of the Licensee

The Licensee is 43 years old and has been licensed since 2010. The Licensee was a broker between October 2020 and January 2023. At the time of the misconduct, he was a broker for just over 1.5 years; a long enough period to have sufficient experience to know his conduct was not appropriate. This is an aggravating factor.

c. The previous character of the Licensee and the presence or absence of prior complaints

The Licensee has had no disciplinary history since he was first licensed in 2010. This factor is mitigating.

d. The number of times the offence was proven to have occurred.

The Licensee's breach of Rule 51(3)(g) occurred once. This factor is slightly aggravating.

e. The role of the Licensee in acknowledging what occurred.

The Licensee admitted and acknowledged that the Licensee committed conduct deserving of sanction. The Licensee's admission helped preserve resources in avoiding the cost of a hearing; and spared the witnesses the stress of testifying at a hearing. This factor is mitigating.

f. Whether the Licensee had already suffered serious financial or other penalties as a result of allegations having been made

No evidence was provided regarding whether the Licensee suffered any financial or other penalties in relation to this matter. This factor is neutral.

g. Impact of the incident on the victim, if any

The impugned conduct did not lead to any financial loss. No evidence was provided as to whether the impugned conduct caused any emotional distress. This factor is neutral.

² Real Estate Act, Section 5

h. Mitigating circumstances

The Licensee has taken several professional development courses specifically targeting ethical and leadership responsibilities, as outlined in Schedule "A" of the Admission of Conduct Deserving of Sanction (Exhibit 1). This factor is mitigating.

i. Aggravating Circumstances

See a, b, d, j, k and l.

j. The need to promote specific and general deterrence and protect the public

This Hearing Panel accepts that in this case, due to no prior incidents, no recurring incidents and the Licensee's expression of remorse, there is not a high likelihood of recurrence. The Licensee has admitted misconduct and expressed remorse; and this reduces the likelihood of recidivism. The Registrar and the Licensee jointly submit that the need for specific deterrence is moderate. This factor is moderately aggravating.

The Registrar and the Licensee jointly submit that there is a need for general deterrence. A clear message must be sent to the public, and to Licensees, that Brokers are required to report fraud, when they see it. This is an aggravating factor.

k. The need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the profession

There is a high need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the real estate profession. A profession's most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which it inspires.³ RECA must demonstrate to the public that it is investigating, detecting and suppressing fraud perpetrated by licensees. RECA must protect the public and demonstrate that due to its legislated mandate as a self-governing profession, its protection of the public is a matter of central concern. There is a need to maintain public confidence that RECA brokers will immediately report fraud to the Registrar. Self-regulation requires that all licensees fulfil their obligation to immediately report fraud to the Registrar. This is an aggravating factor.

³ *Law Society of Upper Canada v Lambert*, 2015 ONLSTH [Tab 2] at 17

- l. The degree to which the offensive conduct that was found to have occurred was clearly regarded, by consensus, as being the type of conduct that would fall outside the range of permitted conduct.

The failure to report fraud is serious. The Licensee's conduct falls outside the range of permitted conduct. This is an aggravating factor.

- m. The range of sentences in other similar cases.

The Registrar and the Licensee's Joint Submission on Sanction cited precedents relating to breach of Rule 51. As at the hearing date, no RECA precedent has been set for a Rule 51(3)(g) breach. The Rule 51 precedents related to brokers who failed to:

- a) provide sufficient supervision of an associate⁴;
- b) actively manage his brokerage and provide sufficient supervision of an associate⁵; and
- c) adhere to the permitted standard of conduct and who also breached Rules 44(2)(a), 51(1)(e), 51(1)(a) and the Act, s. 38(4)⁶.

The sanctions imposed in the precedent cases range from \$1,500 to \$20,000.

The parties jointly proposed, and the Hearing Panel finds, given the *Jaswal* factors, both aggravating and mitigating, and the Rule 51 precedents, that a \$4,000 fine along with a 12-month Associate Broker's license suspension is fair and just.

This Hearing Panel accepts the Joint Submission on Sanction (Exhibit 5) because it satisfies the public interest test established by the Supreme Court of Canada in *R v Anthony-Cook*⁷; the principles of which apply equally to administrative hearings⁸. There is nothing before this Hearing Panel to suggest that the jointly proposed \$4,000 fine and 12-month license suspension would bring the administration of justice into disrepute, or otherwise be contrary to the public interest. The jointly proposed sanction is not "so markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the case that they would view it as a break down in the proper functioning of the ... justice system."⁹

The Licensee shall be prohibited from applying for an associate broker or broker's

⁴ *Mitchell* (Re) 2017 ABRECA

⁵ *Law* (Re) 2015 ABRECA

⁶ *Cowley* (Re) 2021 ABRECA 86

⁷ 2016 SCC 43

⁸ *Bradley v Ontario College of Teachers* 2021 ONSC 2303, Para 13 - 14

⁹ *Anthony Cook, Supra*, at para 33, citing *R v Druken* 2006 NLCA 67 at para 29

license during the 12-month suspension. The Licensee may trade in real estate during the 12-month suspension period, but only at the level of associate.

A fine of \$4,000, together with a 12-month associate broker or broker's license suspension is just and appropriate. The \$4,000 fine coupled with a 12-month associate broker or broker's license suspension provides general deterrence to other licensees and should instill public confidence that RECA is fulfilling its mandate of appropriately regulating licensees. A fine of \$4,000 is also within the range of fines permitted under the Act.

Costs

The Registrar and Licensee jointly submitted that pursuant to *Jinnah v Alberta Dental Association and College*¹⁰, there is a presumption under the *Health Professions Act* that costs should only be imposed when there are compelling reasons to do so; and that a similar standard should apply in this case. The parties jointly submitted that this Hearing Panel be guided by the *Jinnah* principles when considering costs, and the Licensee pay no costs.

While the breach was serious, the Licensee is not a serial offender, and the Licensee assumed responsibility for the Licensee's conduct. The Licensee co-operated with the investigation, and by doing so, the Registrar was not required to incur the time and expense to conduct a contested hearing. On this basis, this Hearing Panel accepts the Joint Submission on Sanction and no costs will be awarded against the Licensee.

On September 2, 2025, counsel for each party was invited to provide written submissions relating to the impact, if any, of *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258, upon costs. On September 11, 2025, counsel for the Registrar submitted that parties did not refer this Hearing Panel to *Charkhandeh* because the parties reached agreement on the Joint Submission on Sanction before *Charkhandeh* was pronounced. The Registrar's counsel submitted that even though *Charkhandeh* redefines the legal framework for awarding costs in professional disciplinary proceedings under the *Health Professions Act*, costs remain discretionary, and the factors cited in *Charkhandeh* are not exhaustive. Counsel for the Registrar submitted that the Licensee:

- a) took responsibility for his conduct,
- b) co-operated with the investigation and hearing process,
- c) did not engage in hearing misconduct to make the process more expensive, and
- d) signed an Admission of Conduct Deserving of Sanction (as converted

¹⁰ 2022 ABCA 336 at paragraphs 140 - 144

to an Agreement Between the Parties) and a Joint Submission on Sanction that contributed to a very short and straightforward hearing.

This Hearing Panel accepts the Registrar's submissions regarding *Charkendeh*, in deciding costs in this matter.

Conclusion

Pursuant to the *Act*, s. 43, it is the unanimous decision of this Hearing Panel that the Licensee engaged in conduct deserving of sanction when:

- b. The Licensee failed to notify the Registrar upon becoming aware of the misconduct of one of his associates related to fraud, contrary to s.51(3)(g) of the *Real Estate Act* Rules.
2. The Licensee was aware of [F.P]'s fraud since June 2022 and did not report said conduct to the Registrar.

and pursuant to the *Act*, s.43(1)(a), it is the Order of this Hearing Panel that:

having engaged in the above conduct deserving of sanction, the Licensee's Associate Broker license shall be suspended for a period of 12 consecutive months, commencing on the date of this decision;

pursuant to the *Act*, s.43(1)(d.1), it is the Order of this Hearing Panel that:

the Licensee shall be prohibited from applying for an Associate Broker's license or a Broker's license during the 12 consecutive month suspension period.

pursuant to the *Act*, s.43(1)(c), it is the Order of this Hearing Panel that:

the Licensee may trade in real estate during the 12 consecutive month suspension period but only at the level of associate;

pursuant to the *Act*, s.43(1)(d)

the Licensee shall pay to the Council a fine of \$4,000, for conduct deserving of sanction; and

pursuant to the *Act*, s.43(2)

having dealt with the conduct of the Licensee under the *Act* s.43(1), this
Hearing Panel orders the Licensee pay no costs.

Signed this 3rd day of October 2025 at the City of Calgary, in the Province of
Alberta.

"Signature"

[G.F],

Hearing Panel Chair