

April 10, 2026

Administrative Review – 25-12-008

Served via email: [REDACTED]

Administrative Penalty

GREAT WEST CHRYSLER INC.
o/a TAZ LOANS
17817 STONY PLAIN ROAD
EDMONTON, AB
T5S 1B4

Attention: Bart Yachimec

Dear Bart Yachimec:

**Re: Great West Chrysler Inc. operating as Taz Loans
– Provincial Automotive Business Licence No. B1019066**

As the Director of Fair Trading (as delegated) (the “Director”), I am writing to you pursuant to Section 158.1(1) of the *Consumer Protection Act* (“CPA”) to provide you with written notice of the Administrative Penalty issued under that section.

Facts

The evidence before me in relation to this matter consists of the material contained in an Alberta Motor Vehicle Industry Council (“AMVIC”) industry standards department application report (the “Application Report”) prepared by an industry standards officer (“ISO”) and the manager of industry standards. A copy of the Application Report is attached as Schedule “A” to this letter. The Supplier provided written representations via email dated March 19, 2026 (attached as Schedule “B”), in response to the Proposed Administrative Penalty, which I have also taken into consideration.

Licensee Status

Great West Chrysler Inc. o/a Taz Loans (the “Supplier”) holds an automotive business licence and is licensed to carry on the designated business activities of new and used sales, garage, leasing and wholesale sales in the Province of Alberta.

Direct communications with the Supplier and its representatives

1. On Aug. 14, 2015, an AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed at the business location of the Supplier. An undated Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier. The Supplier was not found to have sold vehicles over the advertised price during this inspection.

2. On Nov. 15, 2017, a second AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on the Supplier. A Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier on Dec. 21, 2017. The Findings Letter outlined some concerns, including but not limited to:
 - a) During the inspection, 14 deals were reviewed by the ISO and compared with an advertisement and of those 14 deals, six did not reflect all-in pricing contrary to Section 11(2)(l) of the Automotive Business Regulation (“ABR”).
 - b) Advertising issues contrary to requirements in Section 11 of the ABR.
 - c) Issues with the completion of and/or disclosure of Mechanical Fitness Assessments (“MFAs”) contrary to Section 15(1) of the Vehicle Inspection Regulation (“VIR”).

3. On Sept. 18, 2020, a third AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on the Supplier. A Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier on Sept. 29, 2020. The Findings Letter outlined some concerns, including but not limited to:
 - a) During the inspection, four deals reviewed by the ISO did not reflect all-in pricing contrary to Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.
 - b) Advertising issues contrary to requirements in Section 11 of the ABR and Sections 4 and 6 of the Cost of Credit Disclosure Regulation (“COC”).
 - c) Issues with the completion of and/or disclosure of MFAs contrary to Section 15(1) of the VIR.
 - d) The bills of sale (“BOS”) that were reviewed in the deal jackets had various issues contrary to Section 31.2 of the ABR.

4. On May 17, 2022, a fourth AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on the Supplier. A Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier on May 25, 2022. The Findings Letter outlined some concerns, including but not limited to:
 - a) Advertising issues contrary to requirements in Sections 11 and 31.1 of the ABR and Section 6 of the COC.
 - b) During the inspection, three deals reviewed by the ISO did not reflect all-in pricing contrary to Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.
 - c) The BOS that were reviewed in the deal jackets had various issues contrary to Section 31.2 of the ABR.

5. On Oct. 28, 2025, a fifth AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on the Supplier. This inspection focused specifically on the Supplier’s advertising and compliance with all-in pricing legislation. The inspection conducted on Oct. 28, 2025 was therefore not comprehensive in nature and as such, not all documentation or business practices were reviewed in comparison to the previous comprehensive inspections conducted. A Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier on Nov. 13, 2025. The Findings Letter outlined some concerns, including but not limited to:

- a) During the inspection, 23 deals were reviewed by the ISO and compared with an advertisement and of those 23 deals, five did not reflect all-in pricing contrary to Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.
6. Selling vehicles over the advertised price was found in four of the five AMVIC inspections, based on the Findings Letters provided to the Supplier following each AMVIC industry standards inspection.
7. The Proposed Administrative Penalty dated Feb. 17, 2026 was served to the Supplier on Feb. 18, 2026. The Proposed Administrative Penalty provided the Supplier an opportunity to make written representations by March 23, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Supplier provided written representations in response to the Proposed Administrative Penalty (see Schedule "B").

Applicable Legislation

Automotive Business Regulation

Advertising

Section 11

(2) A business operator must ensure that every advertisement for an automotive business that promotes the use or purchase of goods or services

(l) includes in the advertised price for any vehicle the total cost of the vehicle, including, but not limited to, all fees and charges such as the cost of accessories, optional equipment physically attached to the vehicle, transportation charges and any applicable taxes or administration fees, but not including GST or costs and charges associated with financing, and

Consumer Protection Act

Interpretation of documents

Section 4

If a consumer and a supplier enter into a consumer transaction, or an individual enters into a contract with a licensee and the licensee agrees to supply something to the individual in the normal course of the licensee's business, and

(a) all or any part of the transaction or contract is evidenced by a document provided by the supplier or licensee, and

(b) a provision of the document is ambiguous,

the provision must be interpreted against the supplier or licensee, as the case may be.

Administrative Penalties

Notice of administrative penalty

Section 158.1

(1) If the Director is of the opinion that a person

(a) has contravened a provision of this Act or the regulations, or

(b) has failed to comply with a term or condition of a licence issued under this Act or the regulations,

the Director may, by notice in writing given to the person, require the person to pay to the Crown an administrative penalty in the amount set out in the notice.

(2) Where a contravention or a failure to comply continues for more than one day, the amount set out in the notice of administrative penalty under subsection (1) may include a daily amount for each day or part of a day on which the contravention or non-compliance occurs or continues.

(3) The amount of an administrative penalty, including any daily amounts referred to in subsection (2), must not exceed \$100 000.

(4) Subject to subsection (5), a notice of administrative penalty shall not be given more than 3 years after the day on which the contravention or non-compliance occurred.

(5) Where the contravention or non-compliance occurred in the course of a consumer transaction or an attempt to enter into a consumer transaction, a notice of administrative penalty may be given within 3 years after the day on which the consumer first knew or ought to have known of the contravention or non-compliance but not more than 8 years after the day on which the contravention or non-compliance occurred.

Right to make representations

Section 158.2

Before imposing an administrative penalty in an amount of \$500 or more, the Director shall

- (a) advise the person, in writing, of the Director's intent to impose the administrative penalty and the reasons for it, and
- (b) provide the person with an opportunity to make representations to the Director.

Vicarious liability

Section 166

For the purposes of this Act, an act or omission by an employee or agent of a person is deemed also to be an act or omission of the person if the act or omission occurred

- (a) in the course of the employee's employment with the person, or
- (b) in the course of the agent's exercising the powers or performing the duties on behalf of the person under their agency relationship.

Analysis – Did the Supplier fail to comply with the provisions of the ABR?

An AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on Aug. 14, 2015. The inspection findings were discussed with the Supplier and an undated Findings Letter was emailed to the Supplier. Three subsequent AMVIC industry standards inspections were completed between 2017 and 2022. As a result of each inspection, the inspection findings were discussed with the Supplier. After each inspection, a Findings Letter was completed and provided to the Supplier providing education to the Supplier. The Findings Letters addressed a number of legislative breaches including compliance issues with advertising, MFA compliance issues, selling vehicles over the advertised price and BOS compliance issues. The Director has not considered breaches from previous AMVIC inspections to determine the amount of the Proposed Administrative Penalty.

On Oct. 28, 2025, a fifth AMVIC industry standards inspection was completed on the Supplier. This inspection focused solely on the Supplier's advertising and compliance with all-in pricing legislation. The inspection conducted on Oct. 28, 2025 was therefore not comprehensive in nature and as such, not all documentation or business practices were reviewed in comparison to the previous comprehensive inspections conducted in the past. A Findings Letter outlining the inspection findings was completed and sent to the Supplier on Nov. 13, 2025. Based on the facts outlined by in the Application Report and supporting documents (see Schedule "A"), I will be considering the alleged breaches from the 2025 AMVIC industry standards inspection.

A. Selling Above Advertised Price (11(2)(l) ABR)

During the Oct. 28, 2025 inspection, the ISO found five vehicles were sold above the advertised price. Prices advertised must include all fees the seller intends to charge. The only fee that can be added to the advertised price is the goods and services tax ("GST") and costs associated with financing as per Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR. Pre-installed products such as batteries and anti-theft must be included in the advertised price. Destination fees, documentation fees, the AMVIC levy and tire recycling levy must be included in the advertised price. In these five consumer transactions, the Supplier derived an economic benefit of **\$5,508** at the cost of the consumers.

- Stock No. 5CM0844 was sold over the advertised price by \$3,684;
- Stock No. 4HR0313 was sold over the advertised price by \$684;
- Stock No. 5R3537BZ was sold over the advertised price by \$467;
- Stock No. 5R10896Z was sold over the advertised price by \$114; and
- Stock No. PW4154 was sold over the advertised price by \$559.

The Application Report states on page two that 23 vehicles had an advertisement to compare against the corresponding sold vehicle files and five vehicles were sold over the advertised price contrary to Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.

The Supplier was provided the education and the relevant legislation in the Findings Letter following each inspection and has had the opportunity to rectify their business practices, however continues to engage in selling over the advertising price.

The Director finds that on a balance of probabilities, the Supplier has breached Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.

B. Other Considerations

In addition to the individual education, AMVIC provided the Supplier in the form of the Findings Letters provided after each AMVIC industry standards inspection, AMVIC has issued industry bulletins and newsletters over the past two years explaining advertising regulations to educate the automotive industry as a whole. As a licensed member of the automotive industry, the Supplier would have received the AMVIC industry bulletins and newsletters, and in the opinion of the Director, is expected to

have reviewed these education bulletins and newsletters to ensure their business practices are in compliance.

There exists an onus on the Supplier to do their due diligence and ensure they are complying with the legislation that governs the regulated industry they have chosen to be a member of. The Supreme Court of British Columbia in *Windmill Auto Sales & Detailing Ltd. v. Registrar of Motor Dealers, 2014 BCSC 903* addressed the issue of the onus and responsibility the Supplier has when operating within a regulated industry. The court at paragraph 59 stated:

"In my view, it is incumbent upon a party that operates within a regulated industry to develop at least a basic understanding of the regulatory regime, including its obligations under the regime, as well as the obligations, and the authority, of the regulator."

In their written representations (See Schedule "B"), the Supplier stated the following:

"At the outset, we wish to note that the initial correspondence scheduling the inspection described the purpose of the visit as part of AMVIC's proactive industry education efforts. The communication explained that the inspections are intended to review records and business practices, assist business in becoming compliant with legislation, and provide information and guidance regarding legislative requirements."

"In that context, the dealership was surprised that the findings from what was presented as an educational or routine inspection would result in a proposed administrative penalty. While we fully respect AMVIC's enforcement mandate, we respectfully submit that imposing an administrative penalty arising from an inspection that was communicated primarily as a compliance and educational exercise may not fully align with the spirit in which the inspection was initially presented."

The Supplier did not provide the original correspondence provided from the industry standards department scheduling the inspection. As the original correspondence scheduling the Oct. 28, 2025 inspection is not currently before the Director, the Director cannot make a determination regarding the described purpose of the inspection as it was communicated to the Supplier by the ISO.

The Supplier was advised in the Oct. 28, 2025 inspection Findings Letter, which was provided after the inspection was completed that *"Subject to management review, the recommendation for an Administrative Penalty may be made to the Director of Fair Trading (as delegated)."* Further, AMVIC's Industry Standards Policy indicates the following:

"The purpose of an inspection is to:

- *determine whether a supplier is operating in compliance with legislation governing automotive businesses, and the terms and conditions of the supplier's licence;*
- *increase the potential for compliance by educating suppliers about legislation and compliance issues they may face;*

- *develop and maintain a trusted, professional relationship between the ISO and the supplier;*
- *gather information about developments and issues that can assist AMVIC in better understanding the automotive industry in their region; and*
- ***follow a progressive enforcement model to ensure compliance by suppliers with the legislation.*** [emphasis added]

3.2.12 Progressive enforcement

The ISO in consultation with the manager, may recommend administrative enforcement action against a supplier for non-compliance with the legislation. AMVIC follows a progressive enforcement model which may include previous written warnings or administrative action.

3.2.13 Administrative action

The manager may recommend administrative action to the Registrar. Proposed administrative action may include Director's Orders, Undertakings, Administrative Penalties, recommendation for suspension or cancellation of licence. The proposed administrative action will be considered on a case by case basis based on inspection findings."

The Supplier had four previous industry standards inspections prior to the Oct. 28, 2025 inspection. In the most recent three previous inspections, the Supplier was found to have been selling vehicles over the advertised price, in which they were provided education regarding compliance with Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR. The Supplier was provided three opportunities to bring their business practices into compliance with Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR. During the Oct. 28, 2025 inspection, the Supplier was found to have continued this non-compliant business practice, despite AMVIC's attempts to educate the Supplier. Therefore, as per the AMVIC's Industry Standards Policy, the ISO and manager of Industry Standards recommended administrative action to the Registrar (Director of Fair Trading (as delegated)) in alignment with AMVIC's progressive enforcement model. Administrative enforcement actions can be used to aid in bringing licensees into compliance with the legislation governing the automotive industry.

The Director reviewed the evidence currently available and took into consideration that the Supplier reimbursed the five consumers who were found to be charged over the advertised price, after the ISO provided their inspection findings to the Supplier. While that is a mitigating factor considered by the Director, that does not absolve the Supplier from enforcement for breaching the legislation that governs the automotive industry.

The Supplier's business practices discussed above leverages the Supplier's knowledge and position, and does not foster a level playing field between the consumer and the Supplier, leading to financial harm to consumers.

The aggravating factors in this matter are the continued non-compliance with the rather straightforward requirements of the legislation, despite education provided to the Supplier and the resulting financial impact affecting the consumers due to paying over the advertised price. In five transactions, the Supplier derived an economic benefit of **\$5,508**. The Supplier reimbursed the five consumers found to be overcharged during the inspection, however the ISO only reviewed a small number of deal jackets

and it concerns the Director there are other consumers who could have been financially harmed due to this business practice by the Supplier. The amount of the Administrative Penalty cannot be viewed as a cost of doing business but rather as a deterrent for continuing to engage in non-compliant business practices.

The Supplier took responsibility for the non-compliance and provided cheques to the five consumers for the amount they charged over the advertised price. The Supplier provided the cheques to the consumers on Nov. 11, 2025. The Director took this into consideration as a mitigating factor.

This Administrative Penalty is taking into account the number and seriousness of the contraventions of the legislation found during the fifth inspection, and the aggravating and mitigating factors listed above.

Action

In accordance with Section 158.1(a) of the CPA and based on the above facts, I am requiring that Great West Chrysler Inc. o/a Taz Loans pay an Administrative Penalty. This is based on my opinion that Great West Chrysler Inc. o/a Taz Loans has contravened Section 11(2)(l) of the ABR.

Taking into consideration all the evidence currently before the Director, the amount of the Administrative Penalty is **\$2,500**.

The amount takes into consideration the factors outlined in Section 2 of the Administrative Penalties (*Consumer Protection Act*) Regulation, AR 135/2013 and the principles referenced in *R v Cotton Felts Ltd., (1982), 2 C.C.C (3d) 287 (Ont. C.A.)* as being applicable to fines levied under regulatory legislation related to public welfare including consumer protection legislation. In particular the Director took into account:

1. The harm on the persons adversely affected by the contraventions or failure to comply;
2. The economic benefit derived from the contraventions or failure to comply;
3. Administrative Penalties issued in similar circumstances;
4. The maximum penalty under Section 158.1(3) of the CPA of \$100,000; and
5. The deterrent effect of the penalty.

The amount of the Administrative Penalty is \$2,500.

Pursuant to Section 3 of the Administrative Penalties (*Consumer Protection Act*) Regulation, you are required to submit payment within **thirty (30) days** of the date of service of this notice. Payment may be made payable to the **“Government of Alberta” and sent to AMVIC** at:

Suite 303, 9945 – 50th Street
Edmonton, AB T6A 0L4.

If payment has not been received in this time period, the Notice may be filed in the Court of King's Bench and enforced as a judgement of that Court pursuant to Section 158.4 of the CPA and further disciplinary action will be considered.

Section 179 of the CPA allows a person who has been served a notice of Administrative Penalty to appeal the penalty. To appeal the penalty, the person must serve the Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction

Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction
103 Legislature Building
10800 - 97 Avenue NW
Edmonton, AB
Canada T5K 2B6

with a notice of appeal within **thirty (30) days** after receiving the notice of Administrative Penalty. The appeal notice must contain your name, your address for service, details of the decision being appealed and your reasons for appealing.

Pursuant to Section 180(4) of the CPA, service of a notice of appeal operates to stay the Administrative Penalty until the appeal board renders its decision on the appeal or the appeal is withdrawn.

Under Section 4 of the Administrative Penalties (*Consumer Protection Act*) Regulation, the fee for appealing an Administrative Penalty is the lesser of \$1,000 or half the amount of the penalty. As such, the fee for an appeal of this Administrative Penalty, should you choose to file one, would be \$1,000. Should you choose to appeal this Administrative Penalty, you must send the appeal fee to the Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction at the above noted address, made payable to the "Government of Alberta".

Yours truly,

"original signed by"

Alberta Motor Vehicle Industry Council (AMVIC)
Katie Lockton, Deputy Registrar
Director of Fair Trading (as Delegated)

KL/ks

Encl.

cc: Roxanne S [REDACTED], Manager of Industry Standards, AMVIC