

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE  
ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES**

BETWEEN:

**ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES**

-and-

**JUNIOR LLOYD BECKFORD**

**NOTICE OF HEARING**

**THE COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE OF THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES**, pursuant to section 44, subsection (5) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009* (the “Act”), S.O. 2009, chapter 22, has directed that the matter hereinafter described regarding the conduct or actions of Junior Lloyd Beckford (Membership No. 13237315), a member of the College, be referred to the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Trades. The Discipline Committee, pursuant to section 46, subsection (1) of the *Act*, shall hear and determine matters referred to it by the Complaints Committee under section 44 of the *Act*.

**IT IS ALLEGED** that Junior Lloyd Beckford has engaged in professional misconduct as defined in subsection 46(2) of the *Act* and/or Ontario Regulation 97/13 made under the *Act* in that he:

- a) failed to take reasonable steps to safeguard the life, health or property of a person who may be affected by the work of a member or any person for whom the member is responsible, when the member knew or ought to have known that there was a risk to life, health or property, which is defined as professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(1);
- b) failed to act to correct or report a situation that the member knew or ought to have known may endanger the safety or welfare of the public, which is defined as professional

misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(2);

- c) signed or issued, in his capacity as a member of the College, a document that he knew or ought to have known contained a false, improper or misleading statement, which is defined as professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(8);
- d) was found guilty of contravening a law, the contravention of which is relevant to his suitability to hold a certificate of qualification or statement of membership, which is defined as professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(9);
- e) failed to maintain the standards of a trade, which is defined as professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(10); and
- f) acted or failed to act, in respect to the practice of a trade, in a manner that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional, which is defined as professional misconduct under Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(11).

**PARTICULARS OF THE ALLEGATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:**

1. Junior Lloyd Beckford, Membership No. 13237315 (the “Member”), is a member of the Ontario College of Trades (the “College”).
2. At all material times, the Member held certificates of qualification, Journeypersons class, in the trades of Automotive Service Technician (310S) and Truck and Coach Technician (310T).
3. At all material times, JB Auto Solutions (the “MVIS Licensee”), located at 7A Wilby Crescent, Toronto, Ontario, was licensed by the Ministry of Transportation (“MTO”) as a Motor Vehicle Inspection Station and the Member was registered as a motor vehicle inspection mechanic at that location and had the MVIS Licensee’s signing authority to issue Safety Standard Certificates for vehicles, pursuant to the *Highway Traffic Act*, RSO 1990, Ch. 8 (the “HTA”) and its Regulations.
4. On June 25, 2015, [NAME], the son of [NAME] (the “Complainant”), purchased a 2002 Jeep CJ bearing the vehicle identification number [NUMBER] (the “Vehicle”) for \$7,070.00 from Pakdel

Auto (the “Seller”).

5. On June 25, 2015, the Member conducted a Safety Standard inspection of the Vehicle on behalf of the Seller. Following his inspection, the Member signed and issued a Safety Standard Certificate [NUMBER] for the Vehicle, whereby he certified that it met the minimum *HTA* safety and performance standards to be operated on public highways in Ontario.
6. On June 26, 2015, [COMPLAINANT’S SON] took delivery of the Vehicle from the Seller.
7. On July 2, 2015, [COMPLAINANT’S SON] brought the Vehicle to Islington Chrysler for routine maintenance. The assigned Chrysler technician noted a number of deficiencies with the Vehicle, including that the Vehicle’s shock absorbers were knocking and leaking; and that the Vehicle had rusted holes in the floor of the Vehicle’s passenger compartment. [COMPLAINANT’S SON] paid Islington Chrysler for the following: replacement of front and rear shock absorbers; oil and filter change; power steering flush; transmission tune up; 4x4 driveline service; cooling system flush; and brake fluid flush. The cost of the work done to the Vehicle was \$1,603.16.
8. At some point following his visit to Islington Chrysler, [COMPLAINANT’S SON] removed the carpeting and discovered the full extent of the rusted holes in the Vehicle’s chassis and informed the Complainant. Both [COMPLAINANT’S SON] and the Complainant became concerned about the authenticity of the Safety Standard Certificate that the Member had issued for the Vehicle.
9. On July 24, 2015, [COMPLAINANT’S SON] and the Complainant brought the Vehicle to the Seller to demand a refund for the Vehicle based on what they believed to be an inaccurate Safety Standard Certificate. The Seller agreed to have the Vehicle’s rusted holes repaired at the MVIS Licensee by its owner, Robin Singh.
10. On July 31, 2015, the Complainant retrieved the purportedly repaired Vehicle from Pakdel Auto and had it towed to Caledon Chrysler for a Safety Standard inspection.
11. On August 3, 2015, the Vehicle failed the Safety Standard inspection, after the technician performing no less than three safety checks. Following this, the Complainant contacted the MTO to have the Vehicle inspected.
12. On August 10, 2015, MTO Inspector Steven Wong attended at Caledon Chrysler to inspect the

Vehicle, and recorded that it had been driven 1,760 kilometers since the Member had issued the Safety Standard Certificate. He identified numerous deficiencies with the Vehicle, including considerable floor pan rust holes on the left and right sides of the body mount. On performing a smoke test, he observed smoke entering the Vehicle's passenger compartment. MTO Inspector Wong also noted in his Field Inspection Report that the brake rotors had been damaged by rust corrosion; the trailer hitch was missing a locking pin; and the right rear steel brake line was insecure, being looped over the axel.

13. On August 12, 2015, the Complainant wrote to Robin Singh of the MVIS Licensee, outlining the safety deficiencies with the Vehicle identified by MTO Inspector Wong. Mr. Singh retrieved the car the same day and brought it back to the MVIS Licensee to repair those deficiencies. Repairs were done by Douglas Facey, an Auto Body and Collision Damage Repairer (310B) and a member of the College.
14. On August 18, 2015, Robin Singh informed the Complainant that the Vehicle was repaired, with the exception of an unidentifiable water leak, and told the Complainant that the Vehicle would pass a Safety Standard inspection.
15. On August 22, 2015, the Complainant brought the Vehicle back to Caledon Chrysler where it once again failed to pass the Safety Standard inspection. The Vehicle was then returned to Mr. Singh at the MVIS Licensee for further repair.
16. Following the recommendation of MTO Inspector Wong, on September 2, 2015 the Complainant brought the Vehicle to a Canadian Tire Automotive Centre in Bolton, Ontario ("Canadian Tire") for a Safety Standards inspection. The Vehicle also failed that inspection, and a number of deficiencies were noted by the servicing technician and included on the invoice.
17. At some point after the September 2, 2015 Canadian Tire inspection, [NAME] of the Ontario Motor Vehicle Industry Council, on behalf of the Seller, offered to resolve the Vehicle's repair issues: in exchange for having the Vehicle inspected, and if deficient, repaired at no cost by Precision Services, the Complainant would not pursue the matter further. The Complainant refused on the basis that the Seller would only allow Precision Services, and not a third party auto mechanic, to do any needed repairs. Precision Services is located at the same address as the MVIS Licensee.

18. On September 10, 2015, the Vehicle was again repaired at the MVIS Licensee by the Member and an apprentice, a Mr. Rodrigues. Following these repairs, the Vehicle was returned to the Complainant.
19. On October 2, 2015, the Vehicle underwent a final Safety Standard inspection at Canadian Tire. It once again failed that safety inspection.
20. On September 1, 2016, before Justice of the Peace K. Valentine, the Member pleaded guilty to, and was convicted of, making a false statement in Safety Standard Certificate [NUMBER] in respect of the Vehicle, contrary to s. 99(2) of the *HTA*. The Member was fined \$ 2,000.00, with one (1) year to pay.

**A PANEL OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE WILL HOLD A HEARING** pursuant to sections 46 and 48 of the *Act* for the purpose of deciding whether the Member has engaged in professional misconduct. A copy of the *Rules of Procedure of the Discipline Committee & Fitness to Practise Committee* is enclosed.

**AN APPEARANCE WILL TAKE PLACE BEFORE THE PANEL** by teleconference on **Wednesday, July 26, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. (Eastern)** to set a date for the hearing of this matter on its merits (the "Hearing"). The teleconference call-in details will be provided to all parties at least two (2) weeks prior to the teleconference. The Hearing, once scheduled, will be held at Victory Verbatim, 222 Bay Street, Suite 900, Toronto, Ontario or such other venue as the College may advise, on a date to be determined after consultation between College Counsel and the Member or his legal counsel/representative, and fixed by the Hearings Coordinator.

**THE MEMBER IS ENTITLED AND ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ABOVE-NOTED APPEARANCE BY TELECONFERENCE AND AT THE HEARING, AND IS ENTITLED TO BE REPRESENTED BY LEGAL COUNSEL OR A REPRESENTATIVE THROUGHOUT THIS PROCEEDING.**

The Member or his legal counsel/representative may contact College Counsel to discuss the scheduling of the Hearing or a pre-hearing conference to determine whether a date for the Hearing can be agreed upon. College Counsel's contact information is provided below.

**IF A DATE FOR THE HEARING IS NOT AGREED UPON AND THE MEMBER DOES NOT ATTEND THE APPEARANCE BY TELECONFERENCE ON Wednesday, July, 26, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. (Eastern) TO SET A DATE**

**FOR THE HEARING, THEN THE PANEL MAY PROCEED IN HIS ABSENCE TO SET A DATE FOR THE HEARING. NOTICE OF THE HEARING DATE WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE MEMBER IN WRITING AT HIS LAST KNOWN ADDRESS AS SHOWN IN THE RECORDS OF THE COLLEGE.**

**IF THE MEMBER DOES NOT ATTEND THE HEARING ON THE DATE SCHEDULED, THE PANEL MAY PROCEED IN HIS ABSENCE AND HE WILL NOT BE ENTITLED TO ANY FURTHER NOTICE OF THE PROCEEDING.**

**IF THE PANEL FINDS THE MEMBER GUILTY OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT,** the panel shall make one or more of the following orders, pursuant to subsection 46(4) of the Act:

1. Directing the Registrar to revoke the Member's certificate of qualification or statement of membership.
2. Directing the Registrar to suspend the Member's certificate of qualification or statement of membership for a specified period, not exceeding 24 months.
3. Directing the Registrar to impose specified terms, conditions or limitations on the Member's certificate of qualification or statement of membership.
4. Directing that the Registrar not carry out a direction made under paragraph 1, 2 or 3 for a specified period and not carry out the direction at all if specified terms are met within that period.

**IN ADDITION, IF THE PANEL FINDS THE MEMBER GUILTY OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT,** the panel may make an order doing one or more of the following, pursuant to subsection 46(5) of the Act:

1. Requiring that the Member be reprimanded, admonished or counselled by the panel or its delegate and, if considered warranted, directing that the fact of the reprimand, admonishment or counselling be recorded on the register for a specified or unlimited period.
2. Imposing a fine in an amount that the panel considers appropriate, to a maximum of \$2,000, to be paid by the Member to the Minister of Finance for payment into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
3. Directing that the finding and the order of the panel be published, in detail or in summary, with or

without the name of the Member, in the official publication of the College and in any other manner or medium that the panel considers appropriate in the particular case.

4. Fixing costs to be paid by the Member.

A member whose conduct has been directed or referred to a proceeding before the Discipline Committee or panels thereof may examine before the hearing any written or documentary evidence that will be produced or any report, the contents of which will be given as evidence at the hearing. The College must provide the member with complete disclosure at least fifteen (15) days before the hearing on the merits of all evidence in the College's possession or control relevant to the allegations that is not privileged. To obtain disclosure in this matter, the Member or his legal counsel/representative should contact Louis P. Strezos, College Counsel in this matter, using the contact information noted below.

**Date:** June 13, 2017

"David Tsubouchi"

David Tsubouchi  
Registrar & Chief Executive Officer  
Ontario College of Trades  
655 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON M5G 2K4

**To:** Junior Beckford  
[ADDRESS]  
[ADDRESS]

**From:** Louis P. Strezos, College Counsel  
Barrister & Solicitor  
15 Bedford Road  
Toronto, ON M5R 2J7  
Tel: 416-944-0244  
Email: lps@15bedford.com

**End.**