

## **Superintendent of Financial Services**

**Regarding** the Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.1.8, as amended, particularly subsections 393(9) – 393(11)

**AND REGARDING** Tony Fung, life insurance agent

### **DECISION**

#### **Introduction:**

A Notice of Opportunity for Hearing dated August 16, 2010 (the Notice) informed Mr. Fung of allegations against him and the opportunity for a hearing before an Advisory Board. The Notice advised Mr. Fung that if a hearing was not requested, the Superintendent would make a decision based on information in the possession of the Financial Services Commission of Ontario (the Commission). Mr. Fung was also advised that such decision could include suspension or revocation of his licence as a life insurance agent.

I have received an affidavit from Ms. Larissa Easson, legal counsel at the Commission that the Notice was sent by registered mail and was redirected by Canada Post to the new address which it had on file. The affidavit further states that Canada Post confirmed that the Notice was unclaimed and that no request for a hearing has been received. The Insurance Act provides that service can be made by registered mail at the last known address of a person on file at the Commission. I am satisfied that the Notice was properly served in accordance with the provisions of the Insurance Act.

A copy of the allegations is attached to this Decision.

#### **The Evidence:**

Since Mr. Fung has not requested a hearing, the evidence of Commission staff in the particulars attached to the Notice is uncontroverted.

The evidence can be summarized as follows. The Commission received notification from Mr. Fung's insurance company that Mr. Fung's errors and omissions insurance policy was cancelled. The Commission made several attempts to contact him by mail, registered mail and by email without success.

### Findings of Fact

I find the allegations that Mr. Fung has failed to maintain errors and omissions insurance and is unsuitable to hold a licence as a life insurance agent to be established. The reasons for these findings are the notification of cancellation of the policy by Mr. Fung's insurance company and Mr. Fung's failure to respond to the several attempts by the Commission to contact him.

In the absence of testimony by Mr. Fung, I am not aware of any explanations for his behaviour or mitigating circumstances.

### Decision:

I have found that Mr. Fung is unsuitable to hold a licence as a life insurance agent.

Findings of unsuitability frequently result in revocation of the licence of an insurance agent.

Errors and omissions insurance is necessary to protect consumers from negligence by insurance agents. Insurance agents without errors and omissions insurance may not have sufficient assets to indemnify policy holders or applicants for insurance from such losses. Accordingly insurance agents that do not have errors and omissions insurance cannot be allowed to be engaged in the business of insurance.

In this case, Mr. Fung would not respond to the Commission on this matter. Insurance agents must be governable and amenable to being regulated. The Insurance Act imposes a duty on licensed persons to facilitate an examination. Responding to information requests is an attribute of a person suitable to be an insurance agent.

Since Mr. Fung has not requested a hearing, there are no explanations for his behaviour, nor is there any demonstrated interest in maintaining his licence as an insurance agent.

Accordingly considering the lack of suitability as demonstrated by the failure to facilitate an examination, the absence of the necessary insurance to protect the public and lack of any explanation for such behaviour, I believe that the appropriate penalty is revocation of Mr. Fung's licence as an insurance agent.

Accordingly, I hereby revoke the life insurance agent licence of Tony Fung.

Dated at Toronto, this fifteenth day of November 2010

Grant Swanson  
Executive Director, Licensing and Market Conduct  
by delegated Authority from  
Superintendent of Financial Services

## **Schedule 1**

The following allegations were set out in the Notice:

- a. Fung has failed to maintain appropriate errors and omissions insurance, as is required by Section 13 of Regulation 347/04.
- b. Fung is not amenable to regulation, pursuant to sections 4(1)(i) and 8(d) of regulation 347/04. Repeated efforts made to contact the agent were unsuccessful in obtaining required information regarding E&O insurance coverage.