

CHARTERED PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTANTS OF ONTARIO  
*CHARTERED PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTANTS OF ONTARIO ACT, 2017*

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

**IN THE MATTER OF:** An Allegation against **NAVEEN K. TAGORE, CPA, CGA**, under **Rule 201.1** of the CPA Code of Professional Conduct.

**BETWEEN:**

**Chartered Professional Accountants of Ontario  
Professional Conduct Committee**

**-and-**

**Naveen K. Tagore**

**APPEARANCES:**

**For the Professional Conduct Committee:** Lindsay Bandini, Counsel

**For Naveen K. Tagore:** Present  
James Lane, Counsel

Heard: January 29, 2026

Decision and Order effective: January 30, 2026

Release of written reasons: March 24, 2026

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION AND ORDER MADE JANUARY 30, 2026**

**I. OVERVIEW**

- [1] The Professional Conduct Committee (“PCC”) of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Ontario (“CPA Ontario”) made Allegations that Naveen K. Tagore (“the Member”) failed to act in a manner which maintained the good reputation of the profession as a result of being convicted of two counts of assault contrary to [section 266](#) of the [Criminal Code of Canada](#).
- [2] This hearing was held to determine whether the Allegations were established, whether the PCC has proved on a balance of probabilities that the Member’s conduct breached Rule 201.1 of the CPA Ontario Code of Professional Conduct (“the Code”), and whether the conduct amounted to professional misconduct.
- [3] The parties entered into an Agreed Statement of Facts (“ASF”) in which the Member admitted the facts of the arrest, convictions and sentence for the two counts of assault.
- [4] For the reasons set out below, the Panel finds that the Member’s conduct amounts to a

breach of Rule 201.1 of the Code and constitutes professional misconduct.

## **II. THE COMPLAINT AND THE ALLEGATIONS**

- [5] The PCC alleged that between September 27, 2024 and June 27, 2025, the Member was convicted of two counts of the criminal offence of assault, contrary to section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*, and did thereby fail to act in a manner which will maintain the good reputation of the profession, contrary to Rule 201.1 of the Code.

## **III. PRELIMINARY ISSUES**

- [6] Neither party raised any preliminary issues.

## **IV. ISSUES**

- [7] The Panel proceeded to consider the following issues:
- a) Did the evidence establish, on a balance of probabilities, the facts on which the Allegations by the PCC were based?
  - b) If the facts alleged by the PCC are established on the evidence on a balance of probabilities, do the facts constitute professional misconduct?

## **V. DECISION**

- [8] The Panel found that the evidence presented by the PCC established, on a balance of probabilities, the facts on which the Allegations were based.
- [9] The Panel was satisfied that the Allegations constituted a breach of Rule 201.1 of the Code in that the Member failed to act in a manner which would maintain the good reputation of the profession and serve the public interest.

## **VI. REASONS FOR THE DECISION ON MISCONDUCT**

### *Findings Regarding the Conduct of the Member*

- [10] The parties filed a Joint Book of Documents (Exhibit 2) which contained materials relating to the Member's conviction and sentencing, letters of support, and the Member's mentor profile with CPA Ontario. The Joint Book also included the Reasons for Judgment and Reasons for Sentence in the Member's criminal matter. The parties also filed an ASF (Exhibit 1).
- [11] The ASF can be summarized as follows.
- [12] On September 27, 2024, following a trial, the Member was convicted of two counts of assault against SW, contrary to section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*.
- [13] The Member and SW had both worked together at a large national bank ("the Bank"). SW began working at the Bank in September 2019. The Member was her mentor and tasked with ensuring she received the experience necessary to qualify for her CPA designation.

SW moved through various rotations at the Bank over a period of 30 months. In addition to being her mentor, the Member was also the manager SW reported to between July 2021 and March 2022. SW was offered a full-time role in March 2022 and transferred into that role in November 2022. During that time, the Member continued to act as an informal mentor to SW and the two interacted almost daily.

- [14] In October 2022, the Member invited SW to a fundraising event where the Bank had sponsored a table. The event took place on October 19, 2022. The Member was charged with four counts of sexual assault in relation to events that took place that evening.
- [15] At the Member's criminal trial, the trial judge found that on October 19, 2022, the Member held SW's hand twice, put his hand on her leg, nestled his face into her upper chest between her neck and collarbone area, and kissed her cheek twice, and that this conduct took place without SW's consent. The trial judge was not convinced, however, that this conduct violated SW's sexual integrity. On this basis, the trial judge convicted the Member of two counts of assault, as opposed to sexual assault.
- [16] SW had also alleged that the Member touched her buttocks twice while taking group photos at the fundraising event. The trial judge found the Member not guilty of these two counts.
- [17] On June 27, 2025, the Member was sentenced to a conditional discharge with nine months of probation. The terms of the probation order require that the Member have no contact with SW and that he takes counselling and rehabilitative programs as directed by his probation officer.
- [18] SW had also reported the Member to the Bank. After an internal investigation, the Member was found to have violated the company's sexual harassment policy, and he was dismissed in 2023.
- [19] The Member agreed that his conduct established a substantive breach of Rule 201.1 of the Code and constituted professional misconduct.

#### *Finding of Professional Misconduct*

- [20] The Panel agrees that the Member acted in a manner that failed to maintain the good reputation of the profession. The Member was convicted of a serious criminal offence – multiple acts of non-consensual touching. Although at the time of the non-consensual touching the Member was no longer SW's direct manager and his formal mentor-mentee relationship with her had ended, he continued to play the role of an informal mentor. This left SW in a vulnerable position. The Panel believes that any CPA convicted of such conduct in this context fails to maintain the good reputation of the profession.

#### **VII. DECISION AS TO SANCTION**

- [21] The PCC sought the following sanctions:
- Suspension of CPA Ontario membership for a period of 12 months;
  - Permanent restriction from acting as a CPA Ontario mentor;

- A fine of \$10,000 payable to CPA Ontario within 12 months of the final Order;
- In the event the Member fails to comply with the terms of the Order, his membership with CPA Ontario shall be suspended until such time as he does comply, provided that he complies within 30 days of the date of his suspension. In the event that he does not comply within the 30-day period, the Member's membership with CPA Ontario shall be revoked; and
- Publicity in accordance with Regulations 6-2, sections 45, 48, 50 and 52, to all members of CPA Ontario and to all provincial bodies.

[22] The Member was largely *ad idem* with the PCC's proposed sanctions. He took issue only with the PCC's proposed length of the suspension, the permanent restriction on his ability to act as a CPA Ontario mentor, and time to pay the fine. The Member argued that the suspension should be less than 12 months and that while it may be appropriate to pause the Member's ability to act as a CPA Ontario mentor, it does not need to be a permanent restriction.

[23] After considering the evidence, jurisprudence and the submissions of the parties, the Panel ordered a nine (9) month suspension, a permanent restriction from acting as a mentor under any formal CPA Ontario mentorship program, a fine of \$10,000 payable within two years, publication in accordance with Regulation 6-2, and a provision were there to be non-compliance with the Panel's order.

### **VIII. REASONS FOR THE DECISION AS TO SANCTION**

[24] The PCC called no evidence on sanction. The Member testified and called two character witnesses, CF and RG. CF had worked with the Member for five years at the Bank and reported directly to him. RG first worked with the Member as a co-op student at the Bank and later worked with him full-time between 2017 and 2023. The Member also filed additional character letters, though the Panel placed less weight on these letters as they did not have the benefit of hearing the references testify.

[25] In any discipline proceeding, a Panel must consider all principles of sanction and may have a view to those articulated in section 15 of Regulation 6-2. In applying these principles, the Panel concluded that a 9-month suspension was appropriate alongside a permanent restriction on the Member's ability to act as a formal mentor with CPA Ontario. The Panel also ordered 24 months to pay the fine given the Member's evidence about his financial circumstances, including the fact that he lost his job as a result of the incident. The parties were in agreement on the other aspects of the sanction, including the quantum of the fine, publicity and consequences of failing to comply with the Panel's Order. The Panel agrees that these sanctions are appropriate in the circumstances of this case and notes that such sanctions have been imposed in comparable cases.

#### *The Length of Suspension*

[26] When considering the appropriate sanction, the Panel must consider both the aggravating and mitigating factors in the matter. There are several mitigating factors present here. The Member has no prior discipline history with CPA Ontario. The Member's character

witnesses both testified that they had opportunities to observe the Member in the workplace and that he treated colleagues respectfully. They also indicated that they were surprised by the criminal charges and conviction. The Member has also been involved in volunteer work in the community. The Panel accepts this evidence and finds that the Member's conduct was out of character. The Member also testified and expressed remorse for his conduct and the Panel accepts that he is unlikely to re-offend again. The Member had also completed a rehabilitative program, though this was a condition of his probation, and the Member did not complete any further programs.

- [27] There are also aggravating factors in this case. The complainant was in a vulnerable position. She was at the very least an informal mentee to the Member at the time of the incident, and someone who had until recently reported directly to him. While the non-consensual actions took place on a single evening, it was nevertheless a series of actions.
- [28] When determining the appropriate sanctions in this matter, the Panel also considered specific and general deterrence. The Panel agrees that there is no need for specific deterrence in this case – the Member was already charged and convicted, and he has lost his job at the Bank because of this incident. General deterrence, however, remains important. The reputation of the profession must be at the forefront of the Panel's analysis, as it is more important than the fortunes of any individual.<sup>1</sup> A message needs to be sent that non-consensual touching will not be tolerated by the profession and that those who choose to engage in this type of misconduct will face significant consequences.
- [29] The Panel considered the Member's arguments carefully. The Member argued that other professional bodies, particularly in the regulated health care professions, treat conduct that in the Member's view is more harmful with less severe penalties. The Member further argued that given the nature of the relationship between regulated health care professionals and their patients, those complainants are in an even more vulnerable position, and as such, that body of jurisprudence should carry more persuasive weight. The Member pointed to the decision in [College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario v. Peirovy, 2018 ONCA 420](#) as an example. The Panel disagrees with the Member's arguments. The decision in *Peirovy* is no longer of much value given that the conduct at issue in that case (sexual touching of female patients) was decided under a prior legislative framework. Similar conduct post the 2017 amendment to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991* would result in presumptive revocation by the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal. Moreover, CPA Ontario is a self-regulated profession that has the ability to impose its own penalties on members who commit professional misconduct in such a way that the good reputation of the profession is maintained.
- [30] Of the cases provided by the parties, the Panel found the decision in [Chartered Professional Accountants of Ontario v Easterbrook, 2023 ONCPA 6](#) the most helpful. In *Easterbrook*, the member was a facilitator in the CPA Ontario Professional Education Program ("PEP") in which the complainant was an international student. After completing the Core 1 module in the PEP, the complainant contacted the Member for career advice. They later met at a coffee shop to discuss career opportunities. The day after the meeting, the Member sent a series of unwanted sexually explicit text messages to the complainant. The Member

---

<sup>1</sup> [Chartered Professional Accountants of Ontario v. Moore, 2025 ONCPA 15](#) at para. 47

admitted that his actions constituted professional misconduct pursuant to Rule 201.1 of the Code and in addition to other sanctions, received a 6-month suspension. The Member argued that the conduct in *Easterbrook* was a more direct violation of the victim's sexual integrity than the Member's conduct in this case which in the Member's view, could be socially acceptable in some contexts.

- [31] The Panel disagrees. The Panel finds that the Member's conduct here is more serious. The conduct involved physical non-consensual touching, and the Member was charged and convicted criminally for this conduct. The conduct here was not socially acceptable. To make such a finding, the Panel would have to divorce the conduct from the context, which includes the fact that this was the repeated non-consensual touching of someone in a particularly vulnerable position. As already noted, at the time of the touching, the Member had been both a formal and informal mentor to SW, as well as a direct manager.
- [32] In these circumstances, a 9-month suspension is appropriate, which is less than the 12-months sought by the PCC but more than the 6-months sought by the Member.

#### *Permanent Restriction on Being a Formal Mentor with CPA Ontario*

- [33] The parties disagreed on whether a permanent restriction preventing the Member from acting as a formal mentor with CPA Ontario should be imposed.
- [34] The Member testified that during his tenure at the Bank, he acted as a mentor to approximately 15 people, of which, 12 were in a formal capacity. His evidence was that being a mentor was a role that was important to him as he viewed himself as a "teacher" who felt a desire to give back to the profession. On the other hand, the PCC submitted that a permanent restriction was necessary to show the profession and the public that CPA Ontario takes such conduct seriously. The PCC also pointed to *Easterbrook* where the Panel ordered that the member refrain from acting as a facilitator in the PEP through which he met the complainant. The PCC submitted that the decision was analogous to the circumstances here as the Member met the complainant through his role as a CPA Ontario mentor and was acting as an informal mentor at the time the misconduct took place.
- [35] The Panel finds that given the nature of the Member's conduct, it is appropriate to impose a permanent restriction on the Member's ability to act as a mentor under any formal CPA Ontario membership program. Being a formal CPA Ontario mentor is a privilege and one that the Member abused through his conduct. If an informed member of the public or the profession was aware that a member who has been convicted in criminal proceedings for assaulting a former mentee was able to continue acting as a mentor, the reputation of the profession would be brought into disrepute, and the public's confidence in the ability of the profession to self-regulate could be undermined.

#### **IX. COSTS**

- [36] The law is settled that an order for costs with respect to the disciplinary proceeding is not a penalty. Costs are intended to indemnify the PCC, based on the underlying principle that the profession should not bear the costs of members who choose to abandon their professional obligations.

[37] Costs are awarded at the discretion of the Discipline Committee. It has become customary for the PCC to file a Costs Outline and to seek 2/3 of the costs incurred in the investigation and prosecution of the matter. The PCC presented a Bill of Costs (Exhibit 3) for the Panel's consideration. It totals \$8,650, 2/3 of which is approximately \$5,700, the amount sought by the PCC. The Member takes no issue with this costs award. The Panel therefore orders a costs award of \$5,700 to be payable to CPA Ontario by January 31, 2028.

**DATED** this 24<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Finkel', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Alexandra Finkel, CPA, CA  
Discipline Committee – Deputy Chair

Members of the Panel

Robert Barber, Public Representative  
Soheil Talebi, CPA, CA, LPA

Independent Legal Counsel

Janani Shanmuganathan, Barrister & Solicitor