

MPFA disqualified Liu Wing-kit as an MPF intermediary for 10 months

The MPFA has disqualified Liu Wing-kit as a Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) intermediary for 10 months from 11 February 2020 to 10 December 2020.

The MPFA found that when Liu invited an MPF scheme member to transfer the scheme member's MPF benefits from two MPF schemes to another MPF scheme in or about March 2018, he had contravened the conduct requirements of acting honestly, fairly, in the best interests of his client, and with integrity under the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Ordinance (MPFSO) and the Guidelines on Conduct Requirements for Registered Intermediaries. The key facts of Liu's misconduct are summarized as follows:

- I. Liu effected the transfers without the scheme member's proper authorization;
 - II. For the purpose of effecting the transfers, Liu disclosed the scheme member's personal information to a third party and arranged such third party to impersonate the scheme member in calling two MPF trustees to obtain the scheme member's account information; and
 - III. Liu failed to ensure that seven MPF forms were duly completed before asking the scheme member to sign on them.
- In deciding on the disciplinary order, the MPFA took into account all the circumstances of the case including that Liu has made frank admissions and has no previous disciplinary record with the MPFA.

The case was referred to the MPFA following investigation by the Insurance Authority.

A copy of the Statement of Disciplinary Action is available [here](#).

- Ends -

11 February 2020

1. Liu (MPF Registration No. 120609) was attached to Sun Life Hong Kong Limited before he was de-registered as a subsidiary intermediary on 10 October 2019.
2. Section 34ZL(1)(a) of the MPFSO provides that when carrying on a regulated activity, an MPF intermediary must act honestly, fairly, in the best interests of the client, and with integrity.
3. Paragraph III.3 of the Guidelines provides that a registered intermediary should ensure that any form to be signed by a client is duly completed in all material respects before asking the client to sign on it. Paragraph III.8 of the Guidelines provides that a registered intermediary should act in the best interests of the client in conducting sales and marketing activities and in giving regulated advice in relation to registered schemes/constituent funds. Paragraph III.9 of the Guidelines provides that a registered intermediary should treat all information supplied by a client as confidential, must not disclose or use such information except as permitted at law, and avoid any misuse of the personal information obtained in the course of its business activities.

[< Back](#)

STATEMENT OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION

The disciplinary action

1. The Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Authority (**MPFA**) has disqualified Liu Wing-kit (**Liu**) from being registered as a Mandatory Provident Fund (**MPF**) intermediary for 10 months from 11 February 2020 to 10 December 2020.
2. The MPFA found that Liu:
 - (a) without the proper authorization of a scheme member (**Scheme Member**), effected transfers of the Scheme Member's MPF accrued benefits from two MPF schemes to another MPF scheme (**Subject Transfers**);
 - (b) disclosed the Scheme Member's personal information to a third party and arranged such third party to impersonate the Scheme Member in calling two MPF trustees to obtain the account information of the Scheme Member, for the purpose of effecting the Subject Transfers; and
 - (c) failed to ensure that seven forms were duly completed before asking the Scheme Member to sign on the forms.
3. Liu's conduct was in breach of the conduct requirements under sections 34ZL(1)(a) of the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Ordinance, Cap 485 (**MPFSO**), and paragraphs III.3, III.8 and III.9 of the Guidelines on Conduct Requirements for Registered Intermediaries (**Conduct Guidelines**).

Summary of facts

4. Liu was a subsidiary intermediary attached to Sun Life Hong Kong Limited (**Sun Life**) from 25 January 2017 to 2 July 2019. Liu was de-registered as a MPF intermediary on 10 October 2019.
5. In February 2018, the Scheme Member approached Sun Life and enquired about consolidating her MPF benefits. Liu was assigned by Sun Life to follow up the matter and later met the Scheme Member on 1 March 2018.
6. At the meeting, Liu asked the Scheme Member about her existing MPF accounts and explained to the Scheme Member information about the MPF scheme of Sun Life and its fund performance. Liu also invited the Scheme Member to transfer her MPF accrued benefits to the MPF scheme of Sun Life before a designated date in order to be eligible for a promotional offer.
7. Upon Liu's request, the Scheme Member signed several forms for the Subject Transfers during a meeting. The Scheme Member's MPF account numbers were however not filled in as such information was not available at the time. After the meeting, the Scheme Member decided not to provide Liu with such information and considered that any MPF transfers would be suspended until she had provided such information. The Scheme Member confirmed that she had never instructed Liu to effect the Subject Transfers. Nevertheless, the Subject Transfers were

completed on 29 March 2018 and 4 April 2018 without the Scheme Member's knowledge.

8. In the course of investigation, Liu admitted that:
 - (a) the Scheme Member did not authorize him to effect the Subject Transfers but Liu still did so hoping that the Scheme Member could enjoy a promotional offer in time;
 - (b) for the purpose of obtaining the MPF account information of the Scheme Member to complete the Subject Transfers, Liu arranged his friend of the same gender as the Scheme Member to impersonate the Scheme Member and call two MPF trustees on 2 March 2018 without the latter's knowledge or consent; and
 - (c) the signing date on seven MPF forms and some other information such as the Scheme Member's account numbers on three of the forms were not filled in when the Scheme Member signed on them at the meeting.

Breaches and reasons for action

9. Section 34ZL(1)(a) of the MPFSO states that, when carrying on a regulated activity, a principal intermediary or a subsidiary intermediary attached to a principal intermediary must act honestly, fairly, in the best interests of the client, and with integrity.
10. Paragraph III.3 of the Conduct Guidelines states that a registered intermediary should ensure that any form to be signed by a client is duly completed in all material respects before asking the client to sign on it.
11. Paragraph III.8 of the Conduct Guidelines states that a registered intermediary should act in the best interests of the client in conducting sales and marketing activities and in giving regulated advice in relation to registered schemes/constituent funds.
12. Paragraph III.9 of the Conduct Guidelines states that a registered intermediary should treat all information supplied by a client as confidential, must not disclose or use such information except as permitted at law, and avoid any misuse of the personal information obtained in the course of its business activities.
13. Having considered all the circumstances including Liu's admissions, the MPFA is of the view that Liu had failed to act honestly, fairly, in the best interests of the client, and with integrity when conducting regulated activities by effecting transfers of the Scheme Member's MPF benefits without proper authorization; and for the purpose and in the course of effecting the transfers, Liu had without the Scheme Member's knowledge and consent provided the Scheme Member's personal information to a third party (who is of the same gender as the Scheme Member) and arranged the third party to impersonate the Scheme Member in calling two MPF trustees to obtain her relevant account information. Liu also failed to ensure that any form to be signed by the Scheme Member was duly completed in all material respects before asking the Scheme Member to sign on it.

Conclusion

14. The MPFA's view is that Liu's conduct has breached the conduct requirements under sections 34ZL(1)(a) of the MPFSO, and paragraphs III.3, III.8 and III.9 of the Conduct Guidelines. The MPFA has therefore decided to take the disciplinary action set out in paragraph 1 hereinabove against Liu.
15. In determining the disciplinary sanction, the MPFA took into account all relevant circumstances, including the nature, seriousness and impact of Liu's breaches, his frank admissions and that he has no previous disciplinary record with the MPFA.