



November 04, 2025

Gulzar Transport Inc.
8760 River Road
Delta, BC V4G 1B5

Gulzar Transport Inc. (CTC Decision No. 30/2025) – Decision Notice

Introduction

1. In [Gulzar Transport Inc.](#) (CTC Decision No. 30/2025) (“Commissioner’s Decision”), I determined that Gulzar Transport Inc. (“Gulzar”) was in breach of section 24(2) of the *Container Trucking Regulation* (“*Regulation*”) when it failed to pay its independent operators (“IO”) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the IO performed the container trucking services for which the remuneration was owed. I found that this occurred for the months of March, April, May and June 2025.
2. I determined that this was an appropriate case to issue a penalty for the reasons set out in paragraphs 18-20. Consistent with s. 34(2) of the *Act*, I proposed to impose an administrative fine against Gulzar in the amount of \$6,000.00 and advised Gulzar that I would consider its written response to the proposed penalty if it was received within seven days. I also ordered Gulzar to comply with section 24 of the *Regulation*.
3. The Office of the BC Container Trucking Commissioner (“OBCCTC”) received Gulzar’s response to the Commissioner’s Decision on October 14, 2025 (the “Submission”).

Licensee Response

4. Gulzar denies that it was in breach of section 24 of the *Regulation* because “during the four months in question, all cheques were available and issued on time.”
5. Gulzar further argues that the text messages referenced in the Commissioner’s Decision are not evidence of “delayed payment” but “merely reflect the additional time provided to the I/Os to complete their compliance submissions...” in order to be compliant with the National Safety Code which it says requires documents, including fuel statements and maintenance schedules, to be submitted by month’s end.
6. Gulzar states it recently transitioned from employing company drivers to IOs and wanted to ensure that all compliance documents were properly submitted. Gulzar says that it explained its reasoning to the auditor and was advised that additional time “should not be provided going forward,” which, Gulzar says, “we fully understand and have communicated to our accounting and compliance

department for future adherence.”

7. Gulzar asks that the Commissioner either refrain from issuing an administrative penalty or take into consideration its Submission and reconsider the proposed administrative penalty.

Decision Notice

8. At paragraph 13 of the Commissioner’s Decision, I set out that Gulzar did not provide a response to the Investigation Report which summarized a driver’s complaint and text messages that appeared to show that IOs were not paid in accordance with section 24(2) of the *Regulation*.
9. I am not persuaded by Gulzar’s mere assertion in its Submission that it paid its drivers “on time” for work performed in March, April, May and June 2025 or that the text messages are not evidence of “delayed payment.”. First, Gulzar provides no corroborating payroll evidence that it paid its IOs within the regulated timeline. Second, the text messages corroborate the Complainant’s evidence that he was not paid in accordance with the *Regulation*.
10. I am unclear what inference Gulzar asks me to draw from the auditor’s direction that it should not delay payroll going forward, but I am not persuaded that the auditor can either condone or excuse the delayed payment in any event. The auditor is not a decision-maker and she appears to have only advised the licensee to correct its behaviour going forward to ensure the breach no longer continues in any event.
11. I am also not persuaded that Gulzar’s change from mostly company drivers to IOs excuses the breach. I also note that Gulzar has previously sponsored IOs and ought to be familiar with the requirements of the *Regulation*.

Conclusion

12. Having carefully considered Gulzar’s submission, and in light of all of the above-mentioned factors and circumstances, I remain convinced that a \$6,000 penalty is appropriate in this case.
13. In the result, I order Gulzar to pay an administrative penalty of \$6,000. Section 35(2) of the *Act* requires this fine to be paid within 30 days of the issuance of the Decision Notice. Payment should be made by payable to the Minister of Finance and delivered to the Office of the BC Container Trucking Commissioner.
14. Gulzar may request a reconsideration of the Commissioner’s Decision by filing a Notice of Reconsideration with the Commissioner not more than 30 days after Gulzar’s receipt of this Decision Notice. A Notice of Reconsideration must be:
 - a. made in writing,

- b. identify the decision for which a reconsideration is requested,
 - c. state why the decision should be changed,
 - d. state the outcome requested,
 - e. include the name, an address for delivery, and telephone number of the applicant and, if the applicant is represented by counsel, include the full name, address for delivery and telephone number of the applicant's counsel,
 - f. signed by the applicant or the applicant's counsel.
15. Despite the filing of a Notice of Reconsideration, and subject to section 39(2) of the *Act*, the above order remains in effect until the reconsideration application is determined.

This decision notice along with the Commissioner's decision will be published on the Commissioner's website (www.obcctc.ca).

Dated at Vancouver, B.C. this 4th day of November 2025.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Glen MacInnes". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Glen" and last name "MacInnes" clearly distinguishable.

Glen MacInnes
Commissioner