



Institute  
and Faculty  
of Actuaries

**Adjudication Panel Meeting**

**24 March 2026**

**Institute and Faculty of Actuaries  
Held by Video Conference**

**Respondent:** Yunqing Guan

**Category:** Student (lapsed)

**Region:** United Kingdom

**Panel Members:** Peter Wrench (Chair/Lay member)  
Hardeep Jandu FIA C.Act (Actuary member)  
Wendy Yeadon (Lay member)

**Legal Adviser:** Bilaal Shabbir

**Judicial Committees Secretary:** Hinna Alim

**Allegation:**

The allegation against Yunqing Guan (“the Respondent”) is:

- A1 On 12 December 2023, while on board a train, he committed sexual assault by intentionally touching a woman aged 16 or over. That touching was sexual, the woman did not consent and he did not reasonably believe that she was consenting.
- A2 His actions in A1 above were contrary to section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.
- A3 His actions in A1 and/or A2 above were in breach of the Compliance principle of the Actuaries’ Code (version 3.1).
- A4 His actions in A1 and/or A2 above were in breach of the Integrity principle of the Actuaries’ Code (version 3.1).
- A5 His actions, in all or any of the above, constituted Misconduct in terms of Rule 2.1 of the Disciplinary Scheme of the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries (Effective 1 August 2023).

**Panel’s determination:**

The Panel considered the Case Report and appendices and the Respondent’s response to the Case Report. The Panel determined that the Case Report established a *prima facie* case of Misconduct.

The Panel accordingly invited the Respondent to accept that there had been Misconduct and to agree to the imposition of the following sanction:

- exclusion from membership of the IFoA for a period of four years.

**Background:**

The Respondent became a student member of the IFoA on 2 June 2014. His membership lapsed on 7 January 2026. As at the date of the hearing, the Respondent was not a member of the IFoA.

On 17 January 2025, the Respondent was convicted of sexual assault, contrary to section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, by the Central London Magistrates Court. The Respondent was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 12 months, suspended for a period of 24 Months. A Sexual Harm Prevention Order was also imposed on the Respondent for a period of five years, and he was given a Financial Penalty of £1,000.

The Respondent self-reported the conviction on 24 October 2025. He noted on the form that:

***“I have not worked since January 2022 and was not aware of the requirement to report to the IFoA. I only found out today and reported immediately. I’m sorry about the delay.”***

The IFoA began an investigation and the Respondent has engaged with it. He commented, in an email of 31 October 2025:

***“I just wanted to add that I was suffering from significant depression and isolation at that point (December 2023), mainly due to being out of work for a long period of time (since January 2022). This affected my judgement and therefore contributed to the incident. I fully regret what happened and I’m deeply sorry.”***

In his response to the Case Report, the Respondent admitted all of the allegations against him, although he also commented:

***“I do wish to add that in relation to points regarding Compliance, Integrity and Misconduct the degree to which this particular incident relates to the points mentioned may potentially be limited. I was not acting in professional or actuarial capacity and at least some aspects of the points mentioned may not be as applicable or relevant. As commented before, I fully regret the incident, but I do hope this can also be considered.”***

## **Decision and Reasons on the Allegations:**

### **Allegation 1**

The Panel was satisfied that the court documents submitted to the IFoA by the Respondent, together with his admission, provided sufficient evidence for finding this allegation proved. The Panel was aware that Rule 6.1 of the Disciplinary Scheme provides that:

***“Where a Respondent:  
...(b) has been convicted of a criminal offence before a court of competent jurisdiction; ...the findings of fact made in those proceedings shall be conclusive proof of those facts, under this Scheme.”***

The allegation against the Respondent is in the same terms as the conviction. The Panel therefore proceeded on the basis that the underlying conduct is established.

#### Allegation 2

Similarly, the Panel was satisfied that the court documents, together with the Respondent’s admission, provide sufficient evidence for this allegation to be found proven, applying Rule 6.1 , as above.

#### Allegation 3

The Compliance Principle of the Code is that “Members must comply with all relevant legal, regulatory and professional requirements”. The Code also makes clear that it applies to Members’ conduct beyond their actuarial role if that conduct could reasonably be considered to reflect upon the profession. The Code’s requirement that Members disclose any criminal conviction to the IFoA as soon as is reasonably possible is predicated on the fact that a criminal conviction may impact on the reputation of the profession. The Panel was satisfied that conduct of the sort set out in the court papers, which had resulted in a suspended sentence of imprisonment, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a financial penalty, could indeed be found to be breach of a “relevant legal requirement” for the purposes of the Compliance Principle. It was accordingly satisfied that there was sufficient evidence for this allegation to proceed on a prima facie basis.

#### Allegation 4

At the relevant time the Actuaries Code defined the Integrity principle in this way:

“1. Members must act honestly and with integrity.

1.1 Members must show respect for others in the way they conduct themselves...”

The Panel was satisfied that the conduct in this case is manifestly capable of being found to be lacking in respect for others. It was accordingly satisfied that there was sufficient evidence for this allegation to be found proven.

#### **Decision and Reasons on Misconduct:**

The Panel then considered whether there was a *prima facie* case that the Respondent's actions amounted to Misconduct.

For the purposes of the Disciplinary Scheme, Misconduct is defined as any act or omission or series of acts or omissions by a Member, in their professional or non-professional life, which falls significantly short of the standards of behaviour, integrity, competence or professional judgment which other Members or the public might reasonably expect of a Member (see Rule 2.1).

The Panel determined that there was a *prima facie* case that the Respondent's actions constituted Misconduct under the Disciplinary Scheme. A sexual assault resulting in a criminal conviction and a suspended sentence of imprisonment is clearly capable of being found to fall well below the expected standard of behaviour.

#### **Decision and Reasons on Sanction:**

After having determined that a *prima facie* case of Misconduct was established, the Panel was provided with further information submitted by the Respondent about his financial circumstances. The Respondent said that he had not worked since January 2022 and was now in the process of applying for Universal Credit. He said that he had no current income. The Respondent had some equity in a property that was mortgaged and also had some shares in China, which he said he was unable to access. The Panel took that information into account but also recognised that the Respondent had provided limited supporting detail as to the precise value or accessibility of those assets.

In reaching its decision, the Panel had regard to the Sanctions Guidance (1 August 2023). The Panel reminded itself that it is not bound by that Guidance, but that it provides a useful

framework to assist in ensuring consistency and proportionality in decision-making. The Panel therefore took into account the factors identified in the Guidance, including the seriousness of the conduct, the impact on the reputation of the profession, the level of insight demonstrated by the Respondent, and any personal mitigation.

The Panel was aware that the purpose of sanction is not to be punitive although it may have that effect. Rather, the main objective of any sanction is to protect members of the public, to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and competence. The Panel is mindful that it should impose a sanction, or combination of sanctions, necessary to achieve those objectives and in so doing it must balance the public interest with the Respondent's own interests.

In assessing seriousness, the Panel considered that the misconduct in this case is at the higher end of the spectrum. It involves a criminal conviction for a sexual offence, which is conduct that engages fundamental standards of personal integrity and respect for others. The Panel considered that such conduct is inherently capable of causing serious harm, both to the individual affected and to public confidence in the profession.

In considering aggravating features, the Panel took into account that the misconduct resulted in a criminal conviction and the imposition of a suspended sentence of imprisonment, together with a Sexual Harm Prevention Order. The Panel considered that this reflects the seriousness with which the criminal court viewed the conduct. The Panel also considered that the conduct demonstrated a clear departure from the standards of integrity expected of members of the profession. The Panel further noted that the Respondent's insight appeared to be limited. While he has expressed regret, his submissions sought to suggest that the incident had only limited relevance to his professional standing. The Panel considered that this indicated a failure fully to appreciate the impact of the conduct on the reputation of the profession. The Panel also noted that the Respondent did not report the matter to the IFoA promptly, which it considered to be a further indication of limited insight.

As to mitigation, the Panel noted that the Respondent has no previous disciplinary history and that he has cooperated with the investigation. The Panel also took account of his personal circumstances, including his unemployment and financial position. However, the Panel considered that these matters, while relevant, do not significantly reduce the seriousness of the conduct. The Panel regarded cooperation with the process as expected,

rather than exceptional. It did not identify any positive mitigation of sufficient weight to materially affect the outcome.

The Panel considered whether this was a case that warranted no sanction. Having regard to the seriousness of the misconduct and the need to maintain public confidence in the profession, the Panel was satisfied that a sanction is required.

The Panel considered whether to impose a reprimand but was satisfied that this would not be a sufficient or proportionate sanction given the gravity of the offence.

The Panel considered whether to impose a fine and similarly concluded that this would not be a sufficient or proportionate sanction. It considered that, even leaving aside the Respondent's means, a fine would not sufficiently reflect the gravity of the misconduct or address the wider public interest concerns arising from it.

The option of a period of education, training and/or supervised practice was not available to the Panel as the Respondent is not currently a member. It would, in any event, be capable of addressing the issues raised by the Misconduct in this case, which concerns fundamental issues of personal conduct rather than a lack of professional competence or knowledge.

As the Respondent is no longer a member, the Panel considered whether to impose a period of exclusion from membership of the IFoA up to a maximum period of five years. It was satisfied that this could appropriately mark the seriousness of the Misconduct.

In considering the duration of exclusion, the Panel noted that the Respondent would remain subject to his suspended sentence of imprisonment for a further 10 months and to the Sexual Harm Prevention Order for another 3 years and 10 months. The Panel considered that these orders are directly relevant to the assessment of risk and to the Respondent's suitability to be readmitted to the profession.

The Panel took the view that it would not be appropriate for the Respondent to be in a position to seek readmission to membership while he remains subject to those restrictions. The Panel considered that the profession and the public would expect that any application for readmission should only be entertained once those orders have expired, and once the Respondent is able to demonstrate a period of compliance and stability.

The Panel also took into account that the Respondent is at an early stage in his career and has no previous disciplinary findings. It balanced that against the seriousness of the misconduct, which involves a criminal conviction for a sexual offence and conduct which fundamentally undermines the standards of integrity and respect expected of members.

Drawing these factors together, the Panel concluded that a period of exclusion of four years is proportionate. It reflects the seriousness of the misconduct, is broadly consistent with the duration of the ongoing criminal sanctions and ensures that the Respondent cannot seek readmission until a sufficient period has passed.

### **Publication:**

Having taken account of the Publication Guidance (1 August 2023), the Panel determined that, if the Respondent accepts the findings of the Panel, this determination will be published and remain on the IFoA's website for a period of four years from the date of publication.

There had been no submissions on publication, and the Panel saw no reason to depart from the normal approach of matching the period of publication to the duration of exclusion from membership. A brief summary of the determination will also be published in the next available edition of *The Actuary Magazine*.

### **Costs**

In accordance with Rule 13.7 the Adjudication Panel may make an order for costs against the IFoA or the Respondent. Rule 4.9 provides that the amount of any costs order is fixed at £1500. The Panel took account of the Costs Guidance (1 August 2023) and determined that it was appropriate to make the fixed costs award of £1,500 against the Respondent, to be paid in full within 28 calendar days of acceptance by the Respondent of the Panel's determination. The Panel noted the Respondent's submissions about his current financial circumstances but was not persuaded that this award would impose an unfairly heavy burden on him.

The Panel noted the Respondent's financial circumstances as presented. If the Respondent considers that he is unable to pay the costs within the specified period, he may make an

application to the Judicial Committees Secretary to pay by instalments. Any such request should be supported by further information about his financial position, including details of income, expenditure and assets, to enable proper consideration of that request.

That concludes this determination.

**Date of Publication: 13 April 2026**