

**CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.
WASHINGTON D.C.**

In the Matter of

Stuart E. Wells,

Respondent.

Case No. 2023-65064

June 12, 2026

INTERIM SUSPENSION ORDER

Counsel to the Disciplinary and Ethics Commission (“DEC Counsel”) of Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards, Inc. (“CFP Board”) issues this order imposing an automatic interim suspension of Respondent’s CFP® certification and right to use the CFP Board certification marks under Article 2.1.b of CFP Board’s *Procedural Rules*.¹

I. BACKGROUND

On May 27, 2026, Enforcement Counsel filed a Notice of Grounds for Automatic Interim Suspension Order under Article 2.1.b.2 of CFP Board’s *Procedural Rules*, requesting that Respondent’s CFP® certification and Trademark License be suspended pending further CFP Board disciplinary proceedings involving Respondent.²

As grounds for an automatic interim suspension, the Notice asserts that civil contempt and sanctions orders entered against Respondent in two lawsuits pending in Kansas state court are “Civil Findings” (as defined by Article 7.3) that Respondent engaged in misrepresentation and dishonest conduct. (Notice at 6-8, citing Exhibit B at 222-230, 245-251, 264-279, 302-322.)

Although not contemplated by Article 2.1.b, DEC Counsel allowed Respondent the opportunity to file a response to the Notice, which Respondent submitted on May 28, 2026 (“Response”).

a. Notice

The Notice describes and attaches decisions by two Kansas state courts in which Respondent was named as a defendant. Regarding the first, on March 14, 2025, the District Court of Geary County, Kansas issued an order holding Respondent in civil contempt based, in part, on a finding that Respondent “had not testified truthfully” before the court on a topic squarely at issue during a temporary injunction

¹ CFP Board publishes this order in accordance with Articles 2.2 and 17.7 of the *Procedural Rules*. The Notice and any exhibits will not be published.

² Under Article 2.1.b.2 of the *Procedural Rules*, DEC Counsel may deliver an interim suspension order if Respondent is the subject of a Civil Finding, as defined in Article 7.3, that Respondent engaged in fraud, theft, misrepresentation, or other dishonest conduct.

In the Matter of Stewart E. Wells
CFP Board Case No. 2023-65064
June 12, 2026

hearing. According to the contempt order, Respondent testified that “he did not prepare, type, provide language for, or mail” a letter a client sent to her bank, the plaintiff in the litigation, and that “all activities concerning preparation and transmittal of the letters were performed by” the client. (Notice, Exhibit B at 224.) The contempt order states that this testimony was not true, citing contradictory testimony by the client that Respondent “was the one who prepared and typed the letter, brought it to her home for signature on two occasions, and then mailed the signed letter to [the bank].” (*Id.*) The client noted that “it was [Respondent’s] idea to write the letter, which sought to remove her account from [the bank], and that [Respondent] had written the entire letter.” (*Id.*)

On September 5, 2025, the court issued a contempt judgment imposing sanctions on Respondent for his contempt violations and reiterated its finding that Respondent had provided “false testimony” at a hearing. (Notice, Exhibit B at 245.)

In the Notice, Enforcement Counsel asserts that the September 5, 2025 judgment satisfies both elements of a Civil Finding warranting an automatic interim suspension.³ (Notice at 8.) Enforcement Counsel asserts that (1) the District Court of Geary County is a court of civil jurisdiction, and the order is a formal court record; and (2) the order contains a finding—Respondent testified falsely before the court—that Respondent engaged in conduct involving misrepresentation or dishonest conduct. (*Id.*)

The second set of decisions cited in the Notice concern litigation filed against Respondent in the District Court of Saline County, Kansas. (Notice at 9-10.) On June 16, 2025, the Saline County court issued a contempt order finding that Respondent “willfully failed to participate meaningfully in discovery,” “prevent[ed] disclosure of relevant information,” “evaded disclosure of relevant information and production of documents,” and filed a pleading using “fake legal citations” to support legal arguments. (Notice, Exhibit B at 275, 276, 278.)

On December 24, 2025, the court issued a terminating sanctions order finding that Respondent “acted in deliberate disregard of reasonable and necessary Court orders,” “willfully failed to participate meaningfully in discovery,” “evaded disclosure of relevant information and production of documents,” and filed a second pleading containing “fictitious legal citations.” (Notice, Exhibit B at 316-318.)

Enforcement Counsel argues these orders also constitute Civil Findings warranting an automatic interim suspension. (Notice at 10-11.) Enforcement Counsel asserts that (1) the District Court of Saline County is a court of civil jurisdiction and each order is a formal court record; and (2) each order contains a

³ Article 7.3 of the *Procedural Rules* provides that a record from any court of civil jurisdiction containing a Finding (as defined in CFP Board’s *Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct*) against Respondent in that court that Respondent violated a law, rule or regulation governing Professional Services, or engaged in conduct involving fraud, theft, misrepresentation, or other dishonest conduct (“Civil Finding”) is conclusive proof of the existence of such Finding and that Respondent engaged in the conduct that led to the Finding.

In the Matter of Stewart E. Wells
CFP Board Case No. 2023-65064
June 12, 2026

finding that Respondent engaged in dishonest conduct, including willful evasion of discovery, deliberate disregard of court orders, and submission of fictitious legal citations. (*Id.* at 10.)

Enforcement Counsel also notes that under Article 7.4 of the *Procedural Rules*, a Civil Finding that is appealable or subject to further review may still serve as the basis for an Interim Suspension Order, and therefore the contempt and sanctions orders at issue here are sufficient to justify the automatic interim suspension of Respondent, regardless of whether further proceedings remain pending in the underlying litigation. (*Id.* at 10-11.)

b. Response

In the Response, Respondent does not meaningfully refute that the orders issued in the Kansas state court proceedings constitute Civil Findings under Article 7.3, asserting only that the orders arise from ongoing, interlocutory, and actively contested discovery and sanctions disputes that do not constitute clear adjudications of fraud or dishonest conduct. (Response at 4-5.) Respondent also does not engage with or attempt to distinguish Article 7.4. Instead, Respondent argues that issuing an Interim Suspension Order now is unnecessary because there is no immediate public-protection concern given that an underlying regulatory inquiry began in 2023 and he is not presently engaged in ongoing retail financial advisory activity. (Response at 6-8.) Respondent urges DEC Counsel to use its discretion to decline to issue an Interim Suspension Order under Article 2.1.b.2. (Response at 3-4.)

II. DISCUSSION

Under Article 2.1.b.2 of the *Procedural Rules*, DEC Counsel may issue an Interim Suspension Order if Respondent is the subject of a Civil Finding, as defined in Article 7.3, that Respondent engaged in fraud, theft, misrepresentation, or other dishonest conduct.

Each of the orders at issue here constitutes a Civil Finding that warrants a suspension. Both Kansas state courts are courts of civil jurisdiction, the orders are records from those courts, and each contains a finding against Respondent that he engaged in misrepresentation or other dishonest conduct. As to the Geary County proceeding, the court's finding that Respondent provided "false testimony" is a finding that Respondent engaged in misrepresentation or other dishonest conduct. Likewise, the Saline County court's finding that Respondent provided "fake" or "fictitious" legal citations to the court is a finding that Respondent engaged in dishonest conduct.

DEC Counsel is not persuaded by Respondent's arguments. Article 7.4 of the *Procedural Rules* expressly provides that a Civil Finding that is (or at some point may be) under appeal may be the basis for an Interim Suspension Order. The fact that Respondent disputes the orders' findings does not preclude DEC Counsel from acting on qualifying Civil Findings that have been entered by courts of civil jurisdiction. Respondent's argument that no immediate public-protection concern exists is equally unavailing. Article

In the Matter of Stewart E. Wells
CFP Board Case No. 2023-65064
June 12, 2026

2.1.b.2 does not require a showing of urgency or imminent public harm as a prerequisite for issuing an Automatic Interim Suspension Order. The existence of a qualifying Civil Finding is sufficient.

These Civil Findings independently and collectively satisfy the grounds for an Automatic Interim Suspension Order under Article 2.1.b.2.

III. DECISION

For the above reasons, Respondent's CFP® certification and right to use the CFP® marks are suspended pending the outcome of further CFP Board proceedings. Respondent's interim suspension does not preclude CFP Board from imposing a final sanction.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel to the Disciplinary and Ethics Commission
June 12, 2026