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

In the Matter of Brent E. Ditto, Respondent.	CFP Board Case No. 2023-65176 May 5, 2026

ORDER

On February 24, 2026, Enforcement Counsel for Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards, Inc. ("CFP Board") filed a motion under Article 4.2 of CFP Board's *Procedural Rules* ("Motion") requesting that counsel for CFP Board's Disciplinary and Ethics Commission ("DEC Counsel") issue an Administrative Order that permanently revokes Respondent's CFP Board Certification and Trademark License.[1] No hearing on the Motion was requested (*see* Motion at 1) and Respondent did not file a response to the Motion.

For the reasons stated below, the Motion is **GRANTED**.

I. BACKGROUND

Respondent became a CFP® professional on November 3, 2008, and remained certified until February 28, 2026, when his certification expired. (Motion, Ex. 1 at 1; *see also* Exhibit-A[2].)

A. Complaint

The Motion cites an October 7, 2025 Complaint CFP Board filed with the Disciplinary and Ethics Commission alleging that Respondent has violated its *Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct* ("*Code and Standards*"). (*Id.* at 29–34.)

The Complaint alleges that Respondent entered an August 8, 2025 Acceptance, Waiver and Consent ("AWC") with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority ("FINRA") agreeing to a four-month suspension from associating with any FINRA member in all capacities, a $5,000 fine, and disgorgement of $402.58 plus interest. In the AWC, Respondent consented to findings that he willfully violated Rule 15l-1(a)(1) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Regulation Best Interest ("Reg BI"—specifically the Reg BI Care Obligation), and violated FINRA Rule 2010, when he recommended an unsuitable, support-class Ginnie Mae mortgage-backed bond to a 95-year-old customer. Respondent recommended the bond, according to the AWC, even though

[1] Enforcement Counsel certified in its Motion that it had met and conferred with Respondent by email on January 22, 2026, in a good faith effort to resolve or narrow the issues but they were unable, asserting that "Respondent determined to default with a clear understanding of the results of his decision." (Motion at 1, 2; Motion, Ex. 1 at 37–38.)

[2] Although Enforcement Counsel's motion sought a Revocation, CFP Board's records indicate Respondent's certification expired on February 28, 2026, four days after filing the motion, so a Permanent Bar is the more appropriate sanction to consider. (*See* Exhibit-A.)

the customer's new account form stated that his investment objective was "income with capital appreciation" (the most conservative investment objective); the customer's daughter, with power of attorney, had instructed that the investment carry no risk to principal—which could not be tied up for any longer than one year because she needed the funds for her father's living expenses—and the customer incurred approximately $19,000 in losses from his investments. (*Id.* at 20–25, 29–34.)

Based on these allegations, the Complaint asserts that Respondent violated **Standard A.8.a** of the *Code and Standards* (requiring a CFP® professional to comply with the laws, rules, and regulations governing Professional Services[3]) and his fiduciary duty under **Standard A.1** (requiring a CFP® professional to act in the best interests of the Client at all times when providing Financial Advice to a Client[4])—specifically, his Duty of Care under **Standard A.1.b** (requiring a CFP® professional to act with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence that a prudent professional would exercise in light of the Client's goals, risk tolerance, objectives, and financial and personal circumstances). (*Id.* at 32–33.)

Under Article 3.2 of the *Procedural Rules*, Respondent was required to file an answer to the Complaint no later than November 6, 2025. (*See id.* at 28, 36.) On January 22, 2026, Enforcement Counsel emailed Respondent about not receiving an answer, the consequences for not filing one, and resolving the issue before filing its Motion. (*Id.* at 37.) That day, Respondent replied, "Sounds fine" and "satisfied going in a different direction." (*Id.* at 38.)

DEC Counsel has no record of Respondent filing an answer. (*See id.*; *see also* Motion at 2.)

B. Motion

Enforcement Counsel states in its Motion that Respondent is in default under Articles 4.1.e of the *Procedural Rules* because he failed to file an answer in accordance with Article 3.2. (Motion at 1, 2.)

Enforcement Counsel states that it has determined that the seriousness, scope, and harmfulness of Respondent's conduct alleged in the Complaint warrants an Administrative Order imposing a Revocation (Permanent Bar) against Respondent. (*Id.* at 1, 3.)

---

[3] "Professional Services" is defined in the *Code and Standards* Glossary as "Financial Advice and related activities and services that are offered or provided, including, but not limited to, Financial Planning, legal, accounting, or business planning services." CFP Bd. of Standards, Inc., *Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct* Glossary (2020).

[4] "Financial Advice" is defined in the *Code and Standards* Glossary in relevant part as "A communication that, based on its content, context, and presentation, would reasonably be viewed as a recommendation that the Client take or refrain from taking a particular course of action with respect to [t]he value of or the advisability of investing in, purchasing, holding, gifting, or selling Financial Assets; [or, i]nvestment policies or strategies, portfolio composition, the management of Financial Assets, or other financial matter...."

"Financial Asset" is defined in the *Code and Standards* Glossary as including securities. "Client" is defined in the *Code and Standards* Glossary as "Any person, including a natural person, business organization, or legal entity, to whom the CFP® professional provides or agrees to provide Professional Services pursuant to an Engagement." *Supra* note 2.

IN RE BRENT E. DITTO
CFP Board Case No. 2023-65176
May 5, 2026

II. DISCUSSION

If Respondent fails to file an answer to a complaint in accordance with Article 3.2 of the *Procedural Rules*, then Respondent is in default under Article 4.1.e. Enforcement Counsel's Motion states with reasonable particularity the grounds for Respondent's default, as required by Article 4.2.

Enforcement Counsel filed the Motion based on its determination of the seriousness, scope, and harmfulness of Respondent's conduct, as required under Article 4.2 of the *Procedural Rules*.

III. CONCLUSION

DEC Counsel **GRANTS** the Motion and issues this **Administrative Order of Permanent Bar** against Respondent ("Order"). This Order terminates Respondent's CFP Board Certification and Trademark License and permanently prohibits Respondent from applying for or obtaining CFP® certification.[5]

SO ORDERED

Counsel to the Disciplinary and Ethics Commission
Date: May 5, 2026

[5] The Motion and its exhibits and any other exhibits to this Order will not be published under Article 17.7 of the *Procedural Rules*. The *Procedural Rules* are available on CFP Board's website at: www.cfp.net/ethics/enforcement/procedural-rules.