

The Decision and Reasons of the Regulatory Assessor for the Case of Mr Mohammed Iqbal Gill FCCA and Gill and Company referred to her by ACCA on 3 June 2026.

Introduction

1. Gill & Company is the unincorporated sole practice of ACCA member, Mr Mohammed Iqbal Gill FCCA.

Basis and Reasons for the Decision

2. I have considered the Report, including ACCA's recommendation, together with related correspondence concerning Mr Gill's conduct of audit work, including correspondence prepared and submitted by the firm since the monitoring visit.
3. In reaching my decision, I have made the following findings of fact:
 - a. The firm and its audit principal have had three audit monitoring reviews, two of the three reviews had unsatisfactory outcomes.
 - b. The firm's first monitoring review was on 6 July 2011, where the Compliance Officer found that the standard of the audit work on the files inspected was satisfactory.
 - c. At the second review on 16 June 2017 and 24 August 2017, the Compliance Officer informed the firm of serious deficiencies in audit work which had resulted in the audit opinions not being adequately supported by the work performed and recorded. Mr Gill provided an action plan following the second review.
 - d. At the third review which was carried out remotely on 17 and 18 July 2025, the Compliance Officer found that the firm had made little effective improvement to its procedures and the firm has failed to achieve a satisfactory outcome, in spite of the advice and warning given at the previous review.

- e. There are serious concerns about Mr Gill's ability and willingness to achieve and maintain a satisfactory standard of audit work despite the advice and warnings given at the previous reviews.
- f. Following the third review, the principal confirmed that the firm has not renewed its audit certificate, and Mr Gill has not renewed his Responsible Individual (RI) status.

The Decision

- 4. ACCA recommends that the Assessor imposes conditions on any future re-application for RI status by Mr Gill, or by any firm in which he is a principal indicating that Guideline Decision B8 would appear appropriate. However, while I agree with ACCA's recommendation that conditions on future re-application be imposed, I consider Guideline Decision B4 to be the appropriate decision for the Regulatory Assessor.
- 5. I note that Mr Gill has relinquished his practising certificate with audit qualification and his firm's auditing certificate.
- 6. On the basis of the above I have decided pursuant to Authorisation Regulations 7(2)(f), 7(3)(b) and 7(4) that any future re-application for audit registration by Mr Gill, or by a firm in which he is a principal, must be referred to the Admissions and Licensing Committee, which will not consider the application until he has provided an action plan, including appropriate audit related CPD, which ACCA regards as satisfactory, setting out how Mr Gill intends to prevent a recurrence of the previous deficiencies and, following the date of this decision, passed the advanced audit and assurance paper of ACCA's professional qualification.

Publicity

- 7. Authorisation Regulation 7(6) indicates that all conditions relating to the certificates of Mr Gill and his firm made under Regulation 7(2) may be published as soon as practicable, subject to any directions given by me.
- 8. I have considered the submissions, if any, made by Mr Gill regarding publicity of any decision I may make pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(2). I do not find that there

are exceptional circumstances in this case that would justify non-publication of my decision to impose conditions and/or the omission of the names of Mr Gill and his firm from that publicity.

9. I therefore direct pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(6)(a), that a news release be issued to ACCA's website referring to Mr Gill and his firm by name.

Fiona MacNamara
Regulatory Assessor
08 June 2026