

研訊結果

Result

監管局紀律委員會認為該營業員沒有遵守監管局發出的執業通告（編號13-05(CR)），在沒有取得租客的同意下，在社交平台上披露租客的個人資料。因此，該營業員違反了監管局發出的《操守守則》第3.2.1段：「地產代理和營業員應熟悉並必須在執業時遵守《地產代理條例》、其附屬法例、本操守守則，以及由監管局不時發布的所有其他指引。」

考慮到個案的性質及該營業員的違規紀錄，委員會決定譴責他，罰款共12,000港元，暫時吊銷其牌照一個月，並要求他在12個月內取得持續進修計劃下的12個學分。

The EAA Disciplinary Committee was of the view that the salesperson failed to comply with the Practice Circular (No. 13-05(CR)) issued by the EAA, disclosing the personal data of the tenant on social media without obtaining her consent. Hence, the salesperson was in breach of paragraph 3.2.1 of the *Code of Ethics*, which states that, "Estate agents and salespersons should be fully conversant with the EAO, its subsidiary legislation, this Code of Ethics, and other guidelines issued by the EAA from time to time and shall observe and comply with them in the course of their practice."

Having considered the nature and gravity of the case, as well as the disciplinary record of the salesperson, the disciplinary committee decided to reprimand him, impose a fine of HK\$12,000, suspend his licence for one month and required him to obtain 12 points under the CPD Scheme in 12 months.



廖志明先生
香港新界地產代理商聯會永遠榮譽主席
Mr Liu Chi-ming
Life-long President
H.K.N.T. Estate Agents & Merchants
Association

- 業界意見 **Comment from trade**

地產代理應該尊重客戶的私隱，在處理客戶個人資料時要小心，不可利用客戶的個人資料作其他用途，更不應在網上發布客戶的個人資料。損害客戶的私隱是非常嚴重的違規行為，業界應引以為戒。即使租客與業主發生租務糾紛，身為代理亦不應用違法的手段代表業主追討租金

Estate agents must respect clients' privacy and exercise care when handling clients' personal data. They must not use their clients' personal data for other purposes or post their clients' personal data online. Infringing upon client's privacy is a serious non-compliance and every practitioner should be vigilant against such behaviour. Even in the case of a tenancy dispute between the tenant and landlord, estate agents must not use any illegal means to recover the rent for the landlord.

紀律研訊個案 **Disciplinary hearing case**

發布虛假或具誤導性的網上物業廣告 Issuing a false or misleading online advertisement

引言

Introduction

地產代理公司切勿發布含有虛假或誤導性陳述或詳情的物業廣告，亦不得在未獲准許便擅自使用屬於其他人士或公司的相片作廣告宣傳。否則，有可能被監管局紀律處分。

Estate agency companies must not include any false or misleading statements or particulars in property advertisements and must not use photos belonging to other people or company without permission. Otherwise, they may be subject to disciplinary action by the EAA.

事件經過

監管局接獲地產代理公司A的投訴，稱在未獲得其許可的情況下，被地產代理公司B擅自取用了其物業廣告的相片。監管局調查發現，B公司未能提供相關的「出售香港住宅物業用的地產代理協議」（表格三）及相關廣告所載物業的詳細地址。B公司在發布有關物業廣告前未獲得物業擁有人的委託及書面同意。此外，物業廣告上的相片亦證實屬於A公司，B公司於未得到A公司同意下便刊登了有關相片。

Incident

The EAA received a complaint from estate agency company A that the photos of one of its residential property advertisements were misappropriated by estate agency company B. During the EAA's investigation, company B failed to provide the Estate Agency Agreement for Sale of Residential Properties in Hong Kong (Form 3) and the detailed address of the advertised property. Company B did not obtain the instruction and written consent from the vendor before issuing the advertisement. Additionally, it was proved that the photos in the advertisement belonged to company A and were published without the consent of company A.

研訊結果

地產代理公司B擅自取用了未獲准使用的相片發布物業廣告，此行為可能被視為盜取其他地產代理公司的知識產權。因此，監管局紀律委員會認為B公司違反了監管局發出的《操守守則》第3.7.2段：「地產代理和營業員應避免做出可能令地產代理行業信譽及/或名聲受損的行為。」

此外，該物業廣告令人認為地產代理公司B已獲得該物業擁有人的委託代為出售物業，惟事實並非如此。因此，B公司發布了一則載有虛假或具誤導性的陳述或詳情的廣告，違反了《地產代理常規（一般責任及香港住宅物業）規例》第9(1)條。

考慮到個案的性質及該營業員的違規紀錄，委員會決定譴責B公司，並罰款合共94,000港元。

Result

Estate agency company B had issued an advertisement using photos that it had no permission to use, which could be considered as an infringement of intellectual property rights of another estate agency company. Hence, the EAA Disciplinary Committee was of the view that company B was in breach of paragraph 3.7.2 of the *Code of Ethics*, which states that, "Estate agents and salespersons should avoid any practice which may bring discredit and/or disrepute to the estate agency trade."

In addition, the concerned advertisement could also mislead consumers into believing company B was appointed by the vendor to list the property for sale, which was not true. Hence, company B issued an advertisement which included a statement or particular that was false or misleading in a material particular and thus was in breach of section 9(1) of the Estate Agents Practice (General Duties and Hong Kong Residential Properties) Regulation.

Having considered the nature and gravity of the case, as well as the disciplinary record of company B, the disciplinary committee decided to reprimand the company and impose a fine of HK\$94,000 in total.



黃健基先生
香港地產代理商總會秘書長
Mr Andy Wong
Chief Secretary of Hong Kong Real Estate
Agencies General Association

● 業界意見 Comment from trade

地產代理公司在未經同意下使用其他公司的相片發布物業廣告，不但影響同業，亦令地產代理的專業形象受損。此外，該公司事實上沒有受到物業擁有人的委託，而是利用他人的相片發布虛假廣告，此舉會令公眾對地產代理失去信心，令行業信譽受損。

Using photos from another estate agents company to issue property advertisements without permission not only harms the other company but also tarnishes the professional image of the estate agency industry. Besides, the company was not even appointed by the property owner but issued a false advertisement by using photos belonging to another company. This act can lead to a loss of public trust and bring discredit to the trade.