

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	:	
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND	:	
SECURITIES, COMPLIANCE OFFICE	:	Docket No.: 250008 (BNK-ORD)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
DANIEL BOYLE	:	
	:	

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

You are hereby notified that you have the right to appeal the attached Final Report and Order ("Order") issued by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Banking and Securities Commission.

If you wish to appeal the attached Order you may file a petition for review with the Prothonotary of the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania that complies with the format and timing requirements of the applicable Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure. Pa. R.A.P. 1511-1561. Failure to file a petition for review within 30 days of the mailing date of this Order will result in the attached Order becoming final and unappealable. You may reach the Commonwealth Court at 717-255-1650.

Please be advised that this Notice of Right to Appeal is not intended to and does not constitute legal advice. You may consult an attorney regarding your legal rights including your right to appeal the attached Order or your right to file an application for rehearing or reconsideration under the General Rules of Administrative Practice and Procedure. 1 Pa. Code § 35.241.

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES**

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND
SECURITIES, COMPLIANCE OFFICE**

v.

DANIEL BOYLE

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No.: 250008 (BNK-ORD)

FINAL ORDER

AND NOW, the Pennsylvania Banking and Securities Commission (“Commission”) pursuant to the final adjudication authority granted to the Commission under section 1122-A of the Department of Banking and Securities Code, 71 P.S. § 733-122-A, the Commission issues this Final Order, adopting the Hearing Officer’s proposed report.

The Commission reviewed the proposed report and proposed order of Hearing Officer Thomas Blackburn, which are attached. Pursuant to 1 Pa. Code § 35.207, the Commission served these documents on the parties by letter dated July 2, 2026, giving the parties 30 days to appeal the findings and recommendations by submitting exceptions to the Commission. No party filed exceptions. Accordingly, the Commission may proceed to issue a Final Order in the matter pursuant to the final adjudication authority granted it under Section 1122-A of the Department of Banking and Securities Code, 71 P.S. § 733-1122-A.

The Department of Banking and Securities, Bureau of Securities, Compliance and Examination (“Bureau”) made certain allegations in an Order to Show Cause (“OSC”) that it served on Daniel Boyle (“Respondent”) on March 13, 2025. Respondent filed an Answer on April 2, 2025. A Hearing Officer was assigned, parties filed stipulations of facts and prehearing

conferences were held. The parties filed a Joint Motion for Adjudication Without a Hearing on June 22, 2026, which the hearing officer granted.

With this Final Order, the Commission adopts the hearing officer's proposed report as written. The Commission **ORDERS** that Respondent Daniel Boyle shall pay a **FINE** of \$213,000.00 and shall cease and desist from engaging in the business of mortgage lending unless and until licensed by the Department under the Mortgage Licensing Act to do so.

Payment of the fine shall be by certified check, attorney's check, cashier's check or U.S. Postal Service money order, made payable to the "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," and shall be delivered within 30 days of the effective date of the Commission's Final Order in this matter, to:

Respondent shall pay the fine by mailing to the following official a certified check, attorney's check, or U.S. Postal Service money order, made payable to the "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Order:

Pennsylvania Department of Banking and Securities
Office of Chief Counsel
17 N. Second Street
Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101

This Final Order shall be effective 30 days after the Commission mails it.



BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Redacted

James R. Biery
Chair
Pennsylvania Banking and Securities Commission

So ORDERED this 24th day of September, 2026

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES**

**Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Department of Banking and Securities,
Compliance Office,
Petitioner**

v.

**Daniel Boyle,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. 250008 (BNK-ORD)

PROPOSED REPORT

**Thomas A. Blackburn
Hearing Examiner**

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINERS
P.O. Box 60130
Harrisburg, PA 17106-0130**

HISTORY

This matter arose on March 11, 2025, when the Department of Banking and Securities, Compliance Office (“Office”) filed an Order to Show Cause charging Daniel Boyle (“Respondent”) under the Pennsylvania Mortgage Licensing Act¹ (“MLA”). The OSC charged that Respondent is subject to imposition of a civil penalty under section 6140(a) of the MLA because he engaged in the business of mortgage lending in this Commonwealth without a license from the Department to do so. On April 2, 2025, Respondent filed an answer to the order to show cause (“Answer”) requesting that the order to show cause be dismissed. By letter dated December 10, 2025, Secretary of Banking and Securities Wendy Spicher (“Secretary”) designated the undersigned hearing examiner as presiding officer in this matter and directed him to conduct proceedings and file a proposed report for review by the Banking and Securities Commission.

By order dated January 9, 2026, the presiding officer scheduled a prehearing conference for February 26, 2026, and directed the parties to file prehearing statements. With agreement of the parties, a second conference was scheduled for April 8, 2026. At this conference, the parties agreed that the matter could be adjudicated upon stipulated facts to be filed by the parties. On April 8, 2026, the parties filed a stipulation of facts (“Stip.”), and on April 27, 2026, Respondent submitted an affidavit (“Aff.”). On June 22, 2026, the parties requested that the presiding officer adjudicate this matter based upon the stipulated facts and affidavit and waived filing of briefs.

This proposed adjudication and order is now issued in accordance with the Secretary’s letter of December 10, 2025.

¹ 7 Pa.C.S. §§ 6101-6154.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Department is the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's administrative agency authorized and empowered to administer and enforce the MLA. (OSC and Answer ¶ 1)

2. The Office is primarily responsible for administering and enforcing the MLA for the Department. (OSC and Answer ¶ 2)

3. The Office operates from the Department's main office located at 17 North Second Street, Suite 1300, Harrisburg, PA 17101. (OSC and Answer ¶ 3)

4. Respondent has addresses at Redacted . (OSC and Answer ¶ 4, Stip. ¶ 1)

5. On January 3, 2024, the Department received information that Respondent may have engaged in the mortgage loan business in Pennsylvania. (Stip. ¶ 2)

6. The Department's records reflect that Respondent is not and never has been licensed with the Department pursuant to the MLA as a mortgage broker, mortgage lender, mortgage services, nor mortgage originator. (Stip. ¶ 3, exhibit DoBS-H)

7. Staff of the Department ("Staff") conducted a search of Dauphin County, Pennsylvania property records, which revealed that, from in or about March 2009 until December 2023, Respondent served as the lender in at least 213 residential mortgages recorded in Dauphin County, ranging in the amount of \$10,478 to \$84,500. (Stip. ¶ 4, exhibits DoBS-A and DoBS-B)

8. On January 17, 2024, Staff contacted Respondent via telephone. (Stip. ¶ 5)

9. During the telephone call, Respondent confirmed to Staff that he made loans to individuals in Pennsylvania, and Respondent told staff that the loans were secured by mortgages. (Stip. ¶ 6)

10. Staff informed Respondent that he was prohibited under the MLA from engaging in the mortgage loan business in Pennsylvania without a license from the Department. (Stip. ¶ 7)

11. On January 17, 2024, Staff sent Respondent an email that provided the requirements to obtain a mortgage lender license in Pennsylvania. Additionally, Staff included as an attachment to the email a PDF copy of the MLA. (Stip. ¶ 8, exhibit DoBS-C)

12. On January 19, 2024, Respondent left a voice message for Staff. (Stip. ¶ 9, exhibit DoBS-D)

13. Respondent has had no further communication with the Office except through his counsel. (Stip. ¶ 10)

14. On February 29, 2024, the Office issued an Order, ordering that Respondent immediately cease and desist from engaging in the mortgage loan business in Pennsylvania, including but limited to advertising, soliciting, negotiating or offering to make or making mortgage loans, or collecting payments of principal, interest, tax, insurance or other payments under mortgage loans, until such time that he is licensed under the MLA. (OSC and Answer ¶ 24, Stip. ¶ 11)

15. On February 29, 2024, the Department issued an Investigative Subpoena for the Production of Documents and Information relating to Respondent's activity in the mortgage loan business. (OSC and Answer ¶ 25, Stip. ¶ 12, exhibit DoBS-E)

16. On April 23, 2024, legal counsel for Respondent sent a letter titled, "Response to Request for Production of Documents and Information," to the Office. (OSC and Answer ¶ 26, Stip. ¶ 13, exhibit DoBS-F)

17. The letter failed to provide any documents or information as requested in the subpoena, asserting "his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination afforded him by Article

1, Section 9 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution.” (OSC and Answer ¶ 27, Stip. ¶ 14, exhibit DoBS-F)

18. Respondent’s counsel later provided a thumb drive which contained the following: recorded satisfaction pieces, receipts from the Dauphin County Recorder of Deeds, and Respondent’s tax returns. (Stip. ¶ 15)

19. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that to date Respondent has failed to provide any records that show Respondent has maintained all mortgage loan records as required under section 6135(a)(2) of the MLA. (Stip. ¶ 16)

20. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if the interest rates charged on any of the residential mortgages complied with the law known as the Loan Interest and Protection Law² (“LIPL”) which are to be calculated in accordance with section 301 of LIPL. (Stip. ¶ 17)

21. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent was displaying a mortgage originator’s unique identifier on all mortgage loan applications as required by section 6121(14) of the MLA. (Stip. ¶ 18)

22. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent has failed to provide any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent was completing and providing a fee disclosure at the time of the mortgage loan application in violation of section 6121(10) of the MLA. (Stip. ¶ 19)

23. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because

² Act of January 30, 1974 (P.L. 13, No. 6), *as amended*, 41 P.S. §§ 101-605.

Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent ever conducted a review of the mortgage loan applicant's ability to repay the mortgage loan in violation of MLA Regulation Chapter 46, section 46.2(g)(1). (Stip. ¶ 20)

24. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent prepared and provided a written disclosure form to the consumer within 3 business days of the mortgage loan application as required by MLA Regulation Chapter 46, section 46.2(b). (Stip. ¶ 21)

25. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent prepared and provided all required mortgage loan documents to the borrower as required by MLA Regulation Chapter 46, section 46.2(l). (Stip. ¶ 22)

26. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with section 6121(3) of the MLA which mandates that Mortgage Originators must follow all applicable Federal law, including the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act³ ("RESPA"), the Truth in Lending Act⁴ ("TILA"), and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act⁵ ("ECOA"). (Stip. ¶ 23)

27. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if

³ 88 Stat. 1724, 12 U.S.C. § 2601 *et seq.*

⁴ 82 Stat. 146, 15 U.S.C. § 1601 *et seq.*

⁵ 88 Stat. 1521, 15 U.S.C. § 1691 *et seq.*

Respondent complied with ECOA, Regulation B (12 CFR 1002.1(b)) by completing a 1003 mortgage loan application with consumers personal and financial information. (Stip. ¶ 24)

28. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with RESPA Regulation X (12 CFR 1024) by providing the consumer with the special information booklet explaining the features of a mortgage loan. (Stip. ¶ 25)

29. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with TILA Regulation Z (12 CFR 1026) section 1026.37 by completing a closing disclosure and providing the consumer with the disclosure outlining all of the estimated terms and conditions of the proposed mortgage. (Stip. ¶ 26)

30. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with TILA Regulation Z (12 CFR 1026) section 1026.38 by completing a closing disclosure and providing the consumer with the disclosure outlining all of the final terms and conditions of the completed mortgage. (Stip. ¶ 27)

31. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with ECOA Regulation B (12 CFR 1026) section 1002.14(a)(2) by completing and providing the consumer a notice that they have a right to receive a copy of an appraisal report. (Stip. ¶ 28)

32. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if

Respondent complied with RESPA Regulation X (12 CFR 1024) section 1024.20(a)(1) by completing and providing the consumer a notice of homeownership counseling organizations to advise the consumer on real estate ownership and financial obligations. (Stip. ¶ 29)

33. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with RESPA Regulation X (12 CFR 1024) section 1024.15(b)(1) by completing and providing the consumer with a notice of any affiliated business arrangements that he dealt with in the closing of the mortgage loan. (Stip. ¶ 30)

34. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with ECOA Regulation B (12 CFR 1002) section 1002.4(d) by completing and providing the consumer with an ECOA notice stating the fair lending requirements and practices of the lending entity. (Stip. ¶ 31)

35. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) Regulation V (12 CFR 1022) by completing and providing the consumer with the FCRA notice stating the entity’s information collecting and reporting practices. (Stip. ¶ 32)

36. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with Federal regulations 31 CFR Subtitle B, Chapter V, 501 which requires that financial institutions develop and implement an Office of Foreign Assets (“OFAC”) screening program that describes the procedures to prevent conducting business with prohibited individuals.

(Stip. ¶ 33)

37. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with the USA Patriot Act, section 326 which requires lenders to verify and document the identity of the mortgage loan applicant. (Stip. ¶ 34)

38. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLS 6131(a)(3) which requires a mortgage lender applicant to demonstrate to the Department that policies and procedures have been developed to receive and process consumer inquiries and grievances promptly and fairly. (Stip. ¶ 35)

39. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLS 6131(c)(2) which requires a mortgage lender to have been approved for and will continue to maintain a line of credit, repurchase agreement or equivalent mortgage funding capability of not less than \$1,000,000. (Stip. ¶ 36)

40. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLS 6131(c)(3) which requires a mortgage lender to have an established net worth of \$250,000. (Stip. ¶ 37)

41. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLS 6131(c)(4) which requires a mortgage lender to maintain fidelity bond coverage in accordance with the guidelines established by the Federal National Mortgage

Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation. (Stip. ¶ 38)

42. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLS 6131(c)(5) which requires a mortgage lender to maintain a surety bond in an amount that will provide coverage for all mortgage originators sponsored by the applicant or licensee. (Stip. ¶ 39)

43. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with Federal regulation 31 CFR, Subtitle B, Chapter X, Part 1029.210 which requires financial institutions to develop and implement an anti-money laundering program. (Stip. ¶ 40)

44. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with Federal regulation Title 16, Chapter I, Subchapter F, Part 681 which outlines duties regarding the identification and prevention of identity theft. (Stip. ¶ 41)

45. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with the Graham-Leach-Bliley Act Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information Title 16, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 314 which requires financial institutions to develop and maintain a written information security plan that describes the program to protect customer information. (Stip. ¶ 42)

46. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if

Respondent complied with MLA section 6131.1 which requires mortgage lenders to complete pre-licensing education and to pass a written test before licensing. (Stip. ¶ 43)

47. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLA section 6131(f)(1) that requires a mortgage originator to be an employee of a licensed mortgage broker or mortgage lender. (Stip. ¶ 44)

48. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLA section 6131(f)(2) that requires a mortgage originator to be assigned to and work out of a licensed location. (Stip. ¶ 45)

49. If called to testify, Deputy Secretary Timothy Knopp would testify that because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with MLA section 6131(f)(4) that requires a mortgage originator maintain a surety bond that will provide coverage to the mortgage originator from a surety company authorized to do business in the Commonwealth. (Stip. ¶ 46)

50. Beginning in July 1981, Respondent purchased property in Steelton and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and acted as a landlord. (Aff. at 1)

51. In 1995, Respondent sold a property to the tenant and secured his interest by mortgage in the property and continued to do so with other tenants and other buyers. (Aff. at 1-2)

52. Respondent used the services of Community Settlement with its real estate attorney. (Aff. at 2)

53. From 2010 through 2015 and beyond, Respondent's business grew as he found more and more persons looking to buy residential property in Harrisburg neighborhoods with

depressed prices and was able to sell to them and hold the mortgage using forms he developed.
(Aff. at 2)

54. The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in many more people seeking property in Harrisburg and property values increased. (Aff. at 3)

55. Respondent typically required a series of 50 monthly payments of \$250 for each \$10,000 of financing. Many were paid off much more quickly. (Aff. at 3)

56. Respondent had very few written agreements; almost all sales and agreements of installment sales were oral. (Aff. at 5)

57. By December 2023, Respondent stopped extending any new mortgage. (Aff. at 3)

58. Respondent has now filed satisfaction pieces for each mortgage. (Aff. at 5)

59. Respondent discarded notes and other records as the buyers paid off the mortgages.
(Aff. at 5)

60. On March 11, 2025, the Office filed an order to show cause against Respondent under the MLA, and Respondent filed an answer to the order to show cause on April 2, 2025.
(Official notice of Department records⁶)

61. Respondent received service of the order to show cause, as shown by his filing of an answer thereto. (Department records; *see*, answer to order to show cause filed April 2, 2025)

62. On April 8, 2026, the parties filed a stipulation of facts. (Department records; *see*, Joint Stipulation of the Parties, filed April 8, 2026)

63. On April 27, 2026, Respondent filed an affidavit. (Department records; *see*,

⁶Official notice is taken of docket entries in this matter in accordance with the GRAPP rule that an administrative agency may take official notice of its own records. 1 Pa. Code § 35.173; *see also*, *Falasco v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole*, 521 A.2d 991 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1987) (doctrine of official notice allows an agency to take official notice of facts which are obvious and notorious to an expert in the agency's field and those facts contained in reports and records in the agency's files). All subsequent references are cited as "Department records."

Affidavit of Daniel Boyle, Respondent, filed April 27, 2026)

64. On June 22, 2026, the parties requested that this matter be adjudicated based upon the stipulation of facts and affidavit without a hearing and without briefing. (*See*, Joint Motion for Adjudication Without a Hearing filed June 22, 2026)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Banking and Securities Commission has jurisdiction in this matter under sections 6138 and 6140 of the MLA, 7 Pa.C.S. § 6138, 6140, and section 1122-A of the Department of Banking and Securities Code,⁷ 71 P.S. §§ 733-1122-A. (Findings of Fact Nos. 1-18)

2. Respondent received notice of this proceeding and was afforded an opportunity to be heard in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Agency Law, 2 Pa. C.S. § 504. (Findings of Fact Nos. 60-64)

3. By serving as the lender in at least 213 mortgages recorded in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania ranging in the amount of \$10,478 to \$84,500, Respondent engaged in the business of mortgage lending without being licensed by the Department to do so in violation of section 6111(a) of the MLA, 7 Pa.C.S. § 6111(a). (Findings of Fact Nos. 1-18)

4. Because Respondent committed 213 violations of section 6111(a) of the MLA by engaging in the business of mortgage lending without being licensed by the Department to do so, the Department is authorized by section 6140(a) of the MLA, 7 Pa.C.S. § 6140(a), to impose a fine of up to \$10,000 for violation. (Findings of Fact Nos. 1-18)

⁷ Act of May 15, 1933 (P.L. 565, No. 111), *as amended*, 71 P.S. §§ 733-1 – 733-1203.

DISCUSSION

The Office charged that Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6140 of the MLA⁸ because he violated section 6111(a) of the MLA, which provides:

Section 6111. License requirements

(a) General rule.—Except as provided under subsections (b) and (c) and section 6112 (relating to exceptions to license requirements), on and after the effective date of this section, **no person shall engage in the mortgage loan business in this Commonwealth without being licensed** as a mortgage broker, mortgage lender, mortgage servicer or mortgage originator as provided under this chapter. A mortgage originator may not engage in the mortgage loan business unless the mortgage originator is sponsored in the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry by a licensed mortgage broker, mortgage lender, mortgage servicer or mortgage loan correspondent, person excepted from this chapter or person excepted from licensure under section 6112 and is under the direct supervision and control of the sponsoring licensee or excepted person.

(b) Licensed activity exception.--

(1) A mortgage lender may:

(i) Act as a mortgage broker without a separate mortgage broker license.

(ii) Act as a mortgage servicer without a separate mortgage servicer license for mortgage loans the mortgage lender has originated, negotiated and owns.

(2) Deleted.

(3) A person licensed as a mortgage broker may only perform the services of a mortgage broker.

(4) A person only licensed as a mortgage servicer may only perform the services of a mortgage servicer.

(c) Loans for business or commercial purposes.—This chapter shall not apply to mortgage loans made for business or commercial purposes.

7 Pa.C.S. § 6111 (emphasis supplied). The MLA defines the term “mortgage lender” as a “person

⁸ **Section 6140. Penalties**

(a) Persons operating without licenses.—A person subject to the provisions of this chapter and not licensed by the department who violates any provision of this chapter or who commits any action which would subject a license to suspension, revocation or nonrenewal under section 6139 (relating to suspension, revocation or refusal) may be fined by the department up to \$10,000 for each offense.

(b) Violation by licensee.—A person licensed under this chapter or director, officer, owner, partner, employee, mortgage originator or agent of a licensee who violates a provision of this chapter or who commits any action which would subject the licensee to suspension, revocation or nonrenewal under section 6139 may be fined by the department up to \$10,000 for each offense.

7 Pa.C.S. § 6140.

who engages in the mortgage loan business by directly or indirectly originating and closing mortgage loans with its own funds in the primary market for consideration.” 7 Pa.C.S. § 6102. The MLA also the term “mortgage loan” as a “first or secondary mortgage loan, or both, a lease purchase agreement or a mortgage loan modification, as the context may require.” 7 Pa.C.S. § 6102. The MLA additionally defines the term “first mortgage loan” as a loan “(1) made primarily for personal, family or household use, and (2) secured by any first lien mortgage, deed of trust or equivalent consensual security interest on a dwelling or on residential real estate” and defines the term “secondary mortgage loan” as a loan “(1) made primarily for personal, family or household use, and (2) secured by any secondary lien mortgage, deed of trust or equivalent consensual security interest on a dwelling or on residential real estate.” 7 Pa.C.S. § 6102. The MLA further defines the term “mortgage loan business” as “(1) advertising, causing to be advertised, soliciting, negotiating or arranging in the ordinary course of business or offering to make or making mortgage loans, or (2) servicing mortgage loans.” 7 Pa.C.S. § 6102. The MLA applies to “[a]ny person who engages in the mortgage loan business in this Commonwealth” regardless of whether that person is licensed or not. 7 Pa.C.S. § 6151(2).

As established by the stipulated facts, from in or about March 2009 until December 2023, Respondent served as the lender in at least 213 residential mortgages recorded in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania ranging in the amount of \$10,478 to \$84,500. Notwithstanding, Respondent is not and never has been licensed with the Department pursuant to the MLA as a mortgage broker, mortgage lender, mortgage services, nor mortgage originator. By serving as lender in residential mortgages in this Commonwealth, Respondent made mortgage loans and engaged in the mortgage loan business. Because he engaged in the mortgage loan business without being licensed by the Department, Respondent violated section 6111(a) of the MLA, as charged in the order to show

cause.

The remaining question is the appropriate sanction. A person subject to the provisions of the MLA and not licensed by the Department who violates any provision of the MLA or who commits any action which would subject a licensee to suspension, revocation or nonrenewal under section 6139 (relating to suspension, revocation or refusal) may be fined by the Department up to \$10,000 for each offense. Section 6140(a) of the MLA, 7 Pa.C.S. § 6140(a). For his 213 violations of section 6111(a) of the MLA, the Department is authorized to fine Respondent up to \$2,130,000. The primary focus of disciplinary sanctions is not punishment but, rather, public protection. *See, Galena v. Department of State*, 551 A.2d 676, 679-680 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1988). The Department has a responsibility to protect the public against licensees who place the public at risk by originating mortgage loans or negotiating mortgage loans for others in the primary market without the buffer of appropriate regulation.

For almost 15 years Respondent engaged in the business of mortgage lender without licensure as required by law and extended at least 213 residential mortgages ranging from just over \$10,000 to under \$85,000. These mortgages were typically for terms of less than 5 years and were often paid much more quickly. Only through proper licensure can the Department effectively regulate mortgage bankers and mortgage brokers and verify that the business activities of a licensee are being conducted in accordance with the MLA and other State and Federal laws enforced by the Department. Respondent had little documentation and continued to discard that as each mortgage was satisfied. Because Respondent failed to produce any mortgage loan records, the Department cannot ascertain if Respondent complied with any of those duties owed by law to customers as described in Findings of Fact Nos. 19-49. Though the risk of harm to those to whom Respondent extended mortgage loans cannot be determined specifically, it was immense.

Respondent was a landlord who got into the mortgage lender business by financing the sale of his property to the tenant. Eventually, Respondent was finding residential properties and financing the sale to the buyer. Respondent is no longer involved in the mortgage loan business. Respondent has filed satisfaction pieces for all of the mortgages. Although it does not appear that any customers have filed complaints about Respondent, it cannot be determined whether Respondent followed the law in extending and collecting mortgages or if the customers' rights were otherwise protected.

A penalty must be imposed that will stress upon Respondent the importance of complying with the law while protecting the public from the potential for dishonest and unfair dealings by one not submitting to regulatory oversight. Weighing all of these factors, a fine of \$1,000 per violation or a total of \$213,000 should be sufficient to discourage Respondent and others from continued violations of this nature and to recognize the importance of compliance with Pennsylvania's licensure requirements.

Accordingly, based upon the foregoing discussion, the following proposed order shall issue:

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES**

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,	:	
Department of Banking and Securities,	:	
Compliance Office,	:	
Petitioner	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. 250008 (BNK-ORD)
	:	
Daniel Boyle,	:	
Respondent	:	

PROPOSED ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of June 2026, in accordance with the foregoing findings of fact, conclusions of law and discussion, it is **ORDERED** that Respondent Daniel Boyle shall pay a **FINE** of **\$213,000.00** and shall cease and desist from engaging in the business of mortgage lending unless and until licensed by the Department under the Mortgage Licensing Act to do so.

Payment of the fine shall be by certified check, attorney's check, cashier's check or U.S. Postal Service money order, made payable to the "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," and shall be delivered within 30 days of the effective date of the Commission's Final Order in this matter, to:

Charles Vance, Commission Counsel
Banking and Securities Commission
Market Square Plaza
17 N. Second Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101

The Banking and Securities Commission has announced its intention to review this Proposed Report in accordance with 1 Pa. Code § 35.226(a)(2).

BY ORDER:

Redacted

Thomas A. Blackburn
Hearing Examiner

For the Office:

Kurt B. Geishauser, Assistant Counsel
Department of Banking and Securities
Market Square Plaza
17 North Second Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
kugeishaus@pa.gov

For Respondent:

Frank C. Sluzis, Esquire
DETHLEFS-PYKOSH LAW GROUP, LLC
2132 Market Street
Camp Hill, PA 17011
fsluzis@dplglaw.com

Docket Clerk:
(w/ original)

Ms. Jamie Reed, docket clerk
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES
17 North Second Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
RA-BNDocketClerk@pa.gov

Date of mailing:

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES**

FILED
2026 JULY 2 AM 8:00
PA DEPARTMENT OF
BANKING AND SECURITIES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES, COMPLIANCE OFFICE v. DANIEL BOYLE	: : : : :	: Docket No. 250008 (BNK-ORD)
---	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 2, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the attached Letter and Proposed Report in accordance with the requirements of 1 Pa. Code § 33.31 (relating to service by agency), in the manner indicated below:

By Hand Delivery Mail and Electronic Mail:

Kurt Geishauser
17 North 2nd Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
kugeishaus@pa.gov

By United States First Class Mail and Electronic Mail:

Frank C. Sluzis, Esquire
Dethlef's-Pykosh Law Group, LLC
2132 Market Street
Camp Hill, P 17011
fsluzis@dplglaw.com

By: Redacted

/s/

Jamie Reed, Docket Clerk
PA Department of Banking and Securities
17 North Second Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND SECURITIES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND
SECURITIES, COMPLIANCE OFFICE

v.

DANIEL BOYLE

:
:
:
: Docket No.: 250008 (BNK-ORD)
:
:
:
:
:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On behalf of the agency, I certify that I have this day caused to be served a copy of the foregoing *Final Order* upon the following persons pursuant to 1 Pa. Code §§ 33.31:

**BY CERTIFIED AND FIRST-
CLASS MAIL:**

Frank C. Sluzis, Esquire
DETHLEFS-PYKOSH LAW
GROUP, LLC
2132 Market Street
Camp Hill, PA 17011
fsluzis@dpplglaw.com
(Counsel for *Respondent*)

Daniel Boyle
Redacted

(*Respondent*)

Daniel Boyle
Redacted

(*Respondent*)

Daniel Boyle
Redacted

(*Respondent*)

BY HAND DELIVERY:

Kurt B. Geishauser, Assistant Counsel
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Banking and Securities
17 North Second Street, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
*Counsel for the Bureau of Securities
Compliance and Examinations*

Redacted

Dated this 29th day of September, 2026

Eileen Smith, Acting Docket Clerk
PA Banking and Securities Commission
17 N.2nd St., Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 787-5783

Date Emailed: 9/25/26

Date Mailed: 9/29/26