

---

# 2024 Inspection

# LaPorte, A Professional

# Accounting Corporation

(Headquartered in Metairie, Louisiana)

March 27, 2025

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A) OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2025-059



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2024 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2024 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year .....	3
Part I: Inspection Observations.....	5
Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions .....	6
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules .....	9
Part I.C: Independence.....	10
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	11
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of LaPorte, A Professional Accounting Corporation, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review one audit of an issuer with a fiscal year ending in 2021. For the issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

### 2024 Inspection Approach

In selecting issuer audits for review, we use a risk-based method of selection. We make selections based on (1) our internal evaluation of audits we believe have a heightened risk of material misstatement, including those with challenging audit areas, and (2) other risk-based characteristics, including issuer and firm considerations. In certain situations, we may select all of the firm's issuer audits for review.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. Rather, we generally focus our attention on audit areas we believe to be of greater complexity, areas of greater significance or with a heightened risk of material misstatement to the issuer's financial statements, and areas of recurring deficiencies. We may also select some audit areas for review in a manner designed to incorporate unpredictability.

Our selection of audits for review does not necessarily constitute a representative sample of the firm's total population of issuer audits. Additionally, our inspection findings are specific to the particular portions of the issuer audits reviewed. They are not an assessment of all of the firm's audit work or of all of the audit procedures performed for the audits reviewed.

View the details on the [scope of our inspections and our inspections procedures](#).

# OVERVIEW OF THE 2024 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2024 inspection as well as data from the previous inspection. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our review. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and audit areas from inspection to inspection and firm to firm. Further, a firm's business, the applicable auditing standards, or other factors can change from the time of one inspection to the next. As a result of these variations, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

## Firm Data and Audits Selected for Review

	2024	2021
<b>Firm data</b>		
<b>Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	1	1
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	1	1
<b>Audits reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed</b>	1	1
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	1	1
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	0	0
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	1	1
<b>Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	100%	100%

If we include a deficiency in Part I.A of our report, it does not necessarily mean that the firm has not addressed the deficiency. In many cases, the firm has performed remedial actions after the deficiency was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional audit procedures, informing management of the issuer of the need for changes to the financial statements or reporting on ICFR, or taking steps to prevent reliance on prior audit reports.

<sup>1</sup> The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS 1201, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection or, in cases where the firm has not issued an audit report in that period, since the prior inspection or since the firm's registration with the PCAOB.

Our inspection may include a review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm’s remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during the current inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.

If we include a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — it does not necessarily mean that the issuer’s financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer’s public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer’s management, underlying books and records, and other information.

## Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2024 inspection and the previous inspection. For the issuer audits selected for review, we selected these areas because they were generally significant to the issuer’s financial statements, may have included complex issues for auditors, and/or involved complex judgments in (1) estimating and auditing the reported value of related accounts and disclosures and (2) implementing and auditing the related controls.

2024		2021	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Allowance for credit losses	1	Allowance for loan losses	1
Deposit liabilities	1	Deposit liabilities	1

# PART I: INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies, if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

Part I.B discusses certain deficiencies, if any, that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

Part I.C discusses instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules, if any, related to maintaining independence.

Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("Act"), it is the Board's assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's quality control system. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding in Part II. Section 104(g)(2) of the Act restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board's satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

## Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

Within Part I.A of this report, we classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

### Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's financial statements were determined to be materially misstated, and the issuer restated its financial statements. It also includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective, or there were additional material weaknesses that the firm did not identify, and the firm withdrew its opinion, or revised its report, on ICFR.

This classification does not include instances where, unrelated to our review, an issuer restated its financial statements and/or an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective. We include any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits in the audits with multiple deficiencies or audits with a single deficiency classification below.

## Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

This classification includes instances where multiple deficiencies were identified that related to a combination of one or more financial statement accounts, disclosures, and/or important controls in an ICFR audit.

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

This classification includes instances where a single deficiency was identified that related to a financial statement account or disclosure or to an important control in an ICFR audit.

# PART I.A: AUDITS WITH UNSUPPORTED OPINIONS

This section of our report discusses the deficiencies identified, by specific issuer audit reviewed, in the audit work supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements.

We identify each issuer by a letter (e.g., Issuer A) and industry sector. Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

We present issuer audits below within their respective deficiency classifications (as discussed previously). Within the classifications, we generally present the audits based on our assessment as to the relative significance of the identified deficiencies, taking into account the significance of the financial statement accounts and/or disclosures affected, and/or the nature or extent of the deficiencies.

## Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

None

## Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

### Issuer A – Financials

#### Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Allowance for Loan Losses (ALL)**, **Deposit Liabilities**, and **Journal Entries**.

## Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **ALL**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk:

The issuer used various qualitative factors to determine the qualitative component of the ALL. The firm's approach for testing the qualitative reserve was to test the issuer's process. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumptions related to the qualitative factors the issuer used to determine the qualitative reserve because it limited its procedures to reading the issuer's ALL methodology and evaluating the consistency of the assumptions with those used in prior periods. (AS 2501.16)
- The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the relevance and reliability of external information that the issuer used to develop the significant assumptions related to qualitative factors. (AS 1105.04 and .06)
- The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to test, or identify and test any controls over, the accuracy and completeness of issuer-produced information that the issuer used to develop the significant assumptions related to the qualitative factors, because it limited its procedures to inquiries and performing certain recalculations and comparisons of certain of the information to other issuer-prepared information. (AS 1105.10)

The issuer's ALL also included a specific reserve for impaired loans. The issuer engaged external specialists to determine the fair value of certain property that served as collateral for certain impaired loans. The firm's approach for substantively testing the specific reserve was to develop an independent expectation of the specific reserve that included use of the work of the company's specialists as audit evidence. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not test the accuracy and completeness of issuer-produced information, and evaluate the relevance and reliability of external information, used by the company's specialists to determine the fair value of the properties used as collateral. (AS 1105.A8a)
- The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of significant assumptions used by the company's specialists to determine the fair value of the properties used as collateral. (AS 1105.A8b; AS 2501.16)
- The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the relevance and reliability of the work performed by the company's specialists and whether the specialists' findings supported or contradicted the fair value of the collateral because it did not evaluate that the appraisals were not prepared as of the end of the year and perform additional procedures to address the potential effect of the timing difference on the fair value of the collateral. (AS 1105.A9 and .A10)
- The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to demonstrate it had a reasonable basis for certain assumptions it developed because it did not demonstrate how its assumptions took into account its understanding of the company's process that included certain information about the



properties used as collateral, so that its expectations considered the factors relevant to the estimate. (AS 2501.21 and .22)

- The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reliability of external information that the firm used to develop its independent expectation of the specific reserve. (AS 1105.04 and .06)
- The firm did not perform procedures to demonstrate it had a reasonable basis for another assumption it developed and used in its independent expectation of the specific reserve. (AS 2501.22)
- The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of another significant assumption that the issuer developed and it used in its independent expectation of the specific reserve. (AS 2501.16)

With respect to **Deposit Liabilities**:

The issuer used a service organization to process and record transactions related to deposit liabilities. The firm's approach to testing deposit liabilities included reliance on controls. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The service auditor's report for the service organization contained a qualified opinion because controls were not operating effectively to achieve a control objective related to logical access to programs, data, and computer resources. The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate whether the service auditor's report provided sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support the firm's reliance on the service organization's controls because it concluded that the identified control deficiencies did not have an effect on its reliance on controls without performing procedures to support its conclusion. Further, given the length of period under audit not covered by the service auditor's report, the firm inappropriately limited its procedures to reading the bridge letter that only addressed a portion of that period of time. (AS 2601.16)
- The firm did not perform procedures to test, beyond inquiring of management, certain complementary user controls over deposit liabilities identified in the service auditor's report. (AS 2601.14)

The sample sizes the firm used in its substantive procedures to test deposit liabilities were too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because the procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiencies in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

With respect to **Journal Entries**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk:

The firm identified characteristics of potentially fraudulent entries or adjustments for testing, determined that certain journal entries met those characteristics, but limited its testing to haphazardly selected journal entries. (AS 2401.61)

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

None

### PART I.B: OTHER INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PCAOB STANDARDS OR RULES

This section of our report discusses certain deficiencies that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion. This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not reviewed and include any instances of non-compliance below.

The deficiencies below are presented in numerical order based on the PCAOB standard or rule with which the firm did not comply. We identified the following deficiencies:

- In the audit reviewed, the firm, when testing journal entries for evidence of possible material misstatement due to fraud, did not appropriately consider the characteristics of potentially fraudulent journal entries in determining the criteria it used to identify and select journal entries for testing. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2401, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*.
- In the audit reviewed, the engagement team performed procedures to determine whether or not matters were critical audit matters but, in performing those procedures, did not include certain matters that were communicated to the audit committee and that related to accounts or disclosures that were material to the financial statements. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 3101, *The Auditor's Report on an Audit of Financial Statements When the Auditor Expresses an Unqualified Opinion*. This instance of non-compliance does not necessarily mean that other critical audit matters should have been communicated in the auditor's report.

## PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

In the 2024 inspection, we did not identify, and the firm did not bring to our attention, any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence. Although this section does not include any instances of potential non-compliance that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be instances of non-compliance with SEC or PCAOB rules related to independence that were not identified through our procedures or the firm's monitoring activities.

While the firm did not bring to our attention any instances of potential non-compliance, the number, large or small, of firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance may be reflective of the size of the firm, including the number of associated firms; the design and effectiveness of the firm's independence monitoring activities; and the size and/or complexity of the issuers it audits, including the number of affiliates of those issuers. Therefore, we caution against making any comparison of firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance across firms.

## PART II: OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO QUALITY CONTROL

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

We include deficiencies in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, we will make public any such deficiency.

## APPENDIX A: FIRM'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Board provided the firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The firm did not provide a written response.

