
2025 Inspection George Johnson & Company, P.C.

(Headquartered in Detroit, Michigan)

June 17, 2026

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. 104-2026-073

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2025 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2025 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year	3
Part I: Inspection Observations.....	5
Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions	5
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules	5
Part I.C: Independence.....	6
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	7
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2025 INSPECTION

In the 2025 inspection of George Johnson & Company, P.C., the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of issuers.

We selected for review two audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2023. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2025 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 2025 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2025 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

	2025	2022
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the lead/principal auditor	10	6
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	2	1
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed	2	2
Audits in which the firm was the lead/principal auditor	2	2
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0	0
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	0	0
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	0%	0%

¹ 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.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2025 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.

2025		2022	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Investment securities	2	Investment securities	2
Participant and employer contributions	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 apparent non-compliance with rules related to maintaining independence.

Part I.C discusses instances of apparent non-compliance with rules 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.

PART I.A: AUDITS WITH UNSUPPORTED OPINIONS

In the 2025 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies 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 on the issuer's financial statements.

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(s). This section does not discuss instances of apparent non-compliance with rules related to maintaining independence.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. As a result, the area below was not necessarily reviewed on every 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.

We identified the following deficiency:

In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of a person not employed by the firm that performed audit procedures in the audit. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

PCAOB Rule 3520, *Auditor Independence*, requires a firm and its personnel to be independent of the firm's audit clients. This requirement encompasses not only an obligation to satisfy the independence criteria set out in PCAOB rules and standards but also an obligation to satisfy all other independence criteria applicable to an engagement, including the independence criteria set out by the SEC in Regulation S-X, 17 C.F.R. § 210.2-01, *Qualifications of Accountants*.

In the 2025 inspection, we did not identify, and the firm did not bring to our attention, any instances of apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520. Although this section does not include any instances of apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520 that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be instances of non-compliance with 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 apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520, the number, large or small, of firm-identified instances of apparent 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 apparent 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 firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.

February 23, 2026

Ms. Christine Gunia
Director, Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1217

Dear Ms. Gunia:

We have received a draft copy of the inspection report issued by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB") with respect to the inspection conducted by the PCAOB of George Johnson & Company, P.C. ("GJC") between February 10, 2025 and February 14, 2025.

We are committed to maintaining and continuously improving our quality control system. This system is vital in meeting our goal to provide high-quality services that meet or exceed professional standards, our clients' expectations, and the expectations of the general public. We consider the PCAOB inspection process, as well as the feedback provided by the PCAOB, to be an important contributor to the maintenance and continuous improvement of our quality control system. As part of that process, we welcome the opportunity to provide our comments on the inspection report.

This letter provides our comments to the matter identified in Part I.B, within the public portion of the inspection report.

Issue

The draft inspection report indicates that, for one of two audits inspected by the PCAOB, the PCAOB inspection team concluded that GJC did not make a required communication to the audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of a person not employed by GJC that performed audit procedures in the audit, as required under AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

Response

For the audit inspected, the issuer was a defined contribution pension plan. In this case, an accountant who was employed by an organization that provides outsourcing services for public accounting firms was utilized to assist the audit team in performing audit procedures; this individual worked under the supervision and review of the senior members of the engagement's audit team employed by GJC.

Bank America Tower
110 N. Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (872) 465-1330

PNC Center
201 E. 5th Street
Suite 1900-1239
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Tel: (513) 766-9415

1001 Woodward Avenue
Suite 850
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Tel: (313) 965-2655

An Independent Member of the BDO Alliance USA

Ms. Christine Gunia
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
February 23, 2026
Page Two

Response (continued)

In this case, the engagement letter issued by the engagement team to the plan's equivalent to the audit committee included a section indicating that GJC may use members from other accounting firms or industry specialists who may not be employed by GJC to assist in its audit of the plan.

However, given the PCAOB's position on this matter, in order to explicitly communicate and document compliance with the specific provisions of AS 1301, for all audits that GJC conducts in accordance with PCAOB auditing standards since the conclusion of the PCAOB inspection, a separate written communication is now being issued to the audit committee, or its equivalent, that documents, among other matters, the names, locations, and planned responsibilities of persons not employed by GJC that are anticipated to perform audit procedures in the audit. Any changes that occur between the issuance of this communication and the completion of the audit are being included in the required communications letter issued at or near the conclusion of the audit.

Again, we appreciate the feedback received from the PCAOB during this process. We look forward to receiving the final copy of the inspection report, and we anticipate that our responses will be considered in the preparation of that report.

Sincerely,

GJC CPA's & Advisors

Detroit, Michigan

