

MINUTES OF THE 76th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE HELD IN HYBRID MODE ON SATURDAY, 26th FEBRUARY 2022 FROM 10.30 A.M., AT GULMOHAR HALL, INDIA HABITAT CENTRE, LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI AND ONLINE THROUGH ZOOM APPLICATION.

PRESENT:

Ar. Habeeb Khan : President (In Chair)
Ar. Sapna : Vice-President

MEMBERS:

	In Person		Online
1	Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta	27	Ar. Vijay Garg
2	Ar. Abhay V. Purohit	28	Ar. Amitava Roy
3	Ar. Kapil Setia	29	Ar. Jayalakshmi V.
4	Ar. Bansan Singh Thangkhiew	30	Ms. Saumya Gupta
5	Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal	31	Ar. R. Ramesh Kumar
6	Ar. Abhijit Shirodkar	32	Ar. Minaskhi Jain
7	Ar. Punit Sethi	33	Ar. Anil Kumar
8	Ar. Lalichan Zacharias	34	Ar. Vishal Arun Kumar
9	Ar. P. Satheesh Kumar	35	Ar. Maitreyi C. Gupta
10	Ar. Mahendra Pratap	36	Ar. George Lalzuia
11	Ar. Nupur Banerjee	37	Ar. S.K Patra
12	Ar. Nilkashi D. Sarma	38	Ar. Rane Maria LeonteVedamuthu
13	Ar. Navin Sharma	39	Er. H.K. Mittal
14	Ar. Arvind Kumar Ahirwar	40	Dr. G.S. Inda
15	Ar. Chandan K. Parab		
16	Ar. Nand Lal Chandel		
17	Ar. Gajanand Ram		
18	Ar. Anita Samyal		
19	Ar. Vidhyadhar Sadashiv Wodeyar		
20	Ar. Amit Kumar Garg		
21	Ar. V. Neilazo Metha		
22	Ar. P. Vaitianandin		
23	Ar. Ritu Singh		
24	Ar. Ravi Kumar R.		
25	Ar. Naveen Kanithi		
26	Er. Sandip Kumar Deb		

IN ATTENDANCE:

Sh. R.K.Oberoi : Registrar-Secretary
Sh. Deepak Kumar : Administrative Officer

The following members were granted leave of absence:

1	Ar. P.S. Rajeev	2	Ar. Dr. Vandana Sehgal
3	Ar. Sashi Mohan Srivastava	4	Ar. Bapilu Chai

The following members did not attend the meeting and no information was received from them:

1	Ar. Anuradha Bali	4	Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah
---	-------------------	---	--------------------------

2	Ar. Sanjiban Datta	5	Ar. Narmada Devi Yumnam
3	Ar. Nadisha V. M.	6	Ar. Yogeeta Rai

The Registrar-Secretary welcomed the President, Vice-president and Members attending the 76th Meeting of Council in person as well as online and requested the President to conduct further proceedings of the 76th meeting of the Council.

The President thanked the Vice-President and Members of the Council for sparing their valuable time for the meeting. The President informed the members that due to restrictions of Covid-19 Pandemic meeting is being conducted in hybrid mode i.e. physically and online mode.

Thereafter, the regular agenda of the meeting was taken up

ITEM NO.01	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE 75th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the Members that the Minutes of 75th meeting of the Council held on 28th & 29th August 2021 were circulated to the members on 21st September 2021. No views/ Comments were received on the minutes. After discussions the Minutes of 75th Meeting were confirmed and approved.
ITEM NO.02	ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE MINUTES OF THE 75th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	The Registrar-Secretary briefed the members on the action taken report on the Minutes of the 75th meeting of the Council held on 28th & 29th August, 2021. The members noted the action taken report.
ITEM NO.03	APPROVAL FOR RESTORATION OF NAMES TO THE REGISTER OF ARCHITECTS MAINTAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE UNDER SECTION 32 OF THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972.
	The Council granted ex-post facto approval to the action taken by the Registrar for restoring names of 1594 defaulter Architects whose name were restored to the Register of Architects on payment of requisite fees during the period 01.08.2021 to 21.01.2022.
ITEM NO.04	APPROVAL FOR REMOVAL OF NAMES FROM THE REGISTER OF ARCHITECTS:
i)	ON REQUEST FROM THE CONCERNED ARCHITECT:
	The Council noted that some Architects have surrendered their Certificate of Registration and requested for removal of their name from the Register of Architects as most of them have moved abroad or were not in practice. The Council approved for the removal of names of the architects from Register of Architects as requested by them in terms of Section 29(1) (a) of the Architects Act, 1972 and accordingly passed the following Resolution.

Resolution No. :541**Resolved that:**

- (i) The Names of the following architect be removed from the Register of Architects as per their request in terms of Section 29(1) (a) of the Architects Act, 1972:

Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/ City	Registration No.
1	Sh.Sankaranarayanan Seshan	Chennai	CA/1977/003478
2	Sh. Niranjan Malgonda Patil	Kolhapur	CA/2017/084175
3	Ms. Kritika Rajkumar R. Iyer	Mumbai	CA/2015/070189
4	Sh. Suhail Anil Arti Panjwani	Thane	CA/2018/102583
5	Ms. Padmaja D. Panse	Bhopal	CA/1994/017772
6	Ms. A. Shahina	Chennai	CA/1986/009769
7	Ms. Charu Jayendra Bharwada	Ahmedabad	CA/1989/012524
8	Ms. Sangita Sunil Gawahali	Bangalore	CA/2014/062986
9	Sh. Ajit Kumar Majumdar	Kolkata	CA/1978/004686
10	Ms. AlifiyaDalal	Pune	CA/2015/067803
11	Ms. Annette Zehn	Pune	CA/2009/046332
12	Mr. Ullrich Kremtz	Pune	CA/2009/046333
13	Ms. Vaishali A.S.	Bangalore	CA/2011/053480

ii) DUE TO DEATH:

The Council noted with brief the passing away of some architects. The members expressed their condolences to the families of the deceased architects and observed one minutes silence.

The Council decided to remove their names in terms of Section 29 (1) (b) of the Architects Act, 1972 and passed the following resolution:

Resolution No.:542**Resolved that:**

- (i) The names of following Architects be removed from the Register of Architects due to their death as provided under the Section 29 (1) (b) of the Architects Act, 1972.

Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Registration No.
1	Sh. Udham Singh Azad	Ambala	CA/1989/12447
2	Sh. Satya Paul Vaid	New Delhi	CA/1975/01854
3	Sh. Gopal Krishna Arora	Bangalore	CA/1985/09272
4	Smt. Champa Devi	Shimla	CA/2005/37001
5	Sh. Mohammad Ayyub Quadri	Secunderabad	CA/1975/01837
6	Sh. Shridhar S.Ankalkhope	Sangli	CA/1993/16209
7	Sh. Balan Chami	Thrissur	CA/1993/16007
8	Sh. S. Balasubramanian	Erode	CA/1991/13593
9	Sh. Sudhar Ramkrishna Joshi	Bhandara	CA/1975/00404

		10	Sh. Mahinder Nath Andley	New Delhi	CA/1975/01841
		11	Sh. Sharad Manohar Kharsikar	Mumbai	CA/1981/06604
		12	Sh. Sreekantha Kumar Paikary	Bhubaneswar	CA/1980/05519
		13	Sh. Ashok Hiranman Chogle	Mumbai	CA/1977/04252
		14	Sh. Ram Kumar Bhardwaj	Delhi	CA/1975/01996
		15	Sh. K.M. Krishnan	Pallakad	CA/1977/04101
		16	Sh. Dattakumar B. Chachad	New Delhi	CA/1977/03509
		17	Sh. Munishwar Nath Ganju	Delhi	CA/1975/01227
		18	Sh. Prasanth G.	Kollam	CA/2000/26193
		19	Sh. Umeshchandra P.Bhatt	Rajkot	CA/1988/11414
		20	Sh. Shrihari V. Vadnerkar	Gandhinagar	CA/1976/03083
ITEM NO.05	TO CONSIDER ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2020-2021.				
	The Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts for the financial year ended on 31.03.2021 of the Council of Architecture, Council of Architecture (Contributory Provident Fund) Account and Council of Architecture Employees' Group Gratuity Scheme, as annexed with the Agenda, were perused and approved by the Council and accordingly, the Council passed the following resolution: Resolution No.:543 Resolved that: (a) The Annual Report together with Audited Statement of Accounts of the Council of Architecture, Council of Architecture (Contributory Provident Fund) Account and Council of Architecture Employees' Group Gratuity Scheme, for the period ended on 31.03.2021 as placed before the Council be approved; (b) The same be published in the Gazette of India as required under the provisions of the Architects Act, 1972; and (c) A copy of the same be sent to the Central Government in terms of the provisions of the Architects Act, 1972.				
ITEM NO.06	TO CONSIDER THE LETTER NO.F.NO.3-02/2021-TS.VI DATED 11TH NOVEMBER 2021, RECEIVED FROM MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVT. OF INDIA, REGARDING AMENDMENT TO THE COA (MINIMUM STANDARDS OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION) REGULATIONS, 2020.				
	The President informed the members that the Council is in receipt of letter no. F.NO.3-02/2021-TS.VI dated 11th November, 2021, from the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, seeking comments of the Council of Architecture for amending the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, for removing the mandatory requirement of passing NATA for admission to B. Arch. Course. He also informed the members that the matter was considered by the Executive Committee in its 235th Meeting held on 02.12.2021 and later on in 236th meeting				

held on 25th February, 2022. The Executive Committee recommended that all Centrally Funded Technical Institutions (IITs, NITs and SPAs) may admit students based on the Aptitude Test conducted by competent authority of the Central Government (i.e. JEE Paper-2) as per the norms and standards prescribed by the Council.

The President also apprised the Council members about the concerns expressed by the Hon'ble Members of Parliamentary Standing Committee of Rajya Sabha on Ministry of Education in a meeting held on 25.02.2022 about falling number of students in Architecture course.

The major factors affecting low admissions in Architecture course are found to be as under:

- (a) Higher/ longer duration of course,
- (b) High Cost of the Course,
- (c) Less Employment opportunities and low pay scales to fresh graduates,
- (d) Practice of architecture by non-architects after SC Judgement
- (e) Eligibility criteria of 50% marks in PCM at 10+2 level for admission to B.Arch.

The President requested the nominee of the Central Government on the Council Ms. Saumya Gupta, Joint Secretary (NITs), Ministry of Education, Government of India to put forth her views in the matter.

She stated that that admission to the all CFTIs are done through Central Seat Allocation Board (CSAB) on the basis of merit of JEE examination conducted by the NTA which employs negative marking in evaluation and follow percentile based ranking system for drawing merit of students and hence they be exempted by the Council from the mandatory requirement of passing NATA for admission to the B.Arch. Course and the admission to all other institutions including those under State Governments in various States/ UTs be carried out on the basis of NATA only.

She also stated that as per COA (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020 a weightage of 50% marks in qualifying examination and 50% in Aptitude Test in Architecture is to be given for admission into B.Arch Course. She requested that admissions in B.Arch course should be carried out based on merit exclusively drawn on the performance in Aptitude Test as standards of various Boards/ authorities conducting qualifying examinations in the Country are not same and cannot be considered at par.

The Members appreciated the concerns expressed by the nominee of the Central Government and noted that there is no cut-off passing marks in JEE exams which is contrary to the Council's norms and requested that the Central Government may examine the same. The members reiterated that NATA was introduced by the Council as a single window national level aptitude test to avoid hardships being caused to students all over the country in applying for multiple aptitude tests conducted by various state governments/ schools/ institutions of architecture for admission in B.Arch Course and also to ensure that uniform standards are followed to measure the aptitude of candidates.

The Council also noted that since admission to B.Arch Course at CFTIs are done through Central Seat Allocation Board (CSAB) on the basis of merit of JEE Paper-2 examination, therefore, CFTIs could be exempted from the mandatory

requirement of passing NATA for admission to the B.Arch. Course. However, admissions into B.Arch Course at all other institutions including those under State Governments/UTs must be carried out on the basis of NATA conducted by the Council.

The members also perused the report of the Sub-Committee on Review of Eligibility for Admission to B.Arch. Course consisting of Ar. Abhay Purohit as Convenor, Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal, Member, Ar. A. R. Ramanathan, Member and Ar. Arunabha Dasgupta, member, which recommended for doing away with the requirement of having mandatory science subjects i.e. PCM at 10+2/ 10+3 Diploma level for admission to B.Arch course, and conducting of Bridge courses of relevant subjects by Institutions/ Universities during First year of B.Arch Course, in line with NEP 2020 which envisages that there should be no hard separations between arts and sciences, between curricular and extra-curricular activities, between vocational and academic streams, etc. in order to eliminate harmful hierarchies among, and silos between different areas of learning:

The Members after having detailed deliberations in the matter resolved as under:

Resolution No.:544

Resolved that :

- (1) Regulation 4(1), (2), (3) and Clause (2) of Appendix-D of Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020 be amended as under:

- a. 4(1): No candidate shall be admitted to Architecture programme unless he/she has passed an examination at the end of the 10+2 scheme of examination or equivalent with at least 50 percent marks in aggregate or passed 10+3 Diploma Examination with at least 50 percent marks in aggregate.

Provided that all candidates admitted to the programme shall successfully qualify bridge course in Humanities and the candidates who have not studied Physics and Mathematics at 10+2 level or 10+3 Diploma level, are required to successfully qualify bridge courses in Mathematics and Physics, as the case may be, to be conducted by the Institutions/ Universities/ competent authority during the first year of the programme.

The syllabus for the Bridge Courses shall be as prescribed at Appendix-A1:

- b. 4(2) : The candidate needs to qualify an Aptitude Test in Architecture conducted by the Council complying with the Admission Norms prescribed in Appendix-D and in case of admissions in Centrally Funded Technical Institutions (CFTIs), an Aptitude test conducted by the competent authority of Central Government as per norms of the Council.
- c. 4(3) : The admission to B.Arch. course shall be made purely on merit drawn on the basis of marks/ percentile scored by candidates in Aptitude test in Architecture.

- d. Appendix-D (2) : Admission shall not be made under any quota whatsoever, including the Central Government Nominee or Minority Institution or Management or Non-Resident Indian or Persons of Indian Origin or Foreign National or any other quota, unless a candidate has passed an Aptitude Test in Architecture conducted by the Council or in case of Centrally Funded Technical Institutions (CFTIs), an aptitude test conducted by the competent authority of Central Government.

2. Insert Appendix A1 before Appendix B as under:

Appendix-A1

1. MATHEMATICS - 40 Hours duration

A preparatory program aimed imparting necessary knowledge, skills and competence to study Architectural courses which have a mathematical component. The content is based on current CBSE XI & XII standard schooling curriculum for Mathematics.

Program Content:

1. Limits and Derivates

Derivative introduced as rate of change both as that of distance function and geometrically. Applications of derivatives: rate of change, increasing/decreasing functions, tangents & normal, approximation, maxima and minima

2. Integrals

Integration as inverse process of differentiation. Basic properties of definite integrals and evaluation of definite integrals. Applications in finding the area under simple curves.

3. Differential Equations

Definition, order and degree, general and particular solutions of a differential equation.

4. Vectors and Three-Dimensional Geometry

Vectors and scalars, magnitude and direction of a vector. Direction cosines/ratios of vectors. Types of vectors, components of a vector, addition of vectors, multiplication of a vector by a scalar, position vector of a point dividing a line segment in a given ratio.

2. PHYSICS - 40 Hours duration

A preparatory program aimed imparting necessary knowledge, skills and competence to study advance elective Architectural courses which are based on complex physics. The content is based on current CBSE XI & XII standard schooling curriculum for Physics.

Program Content:

1. Properties of Bulk Matter

Stress-strain relationship, Hooke's law, Young's modulus, bulk modulus

Pressure due to a fluid column; Pascal's law and its applications
Viscosity, Stokes' law, terminal velocity, streamline and turbulent flow, critical velocity, Bernoulli's theorem and its applications.
Heat, temperature, thermal expansion; thermal expansion of solids, liquids, and gases. Heat transfer – conduction and thermal conductivity, convection and radiation. Newton's law of cooling and Stefan's law.

2. Thermodynamics

Thermal equilibrium and definition of temperature (zeroth law of Thermodynamics). Heat, work and internal energy. The first law of thermodynamics. Isothermal and adiabatic processes. The second law of thermodynamics: Reversible and irreversible processes. Heat engines and refrigerators.

3. Statics and Dynamics

Elementary concepts of differentiation and integration for describing motion, uniform and non- uniform motion, average speed and instantaneous velocity.

Intuitive concept of force, Inertia, Newton's first law of motion; momentum and Newton's second law of motion; impulse; Newton's third law of motion. Law of conservation of linear momentum and its applications.

Equilibrium of concurrent forces, Static and kinetic friction, laws of friction, rolling friction, lubrication.

Dynamics of uniform circular motion: Centripetal force, examples of circular motion

3.HUMANITIES- 50 Hours duration

A preparatory program is aimed at introducing Humanities to students of Architecture. The content is based on current CBSE XI & XII standard schooling curriculum.

Program Content:

1. World History

Early societies from beginning of time till 3rd millennium BCE;
Empires- Roman; Central Islamic Lands; changes in Europe from

	13th -17th century; America 15th -18th century; Industrial Revolution 2. Indian History First Cities; Medieval Society; Central Asian Influences; Mughal Society; Colonialism and Indian Towns; Nationalist Movement; Independence and new nation state. 3. The Earth Origin and evolution of the earth; interior of the earth; Wegener's continental drift theory and plate tectonics; earthquakes and volcanoes: causes, types and effects 4. Climate Atmosphere composition and structure; elements of weather and climate; insolation; heat budget of the earth; factors controlling temperature; distribution of temperature; pressure belts; winds; precipitation; rainfall; use of weather charts 5. Statistics Collection of data - sources of data; how basic data is collected with concepts of Sampling; methods of collecting data; meaning and types of variables; frequency distribution; Presentation of Data: Tabular Presentation and Diagrammatic Presentation of Data 6. English A preparatory program is aimed at improving Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing skills. The content is based on current CBSE XI & XII standard schooling curriculum for English. Reading Comprehension: Conceptual understanding, decoding, Analyzing, inferring, interpreting, appreciating, literary, conventions and vocabulary, summarizing and using appropriate format/s. Creative Writing Skills: Conceptual Understanding, application of rules, Analysis, Reasoning, appropriate style and tone, using appropriate format and fluency, inference, analysis, evaluation and creativity. Listening and Speaking Skills: Listen to oration, extract relevant information, develop public speaking skills. (3) Insert Note 8 in Appendix-B as under: 8. Adequate faculty, as may be prescribed by the Council, shall be appointed by the institution/university/competent authority for conducting bridge courses for students in Humanities, Physics and Mathematics during the first year of the B.Arch. programme. (4) The above amendments be submitted to the Central Government for their approval in terms of Section 45 (2) of the Architects Act, 1973.
--	--

	(5) After approval of the amendments in Regulations by the Central Government the same be notified in the Gazette of India.
ITEM NO.07	TO CONSIDER APPROVING THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2022-23.
	The President informed the members that the Executive Committee in its 235th meeting held 02.12.2021 approved the Academic Calendar for the Academic Session 2022-2023 for grant of approval/ extension of approval to Architectural Institutions as per the Minimum Standards prescribed the Council. He further informed that in view of Covid-19 Pandemic and on receipt of representations from architectural institutions the academic calendar was revised by him. The Council approved the Revised Academic Calendar as annexed with the agenda.
ITEM NO.08	TO TAKE NOTE OF PROGRESS MADE FOR CARRYING OUT INTERIOR WORK AT COA OFFICE AT NBCC PLACE, OKHLA, NEW DELHI.
	The President informed the members that the interior work of Council office space at NBCC Okhla is being carried out by M/s. NCI Global Infratech, New Delhi and the same is expected to be completed by end of May 2022. The members deliberated in the matter and desired that the work be completed at the earliest.
ITEM NO.09	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE PROGRESS MADE FOR CARRYING INTERIOR WORK AT COA OFFICE AT I.H.C. NEW DELHI.
	The President informed the members that the interior work of Council office at India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi, is being carried out by M/s. A.B. Systems Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi and the same is expected to be completed by end of May 2022. The members deliberated in the matter and desired that the work be completed at the earliest.
ITEM NO.10	PROGRESS MADE FOR PUBLICATION OF MANUAL OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE.
	The President informed the members that Manual of Architectural Practice as approved by the Council in its last meeting held on 28th & 29th August 2021, has been finalized in 5 volumes. The Council decided to print 10000 copies of the Manual out of which 5000 copies in the first lot and remaining 5000 copies to be procured in second lot within a period of six months. The Council also decided that the cost of Manual should be fixed at no margin basis. The members deliberated in the matter and decided that all the Council members, all the Chief Secretaries of all the State Governments and all Architectural Institutions in the country be provided one complimentary copy of the manual. The Members also suggested that the Manual be made available for procurement on GEM portal so that Government Departments can procure the same from GEM

	portal. The members also suggested that in order to spread awareness about the Manual one workshop should be conducted in each State.					
ITEM NO.11	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT/ RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE IN RESPECT OF COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO IT.					
	The Disciplinary Committee upon conduct of detailed inquiry has submitted its Report(s) in respect of the following cases, in terms of Council of Architecture Rules, 1973:					
	<table><tr><th>S.No.</th><th>Complaint No.</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>CA/DC/463 - Shri Rameshwar Maniyar, Pune against Ar. Hrishikesh Kulkarni, Pune</td></tr></table>	S.No.	Complaint No.	1.	CA/DC/463 - Shri Rameshwar Maniyar, Pune against Ar. Hrishikesh Kulkarni, Pune	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant is that he was working for M/s. Landscape Realty for their project(s) located in Pune. The Respondent Architect (Ar. Hrishikesh Kulkarni) accepted the consultancy for the project without his NOC and full and final settlement of his fees by the client. It was also submitted that the Complainant resigned from the project because the developer indulged in illegal construction. The Respondent Architect submitted that he was appointed by the developer after the termination of the services of the Complainant on 29.11.2016 and he took up the project on 07.02.2017. The Respondent further submitted that he received an email dated 02.05.2017 from the Complainant and the same was replied by him on 09.05.2017. Thereafter, there was no communication from the Complainant for about 7-8 months and the Respondent continued with the project in good faith. The Respondent also submitted that the Complainant has made several court cases for concerned project(s) and no relief has been granted to him. The Disciplinary Committee, after considering the Complaint, Statement Defence and submissions made before it, recommended that no case for violation of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989 has been made out against the Respondent Architect. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.
S.No.	Complaint No.					
1.	CA/DC/463 - Shri Rameshwar Maniyar, Pune against Ar. Hrishikesh Kulkarni, Pune					

		Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
2.	CA/DC/475- Shri Venkateshwar Singh, Lucknow against Ar. Rajnish Agarwal & Aekta Agarwal, Lucknow	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect is that he was carrying out the construction of the building in his immediate neighborhood which was having basement and due to construction activity and digging work his house got structurally damaged such as cracks in boundary wall, sinking of pillar resulting in damage to water pipes, cracks on roof on 2nd floor, crack in the granite top of 1st floor kitchen, cracks in ground floor and 2nd floor and crack in front elevation of his house. The Respondent Architect left the basement retaining wall incomplete due to which rain water affected his house foundation. The Complainant also informed that Lucknow Development Authority sealed the site and work was stopped. However, the Respondent Architect along with owner broke the Government seal and casted two more slabs. He further stated that the sealing notice issued by the Lucknow Development Authority also bears the name of the Respondent Architect. Because of the negligence of the Respondent Architect, he has suffered a lot. The actions of the Respondent Architect have disturbed his life and requested that appropriate action be taken against the Respondent Architect. The Response of the Respondent Architects is that he has no role in this case. He stated that the building was constructed by one Mr. D.K. Yadav who is neighbor of the Complainant. He further stated that initially he was engaged for preparation of plan by Mr. D.K. Yadav. However, the Lucknow Development Authority did not approve the building plans. After rejection of plans by the Lucknow Development Authority he was not connected with project. The Respondent also submitted that the construction carried by Mr. D.K. Yadav was different from the drawing submitted by him. He merely tried to resolve the disputes between Mr. DK Yadav and the Complainant.

		The Respondent also stated that there is no structural damage in the building. Corrosion occurred because the building is 25-30 years old. There is no contract between him and the Complainant and or between him and Mr. D.K. Yadav, neighbor of the Complainant. Hence, no complaint for professional misconduct can be made against him. The Disciplinary Committee, after examining the complaint, statement of defence and the submissions made before it, recommended that it is a dispute between two neighbors and the Respondent Architect has been unnecessarily dragged in this matter and no case of Professional Misconduct is made out against the Respondent Architects. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architects have not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
3.	CA/DC/476 - Ar. Ramesh Tepan, Pune against Ar. Suhani Lal, Pune	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complainant was appointed for the project of M/s. Baney Construction company, Pune, for a residential building. The Respondent Architect later worked on the same project and used drawings and designs of the Complainant. The services of the Complainant were not terminated by the construction company and the Respondent Architect took up the project without NOC of the Complainant. Thus, it is alleged by the Complainant that Respondent has committed Professional Misconduct. The Complainant further stated that till this date he has not received any termination letter from the client. The Response of the Respondent Architect is that she was approached by the client in the year 2013 for the project. She took up the project on the understanding given by her client that the developer/construction company has long back terminated the services of the previous Architect.

		While she took up the project in the year 2013, she received a letter from the Complainant in the year 2018. On receipt of the letter from the Complainant, she immediately stopped working for the project. The Respondent also rendered her unconditional apology to the Complainant during the hearing of Disciplinary Committee for inconvenience, if any, caused to him. The Disciplinary Committee after examining the Complaint, Statement of Defence and submissions made before it recommended that no case of violation of Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulation 1989, is made out in the present case and recommended that the Complaint be dismissed. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
4.	CA/DC/497- Shri Sunil Premchand Jain, Pune against Ar. Rameshwar Maniyar, Pune	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the complaint of the complainant is that the Respondent Architect was appointed by them for providing his Services for their projects. However, after some time he revised his fees without proper justification and put the Complainant to several inconveniences. The Respondent filed several complaints before different forums to harass them and misused the project records/ documents, available to him in trust as a professional, by making complaints against Complainant. The Complainant was compelled to spend huge amount on the litigations filed by the Respondent. The Complainant has paid the entire fees as due to Respondent. The reply of the Respondent is that the complaint is about non-grant of NOC by him to the Complainant for changing the architect. He further stated that the complainant did not pay the

		full fees as due to him hence he did not grant NOC. The Complainant also stated that there was nothing wrong in the complaints made by him. It was his duty to point out the illegalities/unauthorized construction being made by complainant as a responsible Professional to avoid any legal consequences. The Complaint is mainly about the professional charges and not about any other aspect. The Disciplinary Committee after examining, the complaint, statement of defence and submissions made by the parties, recommended that no case for violation of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989 has been made out against the Respondent Architect. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
5.	CA/DC/429- Ar. D.T. Vinod Kr., Secunderabad against Ar. Vilas Avachat & Ar. Vijay Kapse, Mumbai	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Respondent Architects undertaken inspection of a College in Hyderabad and as per the Complainant inspection report had following discrepancies: i. Duration of lease deed as 10 years and not 30 years as stated in inspected report. ii. Year of Commencement of Institution 2011 but Rent Agreement was executed only in December 2012. iii. Institution did not have independent building as stated in its application but had shared building. iv. Faculty strength and status of Head Institution. v. Institution was not affiliated to Acharya Nagaarjuna University as stated in Application form but affiliated to JNAFAU. vi. The Institution type mentioned in application was "Government" but actually it was a private Institution.

			vii. On the Survey no. 132/16, Vattinagulapalli Village, application for regularization of building under Building Penalization scheme, filed by Sridevi Education Society SWE Eng College, was rejected, hence building not approved. The response of the Respondent Architects is that the land ownership documents of the architectural institution(s) are not supposed to be checked by the architects/inspectors. If such responsibility is imposed on the architect nobody would go for inspections conducted by the Council of Architecture. The land documents and other ownership record should be checked by an advocate. They further submitted that the first land lease of the Institution was for the 10 years and second lease document provides for an option for lease for 20 years. There was no discrepancy on the same. The Institution also had 2 Acres land in its favor. The building inspected by them was approved by the competent authority and the complaint is purely with the malafide intentions and with ulterior motives and to disturb the reputation of the Respondents. The COA had already approved the Institution. Further, in the 75th meeting of the Council it was decided that verification of land documents shall not be the responsibility of the inspectors/architects appointed by the Council but the same shall be verified by an advocate. The Disciplinary Committee, therefore, recommended that no case for violation of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989 has been made out against the Respondent Architects. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
--	--	--	---

	6.	CA/DC/473 – Shri Mohan HiruKaranje, Mumbai against Ar. Pulkit B.S. Gupta, Navi Mumbai	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the complaint against the Respondent Architect is that he submitted a wrong completion certificate and supervision report to the Town Planning Department of New Mumbai Municipal Corporation. Revised Actual Completion Certificate has not been submitted till date. The approved building plan and Architect's completion certificate plan are totally different. In the Architect's completion plan a water tank is shown on the back side whereas there is no such water tank in actual in the whole building and several other discrepancies. The Response of the Respondent Architect is that initially Ar. Amrish Goel (his maternal uncle) was appointed and after his death he was engaged for completion of the project. Thereafter, with full knowledge of the society committee and as per Navi Mumbai Municipal Corporation approved drawing, application for occupation certificate was made with due diligence. He further submitted that he is not practicing now-a-days and the Complainant can take NOC from him and appoint any other architect for the services required by them. The respondent later on also issued NOC to the Complainant for appointment of another architect, if required, for any other services to be availed by the Complainant. The Disciplinary Committee after examining the complaint, statement of defence and submissions made before it recommended that no case of violation of Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989 is made out against the Respondent Architect. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
	7.	CA/DC/495 – Shri Harrish K.	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that Complaint

		Bajaj, Delhi against Ar. Deshbandhu, Ghaziabad	of the Complainant is that the Respondent Architect has changed the dimensions of the property in the plan submitting by him for approval of the industrial property located at A-29, G.T. Karnal Road, Delhi. Thus, the Respondent Architect has committed professional misconduct by giving fudged dimensions. Reply of the Respondent Architect is that the signatures on the building plans are not his signature and somebody must have forged and submitted the drawings for approvals and he is not associated with project in any way. The Respondent Architect categorically stated that the Complaint is frivolous, concocted and deceitful. The alleged fudged dimensions do not bear his actual signatures and are forged signatures. He also pointed out that neither the current owner nor the Complainant have ever approached him or his office for preparation of alleged drawing. He has also submitted a copy of the Handwriting expert, the Complaint made to Police Authorities for registration of FIR and also a Complaint made before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad on 24.11.2021 for registration of an FIR under section 156(3) of CRPC for the same. The Disciplinary Committee after examination of the Complaint, Statement of Defence and submissions of the parties recommended that no case of violation of Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989 is made out against the Respondent Architect. The Council after deliberations accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that the Complaint be dismissed as the Respondent Architect has not violated the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
8.		CA/DC/344-Shri Rajesh Kumar, Secretary, LSG Dept., Govt. of Kerala against Ar. Lathika I.	The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the complaint of the Complainant is that the Respondent was not competent to prepare drawings/proposal for buildings having height

		Nair, Thiruvananthapuram	more than 11 meters and sign Structural Safety Certificate of the building. According to Kerala Municipal Corporation Building Rules, the structural safety certificate is to be signed by a Structural Engineer. The person who is signing the application form is responsible for the supervision and construction of building. The Respondent Architect has signed the application for addition and alteration. The structural safety certificate that was submitted was beyond her competence. The Response of the Respondent Architect is that she submitted application for additions and alterations and issued Structural Safety Certificate on the basis of the Structural Safety Certificate issued by a Structural Engineer on behalf of her firm M/s. Kumar Group. Further, it is not confirmed whether the building collapsed due to structural failure or poor building material used in construction of building. She signed the Structural safety report as an employee of the firm M/s. Kumar Group. The Disciplinary Committee noted that the application form prescribed by the Thiruvananthapuram Corporation provides for signature of registered Architect/ Engineer/ Town Planner/ Supervisor. The Signature of the Structural Engineer are not mentioned or stated anywhere in the form. As the plot size was more than 500 sq. mt. as per Kerala Municipality Building Rules an Architect was competent to submit building plans for additions/alternation of the building. The Competency of Architect in terms of preparation of Building plans is different and competency of Structural Engineer for issuing Structural Safety Certificate is different. The Committee found that that the applicant had submitted all floor plans (Ground+First+Second and third floor). However, as per record permission was granted for alteration at Ground Floor and First Floor. Further, after approval of building Plans M/s. Kumar Group or the Respondent Architect were not in picture and the work was done through some other agency. The owner/promoter has appointed a firm (M/s. Ideal Construction, Nagercoil) as per the Enquiry Report submitted by the Complainant.
--	--	-------------------------------------	---

			Thus, the Respondent Architect is not involved directly or indirectly for the floor where during alteration mishap had happened as the Construction/Supervision work was carried out by M/s. Ideal Construction, Nagercoil and not by M/s. Kumar Group where Respondent Architect was employed. However, the Respondent Architect should have pointed out to the concerned local authority that she was no longer connected with the project which was her mistake. The Committee thus found her guilty of professional misconduct of violating Regulation 2(1)(x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989. The Council after deliberations in the matter accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that both the Complainant and Respondent Architect be summoned to appear before the Council in its next meeting to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act. Further, a copy of the report of Disciplinary Committee be provided to both the parties. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
9.	CA/DC/499 – Shri Sanjay Singh, New Delhi against Ar. Bela Godha, Bhopal		The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that complaint of the Complainant is that the MPPWD follows the norms of COA in appointment of Architects. The Respondent Architect should have followed the code of conduct prescribed by the Council. She was fully aware that all the project drawings were in the name ARCOP and ARCOP was the project architect. However, she knowing fully that an existing architect is working on the project, took up the project and violated the Council norms. The Complainant also stated that he specifically pointed out to the Respondent Architect that he was Architect on record of the project. However, the Respondent did not respond to his communications and also did not disassociate from the project. She continued to work on the project and violated his copyright by using the drawings and plans submitted by him.

			The Response of the Respondent Architect is that the MPPWD has issued a letter dated 05.04.2018 stating that the project is now being handled by the department itself. A copy of this communication was also marked to ARCOP and ARCOP failed to counter such communication and object to the same. She was appointed only for providing DPR services. Thus, she has not committed any misconduct and has rendered services as DPR Consultant and not as an Architect of the project. The Disciplinary Committee found that the Respondent Architect after receipt of the communication from the Complainant that he was architect of the project should have brought the same to the notice of MPPWD/PIU as well as the Complainant that she is only DPR Consultant and not Architect of the project, as a co-professional which she failed to do and did not reply to the communication of the Complainant. Thus, the Committee found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct for violating Regulation 2(1)(x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989. The Council after deliberations in the matter accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that both the Complainant and Respondent Architect be summoned to appear before the Council in its next meeting to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act. Further, a copy of the report of Disciplinary Committee be provided to both the parties. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.
ITEM NO.12	TO HEAR THE FOLLOWING ARCHITECT FOUND GUILTY OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT BY THE COUNCIL.		
	1. CA/DC/450 - Shri Vipin Jain, Madhya Pradesh Vs. Ar. Arun Singh Rajput, Madhya Pradesh:		
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 75th Meeting held on 28th and 29th August, 2021, considered the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided to summon the Complainant and Respondent Architect in its next meeting in order to provide an opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972, before deciding the Complaint. Both the Complainant and Respondent Architect were summoned to appear before the Council online.		

Accordingly, the Complainant as well as the Respondent Architect along with his advocate appeared before the Full Council. The President first requested the Complainant to briefly state his complaint.

The Complainant submitted that he is an Electric Contractor and works for various clients including banks. In the present case, he carried out the work for Punjab National Bank and Bank authorized the Respondent Architect to verify the work of the Complainant and recommend for payment.

The Respondent Architect demanded bribe from him for recommending payment his bills to Punjab National Bank for making payment. The Complainant being a law-abiding citizen reported the matter to CBI and the CBI after registering FIR and carrying out necessary formalities and preliminary investigation asked him to give bribe to Respondent Architect in the currency notes supplied by them. Thereafter, the Respondent Architect was caught red handed along with the bribe amount.

Thus, the Respondent Architect has not acted in a fair manner and violated the code of conduct prescribed by the Council. He requested the Council to take strict action against the Respondent Architect.

The President, thereafter, requested the Respondent Architect to submit his defence in the matter.

The Respondent Architects submitted that the Disciplinary Committee has wrongly found him guilty of Professional Misconduct. He stated that the work was completed on 6th April, 2015, he approved the bills of the Complainant on 7th April, 2015 and on 9th April, 2015 the CBI arrested him. There was no occasion for the Complainant to involve CBI in this matter.

The Respondent further stated that he has worked with the Complainant on many projects and in case the Complainant was facing any problem he should have made the complaint to the bank. The complainant has not given any information to the bank about demand of any money by him.

Further, the advocate representing the Respondent Architect stated that the complaint about demand of bribe should have given to the bank or to the local police and not to the CBI. The Complainant has manipulated the CBI and the Respondent Architect was wrongly trapped.

He further stated that the money kept on the table by some person is not a bribe. Further, the CBI court has disposed of the case. Hence, the Respondent Architect cannot be found guilty of Professional Misconduct.

He also submitted that unless an evidence is proved before court after examination and cross examination, it has no evidentially value and in present case no such exercise has been taken as the CBI Court has closed the case. The complainant is totally lying.

Thereafter, the Council members asked the Respondent Architect whether an amount of Rs. 12,000/- was received by him from the Complainant. The Respondent Architect admitted the same and stated that it was not a bribe. However, he could not state the purpose of money.

	The Council Members also noted that the during investigation by the Disciplinary Committee also the Respondent Architect admitted that he received a sum of Rs. 12,000/- from the Complainant. Further, he could not provide any justification for which purpose the amount has been received by him from the Complainant. The Council Members also perused the letter dated 27.10.2016 of Superintendent of Police, CBI, Bhopal, to Regional Director, RBI, Bhopal stating that the Respondent Architect demanded bribe form the Complainant and he should be black listed from all works of the banks. Similarly, a letter dated 27.10.2016 was also sent by SP, CBI, Bhopal, to Circle Head, Punjab National Bank in the matter for black listing the Respondent Architect. The Council noted that taking bribe for passing the bills of contractors by the Respondent Architect is a serious matter affecting the integrity and reputation of Architectural profession and bringing the architects into disrepute. The Council members deliberated in detail and after going through the Complaint, Statement of Defence and Report of Disciplinary Committee and considering the submissions made by the both the parties found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct. The Council informed the Respondent Architect that he has been found guilty of violation of Regulation 2(1) (viii) & (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council further granted the Respondent Architects an opportunity to make his submissions on quantum of punishment before any punishment is announced. The Respondent Architect submitted that he is honestly working from the last 15 years and he should not be given any harsh punishment. He may be warned. The Council deliberated in the matter and after detailed deliberation Ordered as under : 1. The Respondent Architect is suspended from practice as an Architect for a period of 2 years. 2. The Respondent Architect shall surrender the COA Registration Certificate within 30 days and his punishment shall start after surrender of the Certificate in the Council office. 3. A copy of the order of the Council be provided to Local bodies and CBI Bhopal.
ITEM NO.13	TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC, GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND ARCHITECTS.

The Sections 22 and 30 of the Architects Act provide for filing of Complaints for Professional Misconduct against Architects with the Council. Accordingly, the Registrar-Secretary has received several Complaints and the same were dealt with as per procedure laid down under Council of Architecture Rules, 1973.

The Council perused all the Complaints together with the Statement of Defence received from Respondent Architects as placed in the agenda. The Council after considering the complaints together with the Statement of Defence and Preliminary Report received from the Council members to whom the respective complaints were referred, unanimously passed the following Resolution:

Resolution No.: 545

Resolved that:

1. **CA/DC/526** - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Dhanesh Kumar PS, Kochi against Ar. Shini MaryRajan, Kochi, the Council noted that the complaint is about the Respondent Architect not informing the Complainant about estimates of Architect's fees for the project and also submitting exorbitant bills and terminating the contract without amicably settling dispute.

In the Statement of Defence, the Respondent Architect submitted that the Complainant was fully aware of the fees structure/professional fees of the Respondent and never demanded any fees estimate as part of the contract. Further, revision in building plans at the instance of Complainant has resulted in the increase of area and cost of project. The Respondent Architect also submitted that there is no deficiency in the services on their part and the Complainant never pointed out any deficiency in services to them at any point of time.

The Council deliberated in the matter and noted that the matter relates to payment of fees by the Complainant (client) to the Respondent Architect and no case of deficiency/negligence is made out against the Respondent Architect.

The Council, therefore, opined that there is no prima facie case of alleged professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the Complaint.

Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.

2. **CA/DC/527** -With regard to the Complaint filed by Shri Prasanna S. Chamankar, Architect, Mumbai against Ar. Shirish Sukhatme, Mumbai, the Council noted that the matter is sub-judice and a similar complaint filed by Mr. Sandeep Toraskar, Mumbai, against the same Respondent Architect have been kept in abeyance on this ground.

The Council, therefore, decided that this complaint be kept in abeyance till such time the matter is decided by the Court of Law.

Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.

3. **CA/DC/528** - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Sanjeev Thakur, Mumbai against Ar. Pratik Bhawe, Mumbai, the Council noted that the complaint against Respondent Architect is that he failed to communicate with the Complainant that his Building proposal was rejected by BMC. Though the Respondent Architect promised that he would get the IOD of building certificate by June 2021 but nothing was done. The Complainant also alleged that due to the failure of the Respondent Architect to communicate the approval status, the project got delayed for more than 2 years and resulted in financial losses and loss of reputation.

The Respondent Architect in his defence has submitted that he was engaged by the client for site survey, design of layout for bungalow scheme, preparing working drawing and site execution and RCC Design and Consultation. He further submitted that the complainant has no authority to lodge the complaint since he is merely a power attorney holder of the owner. The owner appointed him and made no complaint about any deficiency in his services.

The Council deliberated in the matter and opined that no case of alleged professional misconduct is made out against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the complaint.

Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.

4. **CA/DC/459** - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri S. R. Mahajan, AE (BP), MCGM, Mumbai against Ar. Ashok T. Damani, the Council noted that the complaint is that the Respondent Architect in spite of repeated warnings and submission of apology to the Municipal Corporation allowed the construction of building in violation of approved plan and failed to inform the Municipal Corporation Greater Mumbai about the same.

The Respondent Architect tendered his unconditional apology to the Council for not informing the Executive Engineer, MCGM about the slight deviation in the building plan.

He further submitted that the entire thing happened because of circumstances beyond his control and he could not comply with requirement of IOD and CC as issued by the Municipal Corporation. He submitted that the Municipal Corporation on submission of his apology has granted concession in the Occupation Certificate and regularized the construction.

The Council opined that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect as the building has already been regularized by the competent authority of the complainant (Municipal Corporation) and decided that the complaint be dismissed.

Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.

ITEM NO.14	TO CONSIDER THE LIST OF COMPLAINT CASES KEPT IN ABEYANCE IN TERMS OF THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that several complaints for professional misconduct have been kept in abeyance from a long time. One of the complainant, namely Shri Harrish Bajaj, has been pressing for disposal of his complaint. The Council held detailed deliberations and observed that all such complaints be reviewed and for the purpose decided as under : (i) The Registrar-Secretary shall seek updated information/ status of court cases from the concerned Complainant and Respondent Architects. (ii) The President, COA, would constitute a committee which will examine each of such complaints and make its observation whether the complaint is directly linked with the court case in question and if yes, the concerned complaint would continue to be kept in abeyance till the time court cases is decided. (iii) If a complaint is not directly be related with the complaint of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect(s), then the Council would take further action on such complaint(s).
ITEM NO.15	TO RATIFY THE CONSTITUTION OF FOLLOWING COMMITTEE(S) CONSTITUTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & PRESIDENT, COA, RESPECTIVELY:
	The President informed the members that the Executive Committee and the President, COA looking at the urgency of the work and in order to carry out the objectives of the Architects Act, 1972 has constituted/ re-constituted several Committees. The details of the Committees are as under: Since the last meeting of the Council, following Committee(s) were constituted/ re-constituted: i. CONSTITUTION OF PUBLICATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE The President, Council of Architecture has constituted a Committee on 18th October, 2021 to encourage the publication, distribution of books/ published material to promote the growth and understanding of architecture with Ar.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Ar.Ranee Vedamuthu, Special Invitee, Ar.Neelkanth Chhaya, Special Invitee, Ar.Jaymini N Mehta, Special Invitee, Ar.Durganand Balsavar, Special Invitee, Ar.A. Srivathsan, Special Invitee, Ar.Gauri Shiurkar, Special Invitee, Ar.Jayashree Deshpande, Director COA TRC, Pune & Member Secretary and Ar.Navneet Munoth, Hon.Director TRC Bhopal and Special Invitee. ii. NATA-2022 COORDINATION COMMITTEE NATA 2022 Co-ordination Committee is constituted under the Convenorship of Dr. Ranee Vedamuthu, Ar. Sapna, Co-Convenor, Ar. Abhay Purohit, Member, Ar. Ramesh Kumar, Member, Ar. Shirish G. Sukhatme, Special Invitee and Ar. Ajay Kulkarni, Special Invitee.

The Committee is constituted to prepare monitor and co-ordinate the conduct of NATA 2022 examination: finalization of NATA Brochure; to decide time frame of exams; to decide on number of centers in India and abroad; to lay down criteria for selection of questions setters, appoint questions setters, moderation of questions, supervision of evaluation, moderation of evaluation; Declaration of results etc.

iii. INSPECTION REFORMS COMMITTEE TO SUGGEST CHANGES/ REVISIONS IN THE APPLICATIONS FORMS AND THE ASSESSMENT REPORTS FOR INSTITUTIONS.

The Committee was constituted under the Convenorship of Prof. Abhay Purohit, Convenor, Prof. Pushkar M Kanvinde, Special Invitee, Prof. Milind Kollegal, Special Invitee, Prof. Anupama Sharma, Special Invitee, Prof. Radhika Nagpal, Special Invitee, Ar. Chirayu Bhatt, Special Invitee and Prof. Binumol Tom, Special Invitee.

The Committee is required to suggest revision in the procedure of inspections of institutions being followed by the Council and for updation of Application Forms and Assessment Reports to be used for approval process of institutions for B.Arch./M.Arch. courses.

iv. RE-CONSTITUTION/ MERGER OF SUB-COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE FOREIGN RECOGNIZED QUALIFICATIONS & COMMITTEE ON RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN QUALIFICATIONS, AS UNDER:

The President, Council of Architecture, has re-constituted/merged the sub-committee to examine foreign recognized qualifications and committee on recognition of foreign qualifications with Ar. Abhijit Shirodkar as Convenor and Ar. Chandan Parab, Member, Ar. Kavita Daryani Rao, Special Invitee, Ar. Pushkar Kanvinde, Special Invitee, Ar. Gyanender Singh, Special Invitee.

v. SUB-COMMITTEE ON WOMEN ARCHITECTS

Sub-Committee on Women Architects had been constituted by the Council to consider the issues concerning Women Architects and to suggest ways and means to address such issues and also to make recommendations for attracting more women to the profession of architecture. Ar. Gita Balakrishnan has been included as a Special Invitee in the Committee. The revised Committee comprises Ar. Sapna, Convenor, Ar. B.V. Satish, Member, Ar. Bapilu Chai, Member, Ar. Madhavi Desai, Special Invitee, Ar. Smita Khan, Special Invitee, Ar. Vidya Singh, Special Invitee, Ar. Gita Balakrishnan, Special Invitee.

vi. BOARD OF POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION

The Board of Postgraduate Education had been constituted to formulate norms and standards for imparting Master of Architecture by Architectural Institutions and also to formulate a mechanism/proposal for granting equivalence to Postgraduate qualification in Architecture/Allied fields by the Council. The Board is now reconstituted with Prof. Abhay Purohit, Convenor, and Dr. Kavita D Rao, Prof. Prabhjyot Kaur Sachdeva, Prof. Ujwala Shirish

Chakradeo, Dr.Aarti Grover, Dr.Jaffer AA Khan and Prof. Chakor Mehta, as Special Invitees.

vii. SUB-COMMITTEE TO PREPARE THE SYLLABUS AND COURSE CURRICULUM FOR CONDUCT OF THE TRAINING COURSE FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

As per COA (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, the Council of Architecture is required to conduct a threemonths faculty training course for all the faculty members before completion of their probation period.

The training period shall be treated as part of service of the concerned faculty in the concerned University or Institution.

The President, Council of Architecture has constituted a Committee on 08thSeptember, 2021 to prepare the syllabus and course curriculum for conduct of training courses for faculty members. The Committee comprises Prof.Habeeb Khan, President, COA, Chairman Ex Officio, Prof. Jayashree Deshpande, Convenor, Prof.Akhtar Chauhan, Member, Prof. S.M.Akhtar, Member, Prof. K.S.Ananthakrishna, Member and Prof. Ranees Vadamuthu, Member.

viii. SUB-COMMITTEE FOR GRANT OF SCHOLARSHIP

The Executive Committee in its 227th Meeting held on 09thApril, 2021 considered a proposal for grant of Scholarship by the Council to the needy EWS category students. The scheme is proposed for the benefit of needy students from EWS category who cannot afford the architectural education at undergraduate level.

Accordingly, a Committee was constituted to prepare the modalities including eligibility criteria, payment mode, selection of beneficiaries etc. and was placed before the Full Council at its 75th meeting held on August 28th& 29th, 2021 for approval.

The Council at the said meeting desired that the Central Government may be requested to communicate the same of its nominee on the Committee and also decided that a member from the north eastern states may be included on the Committee. Accordingly, the Committee has been reconstituted with Ar.Habeeb Khan, President, COA, Ar.Sapna, Vice-President, Shri Mrutyunjay Behera, E.A.,Ministry of Education, Govt of India,Member, Dr. P.S.N Rao, Director, SPA, Delhi, Member, Prof. Persi Engineer, First Provost Sarvajanic University, Govt. of India, Ar.C.R.Raju, Director, President IIA, Member, Ar.Jit Kumar Gupta, Member, Ar. Bansan Singh Thangkhiew, Member and Registrar CoA, Member-Secretary.

ix. SUB-COMMITTEE FOR REVISION OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR B. ARCH COURSE

The Committee was setup to consider for revision in the eligibility criteria for admission to B.Arch course; to study and examine the feasibility of incorporation of I.B. Diploma as one of the eligibility including the

requirement of having studies chemistry for admission to B.Arch. course; to work out a proposal in which Architecture as a subject in lieu of any other subject be given weightage/ incentive in admission to B.Arch Course; to study and review the syllabus prepared by the Council for "Architecture" as an elective subject at 10+2 level, with Ar.Abhay Purohit as Convenor, Ar.Ashutosh Kr. Agarwal, Member, Ar.A.R.Ramanathan, Special Invitee, Ar.Arunabha Dasgupta, Special Invitee.

The report of the Committee was considered by the full Council at its 75th meeting held on 28th& 29thAugust, 2021, the Council after going through the report, desired that the report be revised by incorporating bridge courses for humanity apart from mathematics and physics subjects. Further, the committee may be requested to suggest eligibility for B.Arch. course as per NEP recommendations.

Accordingly, the Committee was requested to revise its report in the matter. The Committee has submitted its report.

x. SUB-COMMITTEE FOR PRESCRIBING FEE STRUCTURE

The Committee was constituted to review and recommend fee structure of B.Arch. course being followed by the Institutions/ Universities in the country and make its report/ recommendations for regulating & formulating Fee Structure for B.Arch. course, which could be referred to and implemented by various Fee Regulatory Bodies and competent authorities in the States/UTs of the country. The Committee consists of Ar.Dr.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Ar.Prof. Abhay Purohit, Member, Ar.Prof.Abhijit Shirodkar, Member and Ar.Dr. P.S.N. Rao, Special Invitee.

The Committee was constituted on 04.02.2021 and held 03 meetings so far i.e. on 01.06.2021, 16.08.2021 and 17.01.2022. The Council in its 75th meeting held on 28th& 29thAugust, 2021 considered the report of the Committee and decided that the Committee may be requested to revise the report in view of deliberations held at the Council meeting and place the report for consideration at next meeting of the Council. The Committee has submitted its report.

xi. COMMITTEE TO FORMULATE MINIMUM STANDARDS CURRICULUM FOR 10+3 DIPLOMA COURSE IN ARCHITECTURE.

The Committee was constituted to frame the syllabus and minimum standards for imparting of Diploma Course in Architecture with Dr. Kavita D. Rao as Convenor, Ar.Pushkar M. Kanvinde, member and Dr. Vandana Sehgal as member.

The Council at its 75th meeting held on 28th& 29thAugust, 2021 considered the report submitted by the Committee. The Council after deliberations in the matter decided that the draft minimum standards with syllabus be circulated to diploma awarding institutions for their views/ comments.

Further, the Committee has been re-constituted with Dr.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Dr.Kavita D. Rao, Member and Ar.Pushkar M. Kanvinde, Member.

	xii. CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP THE CONTENT OF ALL THE MODULES OF THE 3 MONTHS FACULTY TRAINING COURSE. The President, Council of Architecture has constituted a Committee on 28.01.2022 to develop the content of all the Modules of the 3 Month Faculty Training Course as mandated by Minimum Standards 2020 with Ar.Habeeb Khan, President, Chairman Ex-Officio, Ar. Jayashree Deshpande, Convenor, Prof. K.S. Ananthakrishna, Special Invitee, Dr. Rama Subrahmanian, Bangalore, Special Invitee, Prof.Sapna Srinivasa, Special Invitee, Prof. Preety Shah, Special Invitee. xiii. SUB-COMMITTEE TO PREPARE COMPETITION DOSSIER FOR SELECTION OF ARCHITECT AND TO CONDUCT COMPETITION FOR TRC BUILDING AT BENGALURU. The President, COA constituted a Committee to prepare competition dossier and to conduct competition for CoA TRC office building at Bengaluru, consisting of Ar. Sapna, Vice-President, CoA as Convenor, Ar. Salil Ranadive, Member, Ar. Sandeep Shikre, Member, Ar. Prashant Sutaria, Member, Ar. Vidyadhar Wodeyar, Member, Ar. Ravindra Vasavada, Member and Ar. Bijal Parikh, Member. The terms of reference of the Committee is to prepare technical specifications of the site, to detail out and finalise the requirements of TRC Building, to suggest the type of competition to be conducted, to prepare the process for conduct of design Competition, to prepare Competition Dossier, to prepare the time line for conduct of Competition and selection of Architect and to conduct the competition and Jury. xiv. COMMITTEE TO STUDY INDIAN COOLING ACTION PLAN. The President, CoA constituted a committee to examine and study the Indian Cooling Action plan of Government of India and for incorporating the same in the syllabus of B.Arch and M.Arch Courses, consisting of Prof. Abhijit Shirdkar as Convenor, Dr. Minakshi Jain, Member and Ar. G. Srinivas Murthy, Member. The Committee was constituted on 08th November, 2021 and held 02 meetings i.e. on 09.12.2021 and 23.12.2021. The Council approved and ratified the decision taken by the President, COA, and the Executive Committee, respectively for constituting the above committees.
ITEM NO.16	MATTERS FOR INFORMATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.
I)	INSPECTION & APPROVAL PROCESS OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2021-2022.
	The Council noted the information as provided in the Agenda towards grant of approval to Architectural Institutions for imparting B.Arch/ M.Arch Course for the academic session 2021-22.

II)	ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda for notifying the vacancies in the Executive Committee and conduct of election by the Returning Officer appointed by the Central Government.
III)	CONDUCT OF NATIONAL APTITUDE TEST IN ARCHITECTURE (NATA) 2021.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda about the successful conduct of NATA 2021.
IV)	ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS ADMITTED BY ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda towards enrollment numbers issued by the Council to Students admitted by the Institutions into First year of B.Arch Degree Course for the academic sessions 2016-17 to 2020-21.
V)	SUPPLY OF INFORMATION UNDER THE RTI ACT.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
VI)	ACTION ON COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST QUACKS FOR MISUSE OF TITLE AND STYLE OF ARCHITECT.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
VII)	UPGRADATION OF THE WEBSITE OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
VIII)	PROGRESS MADE REGARDING RECOGNITION OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE EMPLOYEES CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND TRUST.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda and desired that all the formalities in this behalf may be completed at the earliest.
IX)	PUBLICATION OF BOOKS BY THE COUNCIL.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
X)	CONDUCT OF AWARD PROGRAMMES BY THE COUNCIL.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XI)	PROGRESS MADE REGARDING ALLOCATION OF LAND BY GOVT. OF KARNATAKA IN BANGALORE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda. The Council desired that the process for selection of architect by way of conduct of design competition be completed at the earliest.

XII)	INTRODUCTION OF E-OFFICE, TRC PORTAL, E- LIBRARY, API FOR VERIFICATION OF ARCHITECTS BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES, BY THE COUNCIL.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XIII)	AMENDMENTS IN THE RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTIONS RULES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XIV)	FILING OF CURATIVE PETITION BEFORE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA IN MUKESH GOYAL CASE JUDGEMENT.
	The President informed the members that the Council could not proceed with the filing of Curative Petition before Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in view of legal opinion of Shri Naveen R Nath, Senior Advocate, who advised as under : <i>"xxxx none of ground for filing a Curative Petition exists in respect of the judgement dated 01.09.2020. The judgement was passed after hearing the Council of Architecture also. The Court is entitled to take a view of the matter, in view of being ultimate interpreter of the law. The observations of the Court have been rendered in the context of a particular set of facts, in the present case relating to employment of architects under a public authority.</i> <i>The weight for consideration of a curative petition substantially rests also on the nature of certification given by the Senior Advocate who endorses the certificate of fitness. I do not find that any of the reputed Senior Advocates would grant such an endorsement, more so when none of the ingredients for a curative petition are satisfied in the present case.</i> <i>xxxx In these circumstances, I am of the view that it is advisable to raise the substantial issue in any other appropriate proceeding, when the occasion arises for court to consider the issue of exclusive practice of architecture by registered architects. Curative Petitions have to be filed with proper care, particularly when it is at the instance of a public authority or statutory body such as the COA. Any Petition which is seen not to conform to the standards expected of a curative petition by such bodies can also be counter - productive.</i> The Council perused the legal advise of Sr. Advocate Shri Naveen R. Nath and agreed that Curative Petition in the matter need not be filed and the matter should be addressed by appropriate amendments in the Architects Act, 1972 on urgent basis by Central Government. The Council authorized the President, COA, to take up the matter with the Central Government for expediting appropriate amendments in the Act to protect the general public from being served by unqualified and unregulated persons.

XV)	ISSUANCE OF ID CARDS AND NEW CERTIFICATES TO REGISTERED ARCHITECTS.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda and desired that architects be once again requested to update their photo/ signature etc. so that the revised digital certificate and Identity Cards may be issued to them at the earliest.
XVI)	APPOINTMENT OF INTERNAL AUDITOR FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2021-2022.
	The Council ratified the action taken by the President, Council of Architecture for appointment of Internal Auditors for the F.Y.: 2021-22.
XVII)	PUBLICATION OF MONTHLY CANEWS LETTER IN E-FORMAT.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda. The Council appreciated the efforts taken by the Council for revival of its newsletter which will be helpful in disseminating the information to the stakeholder about the various initiatives/ activities being carried out by the Council.
XVIII)	REVIVAL OF PUBLICATION OF MAGAZINE "ARCHITECTURE TIME SPACE AND PEOPLE" IN E-FORMAT (BI-MONTHLY).
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda as desired that the revival issue of the magazine of the Council be released at the earliest possible.
XIX)	COMMITTEE FOR INFORMATION ANALYSIS REPORTING AND ASSESSMENT OF IIA EXAMINATION.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda and desired that the Committee may complete its exercise at the earliest and should submit its report for further consideration in the matter.
XX)	CONDUCT OF COA ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL ESSAY WRITING COMPETITION 2021- FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE AND FOR YOUNG ARCHITECTS.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXI)	CONDUCT OF COA URBAN STUDIO RESEARCH PROJECT (USRP).
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXII)	REGISTRATION DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 2021.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXIII)	RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXIV)	TO TAKE NOTE ON STATEMENT OF DEMANDS IN RESPECT OF SERVICE TAX ON FEES RECEIVED BY THE COUNCIL DURING THE PERIOD FROM

	01.04.2015 TO 31.06.2017 FROM THE PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER, CGST EAST DELHI COMMISSIONERATE, NEW DELHI.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXV)	COLLABORATION WITH ETHOS FOR ORGANISING A VIRTUALEXHIBITION ON ARCHITECTURE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXVI)	CONDUCT OF INTERNATIONAL SUMMIT/ CONFERENCE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXVII)	APPROVAL PROCESS HANBOOK FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2022-23.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXVIII)	FILM ON ARCHITECTURAL AWARENESS.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXIX)	APPROVAL TO DIPLOMA COURSES IN ARCHITECTURE.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda.
XXX)	COMMUNICATION TO STATE/ CENTRAL AUTHORITIES.
	The Council noted the information as detailed in the Agenda. The Council desired that the copies of the letter be uploaded into login accounts of the Members to keep them posted about the Communication sent by the Council for reference and follow up from their end.
ITEM NO.17	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE PROGRESS ON THE FOLLOWING PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE COUNCIL TO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVT. OF INDIA:
A)	RECOMMENDATIONSTO DDA FOR ALLOTMENT OF LAND FOR THE OFFICE BUILDING OF COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that presently the office of the Council is functioning from a small space and a separate land is required for having office building of the Council so that it can carry out its role and responsibilities effectively. The President informed the members that the Council vide its letter no.CA/28/2016/Land dated 02.02.2021 requested the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, to forward the application of Council to DDA making appropriate recommendations for allotment of land for the office building of the Council. The members deliberated in the matter and decided that a request may be sent to the Ministry seeking their recommendations to the L&DO, MOUD and DDA for allotment of land to Council of Architecture duly stating that the Council shall bear the cost of the land from within its own resources.

B)	AMENDMENTS IN THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972.
	The President informed the members that proposal for amendments in Section 37 of the Architects Act, 1972 was submitted to the Central Government vide letter no.CA/28/2021/MOE dated 08.07.2021, addressed to Hon'ble Education Minister, Govt. of India, requesting therein for urgent amendments in the Section 37 of the Act. The members deliberated in the matter and requested the Ministry to expedite further action on amendments in the Architects Act to protect the architectural education and profession in the country.
C)	ENHANCEMENT OF FEES BEING CHARGED FROM ARCHITECTS.
	The President informed the members that the Council vide its letter no.CA/1/2020/Rules/MHRD(Fees) dated 18.11.2020, requested the Ministry for enhancement of fees being charged by the Council in view of escalation in cost of goods and services and rise in the activities and functions of the Council. The President further informed the members that the Ministry vide its letter dated 16.11.2021 has sought certain information/ clarifications like service provided to registered architects, cost of services, amount of corpus fund the Council is having and the manner in which the Council is planning to utilize the corpus fund and interest earned thereon. The Ministry has also requested for comparison vis-à-vis fee charged by the such organizations such as Medical Council, Bar Council of India etc. The office of the Council is compiling the relevant information and shall submit the same to the Ministry shortly.
D)	APPROVAL OF SEPARATE DOMAIN FOR "NATA" EXAMINATION PORTAL AND "SAMARTHAYA" PORTAL.
	The President informed the members that the Council has requested the Ministry to accord approval for using "gov" domain name for the "NATA" portal and "Samarthaya" portal. The Ministry vide its letter no.4-04/2021-TS.VI dated 03.12.2021, informed that the request of the Council could not be acceded to in view of guidelines for third party domains for GOV domain. The Council has obtained domain at private server with the domain name "Samarthaya.in" for hosting the TRC activities, E-Library and E-Learning. The Council is already in possession of domain name "NATA.IN" at private server. The President informed the members that the E-Office Portal of the Council is ready for launch and requested Ms.Saumya Gupta, Joint Secretary (NITs), member COA, to launch and inaugurate the same. Accordingly, Ms. Saumya Gupta inaugurated the E-Office portal of Council. The President thanked Ms.Saumya Gupta, Member, COA, for launching the E-Office of Council. The members appreciated the efforts made in the matter by the Council office.

E)	AUTHORISATION TO COUNCIL TO GRANT EQUIVALENCE TO FOREIGN PG QUALIFICATIONS IN ARCHITECTURE WITH INDIAN MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE DEGREE COURSE.
	The President informed the members that the Council has been receiving representations from Architects who have undergone their Master's Degree in Architecture from Foreign Universities for considering them equivalent to M.Arch. Degree awarded by Indian Universities. The Council has been requesting the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, since the year 2018 to authorize the Council to grant such equivalence or set up such a mechanism in the Ministry so that the foreign Master's Degree in Architecture can be granted equivalence and the concerned architects can be considered for appointment for teaching and other relevant posts. The Ministry vide its letter no.4-03/2021-TS.VI dated 02.11.2021, informed the Council that there is no provision in the Architects Act, 1972, to grant equivalence to Foreign Master's Degree in Architecture with Master's Degree in Architecture of Indian Universities. The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Central Government to address the issue of grant of equivalence to foreign Master's Degrees in Architecture with Master's degree in Architecture of Indian Universities.
F)	USE OF NATIONAL EMBLEM BY THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that the national emblem is being used by all statutory bodies like AICTE, UGC, National Commission for Women, TRAI etc. The Council vide letter no.CA/113/MHRD-ICARD/2021 dated 22.02.2021, has requested the Ministry to grant NOC for using National Emblem. The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Ministry to issue NOC for use of National Emblem like other statutory bodies.
G)	APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER FOR CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS FOR THE VACANCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that the Ministry vide its letter no.4-04/2019-TS.VI dated 01.12.2021 informed that it has notified the three vacancies in the Membership of the Executive Committee in the gazette of India on 27.08.2021 and appointed Shri Syed Ekram Rizwi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, as Returning Officer for conduct of elections. He further informed that the Council vide its letter no.CA/12/2021/Rules/MHRD dated 18.12.2021 informed the Ministry for notifying the 5 vacancies in the Executive Committee and conduct of elections by the Returning Officer at the earliest. The Council noted the information and requested the Ministry to appoint Returning Officer as early as possible for conduct of elections.

ITEM NO.18	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE PROGRESS MADE BY VARIOUS COMMITTEES/ SUB-COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President invited the attention of the members towards Appendix-O of the agenda where details of progress made by various Committees/Sub-Committees constituted by the Council has been detailed. The Council Members perused the progress report and appreciated the remarkable and phenomenal work done by various Committees.
ITEM NO.19	APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY AUDITOR FOR AUDITING THE BOOKS OF ACCOUNTS OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2021-2022.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 75th Meeting held on 28th & 29th August, 2021 approved the appointment of M/s. V. K. Verma & Co. New Delhi, as statutory auditor on a fixed annual audit fees of Rs.40,000/- per annum for audit of the Books of Accounts of the Council. Further, the books of accounts of the Council for the financial year 2021-22 have to be audited. The Council after deliberations decided that M/s.V.K. Verma and Company, New Delhi, may be appointed for auditing the books of Accounts for the financial year 2021-2022 and accordingly, passed the following Resolution. Resolution No.:546 Resolved that : 1. M/s. V.K. Verma & Company, Auditor, New Delhi, be appointed as auditors for auditing the books of Accounts of the Council for the financial year 2021-2022. 2. The Auditors be paid fees of Rs.40,000/- for auditing the books of accounts of the Council.
ITEM NO.20	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMME/ WORKSHOPS, ETC. CONDUCTED AT TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTRES OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that the Council through its TRCs is conducting training programme for practicing architects, faculty members and students. Due to the ongoing COVID 19 pandemic, training programs have been conducted in the online mode on Zoom/ Webex platform. The members perused the details of various training programme/workshop as detailed in the agenda.
ITEM NO.21	TO CONSIDER VIEWS/COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ON THE CAREER ADVANCEMENT SCHEME FOR FACULTY MEMBERS OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS.
	The President informed the members that the Council had constituted a One-man Committee comprising of Prof. Pushkar Kanwinde to prepare the Career Advancement Scheme for Faculty members of Architectural Institutions based on

	Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations 2020. He further informed that the Council in its 75th Council Meeting considered the report of One-Man Committee and decided to refer it to Council members for their views and suggestions so that the same can be finalized and further appropriate action can be taken. The Council perused the comments received from Dr. Ranee Vedomuthu, Dr. Vandana Sehgal and Dr. Kavita Daryani Rao, Former Member, and decided that the same be sent to Prof. Pushkar Kanvinde to consolidate & finalise the views received on the Scheme.
ITEM NO.22	TO CONSIDER STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE (SOP) FOR CLOSURE OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTION(S).
	The President informed the members that the Council has been receiving applications for closure of institutions imparting 5-year B.Arch./ M.Arch. course in the country. The closure of these institutions is to be considered as per the Closure policy already approved by the Council. Further, to streamline the process of closure, the Council may need to appoint its administrators to oversee the academic affairs of the institutions and for ensuring smooth closure process. Therefore, to have a standard procedure to be followed by the administrators appointed by the Council for overseeing and coordinating the closure of the Institution smoothly and to take care of the interests of the students during closure, Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) has been got prepared from Ar.Paramjit Singh Ahuja. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided to approve the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) as annexed with the agenda and further, decided that whenever any Administrator is appointed by the Council, he/she shall follow the SOP for closure of the concerned institution.
ITEM NO.23	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE TO PREPARE SYLLABUS AND COURSE CURRICULUM FOR CONDUCT OF TRAINING COURSE FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.
	The President informed the members that as per COA (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, the Council of Architecture is required to conduct a three months faculty training course for all the new faculty members before completion of their probation period. The training period shall be treated as part of service of the concerned faculty in the concerned University or Institution. He further informed that he has constituted a Committee on 08th September, 2021 to prepare the syllabus and course curriculum for conduct of training courses for faculty members with Prof. Habeeb Khan, President, COA, Chairman Ex Officio, Prof. Jayashree Deshpande, Convenor, Prof.Akhtar Chauhan, Member, Prof. S.M.

	Akhtar, Member, Prof. K.S. Ananthakrishna, Member, Prof. Ranee Vedamuthu, Member. The Committee held 9 meetings and has submitted its report. The Council perused the syllabus and course curriculum as prepared by the Committee and noted that training period three months mainly with an object to train and familiarize the new faculty members with the fundamental skills and attitude required for a teacher. The Council after deliberations approved the same.
ITEM NO.24	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF APPEALS COMMITTEE REGARDING REJECTION OF APPLICATION OF REGISTRATION UNDER THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972.
	The President informed the members that the Appeals Committee constituted by the Council to consider the Appeal(s) received from applicants whose application(s) are rejected by the Registrar, COA, for registration as an Architect under the Architects Act, 1972. The Committee consists of following members: i) Ar.Maitreyi Gupta, Convenor ii) Ar.Yogeeta Rai, Member iii) Ar.Lalichan Zacharias, Member The President further informed that the Appeals Committee considered the Appeal of Ms.Shubhada Prabhakar Deshmukh who has completed B.Tech Degree (House and Interior Design) from Nagpur University and later on took admission in fourth year of 5 year Diploma in Architecture awarded by Board of Technical Education Maharashtra State. The Council perused the report of the Appeal Committee and after deliberations concurred with same. The Council also noted that the appellant was present during the hearing by the Appeals Committee on 04.10.2021 and submitted that the Judgement 28.07.2005 of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 7966-7973 of 2003 is applicable in the case and requested that she be granted registration as an Architect by the Council of Architecture. The Council after detailed deliberations resolved as under: Resolution No.547 Resolved that: 1. The appeal of Ms. Shubhada Prabhakar Deshmukh who possess the B.Tech Degree (House and Interior Design) from Nagpur University and took lateral admission in the fourth year of five year Diploma in Architecture awarded by Board of technical Education Maharashtra state is hereby rejected as she has not undergone the recognized Degree/ Diploma course as per the Council of Architecture(Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulation 1983, as prevalent when the time the candidate undergone her qualification.

	2. The case of the appellant is entirely different from the case of the other candidates of Nagpur University who completed their both the qualifications i.e. B.Tech and B.Arch Degree from the Nagpur University itself. Thus, the order dated 28.07.2005 of Hon'ble Supreme court of India in Civil Appeal No. 7966-7973 of 2003 does not apply to the appellant. 3. The Appellant be informed of the decision of the Council.
ITEM NO.25	REMOVAL OF NAME FROM THE REGISTER OF ARCHITECTS OF MS.SUJATA PURUSHOTTAM JOSHI, WHO GOT B.ARCH. DEGREE ON THE BASIS OF LATERAL ADMISSION IN B.ARCH. COURSE.
	The President informed the members that Ms. Shubhada Prabhakar Deshmukh, Mumbai, had applied for registration as an architect vide Application no.132411 dated 05/02/2021 alongwith supporting documents for Registration as an Architect under the Architects Act, 1972. On scrutiny of the application and documents submitted by her, it was found that she got lateral admission directly in the third year of 5-year G.D. Arch. Programme at Academy of Architecture, Mumbai in the year 1995, after undergoing 4-year B.Tech. (Chemical Technology) degree course in the year 1994 from Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University. On the basis of the above, the Council had rejected her application that she cannot be registered as an architect under the Architects Act, 1972 as she has not undergone the recognized qualification as per provisions of the Architects Act, 1972. When inquired about her lateral admission, she pointed out vide her email dated 26.02.2021 that one person i.e. Ms.Sujata Purushottam Joshi, who had similar qualification was registered by the Council as an Architect vide Registration Number CA/1997/21167 on the basis 5-year Government Diploma in Architecture awarded by Board of Technical Examinations, Maharashtra State, after taking lateral admission into the 4th year in Diploma in Architecture course imparted at Academy of Architecture, Mumbai, on the basis of 4-year B.Tech. (House & Interior Design) course from Nagpur University, Nagpur. The Council examined the records and found that Ms.Sujata Purushottam Joshi had been registered as an Architect under the Architects Act, 1972, vide Registration Number CA/1997/21167 dated 25.02.1997 on the basis 5-year Government Diploma in Architecture awarded by Board of Technical Examinations, Maharashtra State. It was noticed from the records that Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi had submitted her application form for registration on 18.02.1997 along with a copy Provisional Certificate dated 09.09.1996, issued by the Principal, Academy of Architecture, Mumbai, without any marksheets or Final Diploma Certificate. The Council vide its letter no.CA/1997/21167 dated 27.05.2021 had requested her to provide the attested/self-attested copies of the following documents: 1. 5-year full-time Government Diploma Course in Architecture, awarded by the Board of Technical Examinations, Maharashtra State. 2. Marksheets (1st to 5th year (full-time) of Government Diploma Course in Architecture.

3. 10+2 or equivalent examination mark-sheet. In case of 10+3 Diploma, enclosed all semester's mark-sheet & Diploma Certificate.

After examination of the documents submitted by her vide mail dated 22.06.2021, it was noted that she had not undergone the recognized qualification as per provisions of the Architects Act, 1972 and Regulations framed thereunder as she took lateral admission into the 4th year of 5-year Diploma Course in Architecture, awarded by the Board of Technical Examinations, Maharashtra State, contrary to Regulations of Council of Architecture.

The Council of Architecture under section 21 of Architects Act, 1972 has prescribed the Minimum Standards of Architectural Education Regulations, 1983, with the prior approval of the Central Government which were published in the Gazette of India in Part III, Section 4 on 26th March, 1983 and 27th August, 1983. As per the Regulations, a person must have undergone 5-year course of studies in Architecture at a recognised institution and there is no provision for lateral admission at any stage of the course.

The Regulation 3(1) of the said Regulations, namely "Duration and Stages of the Course", states that "The architecture course shall be of a minimum duration of 5 academic years or 10 semesters". *There is no provision for any lateral admission to B.Arch. programme at any stage or year of the 5 years degree course in the said Regulations.*

Thus, she has not undergone the recognized qualification as per provisions of the Architects Act, 1972 and Regulations framed thereunder and got registered with the Council by suppressing the information related to lateral entry in 5-year Diploma course.

The Council has issued show cause notice dated 30.08.2021 to Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi as to why her registration as an Architect be not cancelled and her name be not removed from the Register of Architects maintained by the Council of Architecture under Section 23 of Act, as she has not undergone 5-years of the course of studies in architecture as per the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 1983.

In response, vide her letter dated 30.08.2021, she stated that she had passed 4-Years full time B.Tech.(House and Interior Design) Degree Course, recognized by Nagpur University, Nagpur. After completion of the said course, she approached Academy of Architecture, Mumbai, for direct admission into 4th year in Diploma of Architecture course and was advised to approach the Board of Technical Examination, Maharashtra and obtain Equivalence Certificate.

Accordingly, she applied for Equivalence Certificate to the Board and the Board, upon examination of syllabus of the course sent by her, had issued a Certificate stating that the said course is equivalent to 3-years Architecture course under Mumbai University. On the basis of this Equivalent Certificate issued by the Board of Technical Examination, Maharashtra, Ms.Sujata Purushottam Joshi had got lateral admission directly into the 4th year of 5-year Government Diploma in Architecture at Academy of Architecture, Mumbai, after undergoing 4-Years full time B.Tech.(House and Interior Design) Degree Course from Nagpur University, Nagpur.

	The Council sent another email dated 01.10.2021 to Ms.Sujata Purushottam Joshi for providing the Equivalence Certificate issued from Board of Technical Examination, Maharashtra to which Ms.Sujata Purushottam Joshi, vide her email dated 18.10.2021 replied that she had handed over the Original Equivalence Certificate to Academy of Architecture during the admission process and do not have any copies of the same. The Council perused the various communications made by the Council and the responses/ replies received from Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi and after detailed deliberations noted that Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi got wrongly registered as an Architect with the Council of Architecture by suppressing the information about obtaining her qualification on the basis of lateral admission in 4th year of 5-year B.Arch course. The Council, after deliberations resolved as under: Resolution No: 548 Resolved that : 1. Name of Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi (Registration No. CA/97/21167 be removed from the Register of Architects under Section 29 (2) (a) of the Architects Act, 1972. 2. The decision of Council be informed to Ms. Sujata Purushottam Joshi.
ITEM NO.26	PROGRESS MADE FOR CONDUCT OF NATA 2022 EXAMINATION.
	The President informed the members that the Council of Architecture is conducting NATA for admission to B.Arch course as a single window mechanism all over India. He further informed that NATA 2022 would be held thrice for the Academic Session 2022-2022 on three separate single days each having 2 examination sessions with duration of 3 hours each. He also informed that the candidates would be allowed to appear for maximum three tests. In case a candidate appears for two tests, the best of two scores shall be the valid score but in case a candidate appears for all the three tests valid score shall be average of two best scores out of three tests. In case of single attempt, the lower score shall be valid. The minimum passing score for NATA shall remain as 70 marks out of 200. The medium of Aptitude Test will be in English though some question will be in regional languages also. The Council deliberated on the conduct of NATA 2022 and approved the recommendations of NATA 2022 Co-ordination Committee as elaborated by the President, COA.
ITEM NO.27	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN QUALIFICATIONS.
	The President informed the members that the Council is in discussion with the Ministry of Education, Government of India for resolving the issue of recognition of Foreign Qualifications and requested that the matter be kept in abeyance.

	The Council accordingly decided to defer the matter to next meeting.
ITEM No. 28	TO CONSIDER THE APPEAL/ REPRESENTATION OF SHRI MOHIT DOBARIYA REGARDING REJECTION OF HIS REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF M.ARCH. DEGREE AWARDED BY UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, USA, BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.
	In view of the discussions held on the preceding item, the Council decided to defer this item to the next meeting.
ITEM No. 29	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY INDIAN COOLING ACTION PLAN.
	The President informed the members that he received a D.O. letter no. K-14011/28/2021-AMRUT-IIA dated 27th October, 2021, from Ms. D. Thara, IAS, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Govt. of India, informing that Ministry of Environment, Forest, & Climate Change, has released the Indian Cooling Action Plan (ICAP) and requested the Council to incorporate the national and international standards and best practice practices for energy efficient buildings in the syllabus of B.Arch and M.Arch. Course. He further informed that he has constituted a Committee comprising of Prof. Abhijit Shirodkar as Convenor, Dr. Minakshi Jain, Member and Ar. G. Srinivas Murthy, Member, to examine and study the Indian Cooling Action plan of Government of India and for incorporating the same in the syllabus of B.Arch. and M.Arch. Courses. The Council perused the report and recommendations of the Committee and decided that further action be taken by the Council on the recommendations of the Committee.
ITEM No. 30	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONTRIBUTION OF OUTGOING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.
	The President informed the members that since the last meeting of the Council term of following members have ended: 1. Mr. Mritunjay Behra 2. Ar. Jagdev Thakur 3. Ar. Kavita Daryani Rao 4. Ar. Lalchandami 5. Ar. Sadiq Ali D.A The President informed that all the above members have contributed greatly in affairs of the Council and supported it as part of its various Committees, as inspectors for inspection of institutions, as evaluators, as guide and mentors for running the affairs of the Council smoothly and for betterment of the architectural fraternity. The Council appreciated the contribution of these members and expressed its best wishes for their good health and future endeavors.

ITEM No. 31	CONDUCT OF COA AWARDS PROGRAMME CEREMONY
	The President informed the members that since the conduct of Jury and announcement of awards got delayed due to Covid 19 restrictions, the Council has organised an online Award Programme for Excellence in Architectural Thesis at UG & PG Level, Awards for Excellence in Documentation of Architectural Heritage in the evening from 6.30 pm onwards in a break during the meeting of the Council. Accordingly, Awards Programme was conducted online and the winners of the COA Awards 2021 were declared. The function had a large viewership with Hon'ble President IIA as Chief Guest, Hon'ble President and Vice-President of COA, Executive Committee and Council Members, eminent architects, jury members, professionals, academicians, teachers, and students in architecture from all over the country. The following awards were announced during the online Awards Programme:
1.	National Awards for Excellence in Architectural Thesis and JK AYA Best Architecture Student of the Year (2 Categories)
	The President informed the members that the Zonal and National Juries of the COA Awards 2021 were conducted in the online mode on Zoom and streamed live on the Facebook page of COA Social in the month of February 2022 from 10.30 am onward each day. 1.Zone 1 Jury was conducted on Tuesday 15th February 2022 by Ar. Anup Naik, Bangalore, Ar. Shraddha Sejal, Mumbai and Ar. Shantanu Poreddy, Mumbai. The activities of Zone 1 were coordinated by Sushant School of Art and Architecture, Gurgaon, headed by Dr. Vibhuti Sachdev and Col. Virendra Malik with Ar. Sehba Saleem, Ar. Tanaya Verma and Ar. Pooja LalitKumar. 2.Zone 2 Jury was conducted on Monday 14th February 2022 by Ar. Biju Kuriakose, Chennai, Ar. Leena Kumar, Bangalore and Ar. Sathyaprakash Varanashi, Bangalore. The activities of Zone 2 were coordinated by College of Architecture, Sardar Vallabhai Patel Institute of Technology, SVIT Vasad, headed by Ar. Sailesh Nair with Ar. Preety Shah, Ar. Pallavi Mahida, Ar. Prashant Rami and Ar. Dhvani Bhavsar. 3.Zone 3 Jury was conducted on Wednesday 16th February 2022 by Ar. Jaisim KrishnaRao, Bangalore, Ar. Sandeep Sen, Bangalore and Ar. Ujan Ghosh, New Delhi.

	The activities of Zone 3 were coordinated by School of Architecture, Urban Development and Planning, Symbiosis Skills and Professional University, Pune headed by Dr. Gauri Shiurkar with Ar. Kirti Nandode, and Ar. Payal Gulhane. 4. Zone 4 Jury was conducted on Thursday 17th February 2022 by Dr. Jaffer AA Khan, Chennai, Ar. Jaimini Mehta, Vadodara and Ar. Nilakshi Sarma, Guwahati. The activities of Zone 4 were coordinated by Mysore School of Architecture, Mysore headed by Prof. Sapna Shivakumar with Dr. Balaji and Ar. Seema Navin. 5. Zone 5 Jury was conducted on Friday 18th February 2022 by Ar. Amarja Nimbalkar, Kolhapur, Ar. Aziz Rajani, Bangalore and Ar. Surya Kakani, Ahmedabad. The activities of Zone 5 were coordinated by Asian School of Architecture and Design Innovation, Cochin, headed by Dr. Pratheek Sudhakaran with Ar. Arun Shankar and Ar. Santosh Kumar. 6. The National Jury was conducted on Thursday 24th February 2022 by Ar. Jacob Cherian, Cochin, Prof. Radhika Nagpal, Chandigarh and Ar. Salil Ranadive, Mumbai. The National Jury was coordinated by Aayojan School of Architecture and Design Pune, headed by Ar. Anand Ukidve with Ar. Asif Ahmed Sayed, Ar. Fatema Kabir, and Ar. Manjusha Ukidve. The juries of the National Awards for Excellence in Architectural Thesis and JK AYA Best Architecture Student of the Year (2 Categories) were conducted by Prof. Jayashree Deshpande, Pune, Dr. Aneerudha Paul, Mumbai and Dr. Rama Subrahmanian, Bangalore, Members of COA Awards Committee. The names of winners were announced during Awards Programme conducted online from 6.30 pm onwards in a break during the meeting of the Council. All the members and present guests congratulated the winners as well those who participated in these awards programme.
2.	National Awards for Excellence in Post Graduate Thesis in Architecture
	The President informed the members that the National Jury of the COA Students' Awards for Excellence in Documentation of Architectural Heritage (3 Categories) was conducted on Thursday 10th February 2022 by Dr. Nalini Thakur, Chennai, Ar. Sashikala Ananth, Kotagiri and Ar. Shikha Jain, Jaipur.

	The jury was coordinated by Dr. Vaishali Latkar, Head of the Department of Architectural Conservation, Sinhgad College of Architecture, Pune with Ar. Sonal Chitnis Karanjikar, Conservation Architect and Faculty at Department of Architectural Conservation, Sinhgad College of Architecture, Pune. The names of winners were announced during Awards Programme conducted online from 6.30 pm onwards in a break during the meeting of the Council. All the members and present guests congratulated the winners as well those who participated in these awards programme.
3	Students' Awards for Excellence in Documentation of Architectural Heritage.
	The National Jury of the COA Students' Awards for Excellence in Documentation of Architectural Heritage (3 Categories) was conducted on Thursday 10th February 2022 by Dr. Nalini Thakur, Chennai, Ar. Sashikala Ananth, Kotagiri and Ar. Shikha Jain, Jaipur. He further informed that the jury was coordinated by Dr. Vaishali Latkar, Head of the Department of Architectural Conservation, Sinhgad College of Architecture, Pune with Ar. Sonal Chitnis Karanjikar, Conservation Architect and Faculty at Department of Architectural Conservation, Sinhgad College of Architecture, Pune. The names of winners were announced during Awards Programme conducted online from 6.30 pm onwards in a break during the meeting of the Council. All the members and present guests congratulated the winners as well those who participated in these awards programme.
4	LAUNCH OF COA REFEREED JOURNAL - JCOA.
	The President informed the members that COATRC Pune has come out with the publication of COA refereed Journal-JCOA. The President requested Dr. P. Satheesh, Member, to inaugurate and launch the same. Accordingly, Dr. P. Satheesh launched the same during the online Awards Programme and thanked the President, COA for providing this honor. The members appreciated the efforts made for publication of COA Journal.
ITEM No. 32	ANY OTHER ITEM WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR
(1)	TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC, GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND ARCHITECTS.

	The Council has received complaint against Architects for alleged professional Misconduct in terms of Sections 22 & 30 of the Architects Act, 1972. The Complaint along with Statement of Defence of the Respondent Architects were referred to the Member(s) of the Council for their Preliminary Report for assisting the Council to come to the opinion as to whether there exists a prima facie case of alleged professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect(s) or not. The details of the complaints are as under: 1. a. CA/DC/525 Shri Satish Kantilal Bora Vs. Ar. Sameer Murari Valimbe b. CA/DC/525 Shri Satish Kantilal Bora Vs. Ar. Girish Vidhyadhar Brahme c. CA/DC/525 Shri Satish Kantilal Bora Vs. Ar. Sanjit Kulkarni The Council perused the complaints together with statement of defence of Respondent Architects, namely Ar. Sameer Murari Valimbe, Ar. Girish Vidhyadhar Brahme and Ar. Sanjit Kulkarni. The Council noted that the complainant has alleged that the Respondent Architects, who are directors of M/s. Telesis Architects and Designers Pvt. Ltd., did not adhere to terms & conditions of commencement certificate and carried out excessive and illegal construction over and above what they were legally entitled to. The Respondent Architects have submitted wrong calculations of FSI of two plots. They have also submitted wrong plans and information before the Environment Committee and did not disclose the illegal construction done by M/s. Aditya promoters. The response of the Respondent Architects is that the Complainant has already raised these issues before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and other forums and have failed to get nay favorable order. The Respondents have been wrongly targeted whereas this is a dispute between complainant and M/s. Aditya Promoters. The Respondents also stated that the complainant is not their client and he cannot make a complaint for professional misconduct against them. The Council after deliberations in the matter opined that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent architects and dismissed the complaint. Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architects be informed of the decision of the Council.
(2)	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE JUDGEMENT DATED 14.02.2022 OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA IN CIVIL APPEAL NO.1320 OF 2022, COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE V/S. THE ACADEMIC SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS (TASA) & ORS.
	The President informed the members that the Council filed an SLP against the Order of Hon'ble Madras High Court dated 04.06.2009 in the matter of Council of Architecture v/s. The Academic Society of Architects (TASA) & ors., which inter alia held as under : <i>xxx Further, Section 21 of the Architects Act gives power to the Council of Architecture to prescribe the minimum standards of architectural education</i>

required for granting recognized qualifications by colleges or institutions in India and such prescription of the Regulations cannot be done independently by the first Respondent – Council of Architecture. **Thus, the Minimum Standards of Architectural Education Regulations are to be brought into force only by way of due approval of the same by the Central government and issuance of the same in the official gazette of Union of India as provided under section 45 of the Act. In the absence of the such approval by the Central Government, the said “Minimum Standards of Architectural Education Regulations, 2017”, do not have any statutory force and they cannot be implemented.** xxxxx

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its judgement dated 14.02.2022 has held as under :

14.To put it differently, Section 22(1) confers power upon the Council of Architecture to prescribe standards of professional conduct and a code of ethics, only by way of regulations, though Section 45(2)(i) takes care of the procedural requirement. But Section 21 which confers substantive power upon the Council to prescribe minimum standards of architectural education, is not couched in the same language as Section 22(1). **In other words, Section 21 does not contain a stipulation that, “the Council may by regulation prescribe minimum standards of architectural education”.** The words “may by regulation”, found in Section 22, are conspicuous by their absence in Section 21. **This is a clear indication of the fact, (i) that the Council is empowered to prescribe minimum standards of architectural education, not necessarily by taking recourse to Section 45(2); and (ii) that if at all, such minimum standards are issued otherwise than through Regulations, they should not be in conflict with those found in the Regulations.**

15.**It is thus clear from the scheme of the Act that the Council of Architecture may prescribe minimum standards of architectural education, either by way of regulations issued under Section 45(2) or even otherwise.** It is only in cases where the Council chooses to prescribe standards in the form of regulations that the requirement of approval of the Central Government under Section 45(1) would become necessary.

17.In the counter affidavit filed by the appellant before the High Court, a specific objection was taken to the maintainability of the writ petition on the ground that the communications impugned in the writ petition were addressed to the institutions imparting architectural education and that individuals who claim to be teaching faculty cannot challenge the same. It was also contended in the counter affidavit that the 1st respondent (writ petitioner) was attempting to espouse the cause of some defaulting educational institutions which did not meet the minimum standards. Another important issue raised in the counter affidavit filed by the appellant herein before the High Court was that one of the members of the 1st respondent Society was a member of the appellant Council which approved the 2015 norms and that some of the members of the 1st respondent Society even acted as Inspectors and inspected the educational institutions to find out whether minimum standards are put in place.

18. But the above objections were not even considered by the High Court. The High Court addressed itself merely to the question of the requirement of approval of the Central Government under Section 45(1) and did not go into the question of locus standi of the 1st respondent. **The High Court even overlooked the fact**

	that none of the educational institutions imparting architectural education ever chose to challenge the communications impugned before the High Court. In fact, the appellant has furnished a chart extracting the provisions of the 1983 Regulations in Column No.1, the 2017 Prescriptions in Column No.2, and the area of difference between the two, in Column No.3. It is seen from the said chart that many of the changes brought forthwith in 2018 were in relation to, (i) duration of the architecture programme; (ii) admission to architecture course; (iii) intake and migration; (iv) courses and periods of study; (v) professional examination, standards of proficiency and conditions of admissions and qualifications of examiners; and (vi) standards of staff, equipment, accommodation, training and other facilities. 19. If at all, the 1st respondent-society (writ petitioner), due to the nature of its membership, could have been aggrieved only by the prescriptions affecting the teaching faculty. The 1st respondent could not have challenged the prescriptions with which they are not in any way concerned. Unfortunately, the High Court did not address itself to these important issues. The Hon'ble Supreme Court accordingly quashed and set aside the order dated 04.06.2019 of Madras High Court and dismissed the petition. The Council appreciated the efforts made by the advocates of the Council and office of the Council in the matter.
(3)	TO CONSIDER THE MINIMUM STANDARDS OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION FOR PG COURSES IN ARCHITECTURE.
	The President informed the members that the Council constituted the Board of Post Graduate Education with Prof. Abhay Purohit as Convenor, Dr.Kavita D Rao, Prof. Prabhjyot Kaur Sachdeva, Prof. Ujwala Shirish Chakradeo, Dr.Aarti Grover, Dr.Jaffer AA Khan and Prof. Chakor Mehta, as Special Invitees to formulate norms and standards for imparting Master of Architecture by Architectural Institutions and also to formulate a mechanism/proposal for granting equivalence to Postgraduate qualification in Architecture/Allied fields by the Council. He further informed that the Council prescribed the norms for imparting PG Courses in the year 2006. The PG Board was asked to revise the same. The Board held various meetings and has finalized draft revised Minimum Standards of Architectural Education for PG Courses. The Council perused the Minimum Standards of Architectural Education for PG Courses in Architecture and it was decided that the members may send their view and comments on the Minimum Standards within 15 days so that a final document can be prepared. The Council authorized the President, COA, finalise the document after received from comments from members and forward the same to Central Government for its approval.
(4)	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON REFORMS IN INSPECTION PROCESS OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS.