

MINUTES OF THE 78TH MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE, HELD ON MONDAY, 7TH NOVEMBER, 2022, FROM 10.30 A.M. ONWARDS, IN CASUARINA HALL, CONVENTION CENTRE, INDIA HABITAT CENTRE, LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI – 110 003.

PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS :

1.	Ar. (Prof.) Abhijit D. Shirodkar	19.	Ar. Sanjeev Kumar
2.	Ar. Naveen Sharma	20.	Ar. Harinder Arora
3.	Ar. Punit Sethi	21.	Ar. Gajanand Ram
4.	Ar. Lalichan Zacharias	22.	Ar. Vidyadhar Sadashiv Wodeyar
5.	Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal	23.	Ar. P. S. Rajeev
6.	Ar. (Prof.) Minakshi Jain	24.	Ar. Aldrina K. Marak
7.	Ar. (Dr.) Amogh Kumar Gupta	25.	Ar. Benjusingh Nongthomban
8.	Ar. (Prof.) Abhay V. Purohit	26.	Ar. V. Neilazo Metha
9.	Ar. (Prof.) Amit Kumar Garg	27.	Ar. P. Vaitianadin
10.	Ar. (Prof.) Jayalakshmi V.	28.	Ar. Ritu Singh
11.	Ar. (Dr.) P. Satheesh Kumar	29.	Ar. T. Loganathan
12.	Ar. R. Thanigai Arasu	30.	Ar. Ravi Kumar R.
13.	Ar. Naveen Kanithi	31.	Ar. (Dr.) Vandana Sehgal
14.	Ar. Atonu Baruah	32.	Ar. Shashi Mohan Srivastava
15.	Ar. R. Ramesh Kumar	33.	Ar. Manish Chakraborti
16.	Ar. Kapil Setia	34.	Er. Sandip Kumar Deb
17.	Ar. Vijay Garg	35.	Er. H.K. Mittal
18.	Ar. Marvin C. Gomes	36.	Dr. G.S. Inda

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

The following members were granted leave of absence:

1.	Ar. Amitava Roy	7.	Ar. Nadisha V. M.
2.	Ar. Bapilu Chai	8.	Ar. Sushant Kumar Patra
3.	Ar. Vishal Arun Kumar Vyas	9.	Ar. Anil Kumar
4.	Ms. Saumya Gupta	10.	Ar. Sandeep L. Bangde
5.	Ar. George Lalzuia	11.	Ar. Rajesh Pradhan
6.	Ar. Nand Lal Chandel		

No information about their absence was received from following members:

1. Ar. Mahendra Pratap
2. Ar. Sanjiban Datta
3. Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah





The Registrar-Secretary welcomed the Hon'ble President, Hon'ble Vice-President and Hon'ble Members attending the 78th Meeting of Council and requested the President to conduct further proceedings of the meeting.

The President thanked the Vice-President and Members of the Council for sparing their valuable time for the meeting, specially, new members who attended the meeting for the first time.

Thereafter, the regular agenda of the meeting was taken up.

ITEM NO.01	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE 77TH MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 15TH JULY, 2022.
	The President informed the Members that the Minutes of 77th Meeting of the Council were circulated to the Hon'ble Members on 26th August, 2022. The comments were received from Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal, Member. The President read out the comments and informed that these are not the correct version of oral clarification given by him in last meeting and he clarified as under : (a) Preparation of Scheme of Conduct of Professional Practice Examination: It was clarified by the President that Professional Practice Examination exists world over except India and Pakistan and would be implemented with the approval of Central Government. Further, in view of NEP 2020 this exit exam would be very important. The Council is not able to have MRA with foreign authorities in the absence of professional examination. (b) Constitution of State Level Committees: It was clarified by the President that he has already initiated the process for constitution of Committee and soon communications would be issued to the members. The President further informed that these clarifications made to the concerned member were not decision of the Council and these were not included in the Minutes of the last meeting.
ITEM NO.02	ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE MINUTES OF THE 77TH MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	The Registrar-Secretary briefed the members on the action taken report on the Minutes of the 77th Meeting of the Council held on 15th July, 2022. The Hon'ble Members noted the action taken report and requested to expedite further action on following issues: i) Career Advancement Scheme for faculty members;



	ii) Interior of CoA's Office space at Okhla; iii) Recommendations of the Sub-Committee on conduct of Professional Practice Examination; iv) Recommendations of Committee on Equivalence of Foreign PG Qualifications. v) The members after deliberations decided that PG Minimum Standards be implemented as Guidelines till the same are approved by the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, in terms of provisions of Section 21 of the Act. vi) With regard to resolution of the Complaint of professional misconduct and Writ Petition filed by Ar. C.N. Raghavendran, the members decided that without any regret/ apology from Ar. C.N. Raghavendran matter cannot be considered further and the matter may be decided by the Hon'ble High Court on merit.										
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 1825 defaulter Architects, in terms of Section 26 (2) of the Architects Act, 1972, whose name were restored to the Register of Architects on payment of requisite fees during the period 24.06.2022 to 20.10.2022.										
ITEM NO.04	APPROVAL FOR REMOVAL OF NAMES FROM 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. :552 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: <table><tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>Name of Architect</th><th>State/City</th><th>Name Remove on Request Cases</th><th>Reason of Removal Name</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Name Remove on Request Cases	Reason of Removal Name					
Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Name Remove on Request Cases	Reason of Removal Name							





1	Ms. Kanika Pavan Talwar	Delhi	CA/2015/68585	Currently settled in USA.
2	Ms. Kavita Garg	Maharashtra	CA/2015/69260	Currently settled in Canada
3	Ms. Ruqaiya Sadique Ali	Madhya Pradesh	CA/2018/103716	Due to financial issues
4	Mr. Upendra Narayan Desai	Gujarat	CA/1990/13523	Due to old age
5	Ms. Sripriya M.	Tamil Nadu	CA/2014/63924	Currently settling in Sweden.
6	Mr. Utkarsh Prakash	Delhi	CA/2014/63977	Currently settling in Australia.

ii) DUE TO DEATH :

The Council noted with grief 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.:553

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	Mr. Bhalchandra Vishnu Datey	Maharashtra	CA/1988/11789
2	Mr. Sarasvatichandra B. Tripathi	Gujarat	CA/1981/06359
3	Mr. Kapil Ghisuram Singhal	Maharashtra	CA/2009/45864
4	Mr. Ulhas Bhimrao Jamble	Maharashtra	CA/1984/08814
5	Mr. Bhargav Anant Mahajan	Maharashtra	CA/1975/02241
6	Mr. Sudhakar D. Wachasunder	Maharashtra	CA/1976/03373
7	Mr. Sanjay Nadh B.	Kerala	CA/1996/20020

ITEM NO.05 TO CONSIDER THE ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2021-2022.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts for the financial year ended on 31.03.2022 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.: 554 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.6	TO HEAR THE FOLLOWING ARCHITECTS FOUND GUILTY OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT BY THE COUNCIL.
I)	CA/DC/344 – SHRI RAJESH KUMAR SECRETARY, LSG DEPARTMENT, GOVT. OF KERALA V/S. AR. LATHIKA I. NAIR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 76th Meeting held on 26th February, 2022 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 have been summoned to appear before the Council. Accordingly, the Complainant through its authorized representatives and Respondent Architect through her advocate appeared before the Council. The President first requested the Complainant to briefly state his complaint. The Complainant submitted that the Respondent Architect submitted an application for addition/ alteration in a building called Uduppi Srinivas Tourism Home. The building collapsed while additional work was going on and six persons died and six others injured. The Plan and application were submitted by Respondent Architect for and on behalf of the Kumar Group along a Structural Safety Certificate. The Respondent also submitted an undertaking that construction/ land development will be carried out as per the approval plan and permit in accordance with the rules in force and under her supervision. The Architect is empowered to certify Structural Design for 3 storied building in 500 sq.m. are or 11.00 meter high buildings. The building in question was 1461.45



sq.m. plinth area and height from 11.70 to 15.30 meter. Thus, she issued false certificates and liable for professional misconduct. The corporation has also taken action against is erring officials.

The Council members asked the complainant whether any Structural Drawings was submitted by the Respondent. The complainant replied that no such drawing was supplied to them.

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

The representative of the Respondent submitted that she was employee of M/s. Kumar Group, Trivandrum, as an architect and used to sign all documents on behalf of M/s. Kumar Group. Application submitted before local authority for renovation of existing building without increasing the plinth area and as per prevailing rules. The Respondent has not supervised the construction works carried out by the client.

The Respondent has not issued any certificate of Structure soundness of the existing building as a registered architect and the structural stability certificate was issued only for and on behalf of the firm M/s. Kumar Group after obtaining a note against the Structural liability of the existing building from a competent structural consultant Mr. S. Ravikumar.

The main reason for the collapse of the building was on account of the work done by unskilled labourers without proper supervision. Rule 110 of KMBR rules defined a High Rise building as "a building having more than four floors and or 15 meters of heights from ground level. Whereas the collapsed building was 12 meters in height and four floor as per the plan submitted before the authority.

The Council also perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee which observed that application form prescribed by the Thiruvananthapuram Municipal Corporation provides for signature of registered Architect/ Engineer/ Town Planner/ Supervisor. The signature of Structural Engineer was not mentioned or stated anywhere in the form. As plot size was more than 500 sq.m., as per Kerala Municipality Building Rules an Architect was competent to submit buildings plans for additions/ alteration of the building. The Competency of Architect in terms of preparation of Buildings Plans is different and Competency of Structural Engineer for issuing Structural Safety certificate is different.

The Disciplinary Committee also observed that Respondent has submitted all floor plans (Ground+First+Second and Third Floor). However, permission was granted for alteration at Ground Floor and First Floor. After approval of building plans M/s. Kumar Group or the Respondent Architect was not in picture and the work was done through some other agency appointed by the owner/ promoter namely M/s. Ideal Construction, Nagercoil. The Respondent Architect was not involved directly or indirectly for the floor where mishap during alteration had happened.



	The Disciplinary Committee pointed out that the Respondent Architect should have communicated to the concerned local authority that she was no longer connected with the project which was her mistake since as per undertaking supervision was to be carried out by her. The Council members deliberated in detail and after going through the Complaint, Statement of Defence and Report of Disciplinary Committee and other documents found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct. The incident also resulted in loss of 6 lives and apart from injury to many others. The Council informed the representative of the Respondent that she has been found guilty of violation of Regulation 2 (1) (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council further granted the Complainant and representative of Respondent an opportunity to make submissions on quantum of punishment before any punishment is announced. The Complainant stated that the Respondent be given highest penalty. The representative of Respondent requested for minimal punishment to her. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter Ordered as under : 1. The Respondent Architect is hereby Reprimanded and directed to not repeat such mistakes in future. 2. A copy of the order of Council be provided to the concerned local body.
II)	CA/DC/499 – AR. SANJAY SINGH, NEW DELHI V/S. AR. BELA GODHA, BHOPAL.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 76th Meeting held on 26th February, 2022 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. Accordingly, both the Complainant and Respondent Architect have been summoned to appear before the Council. The Complainant appeared in person. The Respondent Architect also appeared in person before the Council. The President first requested the Complainant to briefly state his complaint. The Complainant stated that their complaint made to Council contains everything. He further stated that the project was of a Medical Science



University and he was appointed through an Open Design Competition floated by M.P. PWD. He was asked to make Detailed Project Report and also provide Comprehensive Architectural Services. His firm also signed an agreed dated 08.10.2014 with Division Project Engineer, PWD PIU, Jabalpur, M.P.

The Respondent Architect has plagiarized his original architectural Design and Drawings by making minor changes and passing it off as her work and her name, title and style without intimation to him. He further stated that the agreement dated 08.10.2014 is still in force and a large part of their professional fees is yet to be paid by the client. The acceptance of the assignment by the Respondent without ensuring that earlier architect is fully paid or not and his agreement is closed or not is unethical on the part of Respondent and is a professional misconduct.

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

She stated that in the year 2017 she was awarded the work of D.P.R. Consultant by the Division Project Engineer, PWD, PIU Jabalpur. She had also deposited performance security and Bank Guarantee totaling to Rs.17,22,061/- (Seventeen Lakhs twenty-two thousand and sixty-one rupees). The Department gave her some plans and asked her to do the DPR work.

After lapse of some months' time, she got a call from the Complainant that he is architect of the project and she should not work for the same and she informed him that she was only DPR consultant and not aware of appointment of the Complainant. She further stated that she met the then Chief Architect and he said from where the plans had come is not in her purview and asked her to complete the work. The M.P. PWD officials also informed her that they have already informed the M/s. ARCOP, firm of complainant that this would be done in house by the Department.

She reiterated that she was only DPR Consultant. The contract of Complainant was with MPPWD and she was not in picture at all. She admitted that after receipt of communication from the Complainant she did not respond to the same and neither brought the same to the notice of MPPWD in writing.

She further stated that she would like to apologize to the Complainant if any inconvenience caused to him because of her actions.

The Council also perused the Report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted the findings of the Committee that Respondent after receipt of communication from the Complainant that he was architect of the project should have brought the same to the notice of the MPPWD/ PIU Jabalpur as well as the Complainant that she was only DPR Consultant and not Architect of the project.

The Council also noted that the Respondent Architect was provided sufficient time and opportunity by the Disciplinary Committee during its investigation and proceedings held on 15.09.2021 and 12.10.2021 to submit drawings (concept



	plan prepared / developed by PIU with signature) along with forwarding letter/ communication as received from the PWD/PIU/Client, however no such documents were produced by her. Thus, the Disciplinary Committee concluded that as a co-professional the Respondent Architect failed to do what is required of her as per COA Regulations and was accordingly found guilty of professional misconduct. The Council members deliberated in detail and after going through the Complaint, Statement of Defence and Report of Disciplinary Committee and other documents found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct. The Council informed the Respondent Architect that she has been found guilty of violation of Regulation 2 (1) (x) and (xv) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council further granted the Complainant and Respondent Architect an opportunity to make submissions on quantum of punishment before any punishment is announced. The Complainant sought maximum punishment as the Respondent deliberately violated the code of conduct and ethics. The Respondent requested that she may be warned or reprimanded as it is her first instance and she is in profession from last so many years. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter Ordered as under: 1. The Respondent Architect is hereby Suspended from practice as an Architect for a period of 12 months; 2. The Respondent Architect shall surrender the Certificate of Registration issued by the Council within 30 days of receipt of the Order from Council; and 3. A copy of the Order of Council be provided to the concerned local body/ authority.
III)	CA/DC/461 – SHRI S. R. MAHAJAN, A.E., MCGM, MUMBAI V/S. AR. SUHAS MAHANT, MUMBAI.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on 15th July, 2022 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 Complainant was represented through its authorized representatives. The Respondent Architect did not appear and no information was received from him about his absence for the hearing. The President requested the Complainant to briefly state the complaint. The Complainant submitted that the Respondent Architect submitted a proposal for redevelopment of residential building on 13.08.2013 for a plot and showed the plot as vacant and not shown plans showing rehabilitation of existing tenants. The Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai believing the plans made by the Architect approval the proposal and commencement certificate was also issued. Subsequently, complaints were received that 15 tenants have not been shown in the building plans. When explanation was sought from the Respondent, he admitted his mistake and withdrew the proposal. Thus, the Respondent Architect is guilty of professional misconduct. The Council noted that Respondent Architect was not present and therefore decided to defer the hearing to the next date in order to provide a final/ last opportunity to the Respondent in the matter.
IV)	CA/DC/493 – MS. MADHU KISHWAR, NEW DELHI V/S. AR. NABIN PATRA, NEW DELHI.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on 15th July, 2022 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 have been summoned to appear before the Council. Accordingly, the Complainant along with her Advocate Shri Narayan Krishnan, appeared before the Council. The Respondent Architect was represented by his Advocate Shri Sidharth Joshi. The President first requested the Complainant to briefly state her complaint. She stated that the Respondent Architect was appointed by her to provide Architectural Design and Project Management Consultancy. However, he indulged in criminal breach of trust, cheating, fraud, impersonation and violated the contract with the Manushi Sangathan and also committed professional misconduct. She further stated that the Respondent has committed serious flaws in architects plans and execution leading to denial of completion certificate by MCD. The Respondent turned into a supplier of equipment from an Architect in violation of the contract. The Respondent has abandoned the project in midway and forced



her to look for another architect. When the Respondent was appointed, she was unwell and could not regularly keep watch on construction process.

The Advocate of the Respondent submitted a written response to the Final Report of the Disciplinary Committee stating that though the Committee has found the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct on some other count but it has totally overlooked the documentary evidence on record which established gross violation of conduct regulations by the Respondent Architect. The Council reminded the Advocate to address his submissions only on professional misconduct rather about any alleged criminal conduct before the Council.

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

The Advocate of Respondent submitted that the Complaint is totally false, fabricated and the Respondent has not committed any professional misconduct. All the activities were undertaken by the Respondent with the consent of the Complainant. She had not complaint till the time the building was not to be used for commercial purpose. She started complaining only after the Respondent objected to use of the building for commercial purposes.


The Complaint is in habit of sharing fake news and making false allegations. She makes false and frivolous complaints, harasses them, arm twist and extort till they succumb down to her illegal demands. The complainant wanted to use the property for commercial renting by encroaching basement and establishing Gym, Saloon, Spa, etc. Prior to that there were whatsapp conversation calling the Respondent Guardian Angel and good deeds done by the Respondent would be remembered by her etc.

The Respondent was not involved in his personal capacity for supply of material it was through the Companies M/s. ERR & Integration Pvt. Ltd. And Geometrics Design Pvt. Ltd. The Complainant is at fault for not paying him the complete fees and making frivolous complaints at several forums. The complainant always intended to grab the hard-earned money to cause wrongful loss to him.

It was also submitted that the Respondent is working on about 15 projects with a staff of 15 employees and the decision of Council will directly impact all sixteen persons apart from their family.

The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint in question relates to the supply of following services by the Respondent Architect to Manushi Sangathan:

- A) Architectural Design Services.
- B) Project management consultancy services.
- C) Interior Design.
- D) Supplying of materials etc.



While Architectural Services, Project Management Consultancy services, Interior Design services were rendered through M/s. Geometric Design Management Pvt. Ltd., the supplies, materials were provided through M/s. ERR and Integration Pvt. Ltd. The Respondent Architect is Director in both the companies.

The Complainant initially did not have any issue with the architectural services provided by the Respondent Architect. The building was constructed as per requirements of the Complainant and interior work was undertaken thereafter.

The allegations related to the supplies such as lift, air conditioner and other services/products which are provided by M/s ERR and Integration Pvt. Ltd. cannot be taken into consideration for determining a Complaint for Professional Misconduct of an Architect, within the scope of separately signed document. The drawings and plans were submitted by the Respondent Architect as per his scope of services.

The Council noted that the Disciplinary Committee sought following documentary evidence from Complainant:

- (i) Whether any communication has been received by you (the Complainant) from MCD about serious flaws in Architectural plans and execution, as alleged in your complaint, which are in any manner hindrance to the delivery of any of the scope of work agreed between you and the Respondent (Ar. Nabin Patra).
- (ii) Any supporting document(s) about the allegation of inaccurate and highly flawed drawing by incompetent juniors which has nil or little relationship to the actual dimensions of the space at hand and this lack of dimensional inaccuracy led to constant tussles with the builder.
- (iii) Any supporting document about the allegation, "...endless delay in submitting working drawings for services, etc. leading to compounded delays in execution of the project."
- (iv) A matrix in form of a table, wherein first column all the deliverables (as per signed scope of work) is to be listed and in corresponding row of 2nd column yours (complainant's) comment about confirming delivery as well as satisfaction level of the same to be mentioned.

But the Complainant could not provide the same in the manner sought by the Committee.

The Council also noted that the Disciplinary Committee, further observed that after considering all the documents and submissions made before it, the Committee found that the Respondent Architect engaged himself in supplying material for the project in question. Being a professional he should have refrained himself from working like a contractor/ supplier, in addition to his responsibility as the Architect of the project.

The Respondent Architect and his wife were Directors of the Supplier Companies, namely, M/s. ERR & Integration Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Geometric



	Designs Pvt. Ltd. Irrespective of the reasons, such indulgences on part of the Respondent caused a conflict of interest with the work. The Committee, therefore, concluded that the Complainant could not prove, beyond doubt, the lapse(s) in Architectural services and anomaly in the payments vis a vis services received, still the Respondent Architect has violated Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989, by providing materials/ supplies through his own companies for a project where he was also rendering his professional/ architectural services as an Architect. The Council members deliberated in detail and after going through the Complaint, Statement of Defence and Report of Disciplinary Committee and other documents submitted by both parties found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct. The Council informed the advocate of the Respondent Architect that the Respondent Architect has been found guilty of violation of Regulation 2 (1) (i) (viii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council further granted the Complainant and the representative of the Respondent Architect an opportunity to make submissions on the quantum of punishment before any punishment is announced. The Complainant stated that the Respondent deserve maximum punishment. The Advocate of the Respondent requested that his client may be warned or reprimanded as it his first instance and he is in profession from last many years and about 15 staff members are working with him and the decision of Council would affect their livelihood. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter Ordered as under: 1. The Respondent Architect is hereby Suspended from practice as an Architect for a period of 24 months; 2. The Respondent Architect shall surrender the Certificate of Registration issued by the Council within 30 days of receipt of the Order from Council; and A copy of the Order of Council be provided to the concerned local body/ authority.
V)	CA/DC/530 – THE REGISTRAR, COA V/S. AR. HARSHIT SADH, VADODARA.
	The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on 15th July, 2022 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 before deciding the Complaint.

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

Both the Complainant and Respondent Architect have been summoned to appear before the Council.

Accordingly, the Complainant and the Respondent Architect appeared in person before the Council.

The President first requested the Complainant to briefly state his complaint.

The Complainant stated that the Respondent Architect was working as a faculty in the Parul Institute of Architecture and Research, Parul University, Vadodara and created a Whatsapp Group with the name "Parul Entrance Awareness" to provide live answers to students who were part of that group during NATA 2020 Examination.

In the year 2020 due to Covid-19 Pandemic and in view of lockdown restrictions by Government of India all over India, NATA test was conducted online as Home Based Test and Centre Based Test. The whatsapp chats clearly show that the Respondent was providing answers to candidates. The messages and pictures being shared on the group by the administrators and candidates were found. The Council after enquiry cancelled the examination of all such students and even the intake of Parul University in B.Arch. Course was reduced.

The Enquiry Committee consisting of Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta, Convenor, Ar. Kapil Setia, Member, Dr. Ranee Vedomuthu, Member, Ar. Mala Mohan, Member and Ar. Persi Engineer member also found the Respondent guilty of involvement unethical activities and bring disrepute to the profession of Architecture.

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


The Respondent stated that whatever happened had happened unintentionally. He came to know about the student clicking pictures of NATA test and seeking/sharing answers on Whatsapp group very late. He is already suffering because of the incident. He was removed by the Parul University as a faculty member. He stated that he learned a lesson and won't do anything in future which would damage the reputation of the Council or the profession and requested that a chance be given to him. The students who cheated in the exam are in the Third Year of B.Arch. Course.

The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that Respondent Architect himself admitted about the mischiefs happened on his part, namely answering the questions shared by students during NATA Exam on 29.08.2020 live on Whatsapp Group and sharing of questions and answers by students during examination, on the Whatsapp group. These actions of the Respondent Architect have resulted in loss of reputation, goodwill and sanctity of the NATA exam conducted by the Council and caused deterioration of minimum standards of Architectural Education prescribed by the Council. He has failed to act as a responsible professional and a faculty member.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized cursive letters, located to the right of the official stamp.

	The Council members deliberated in detail and after going through the records and documents submitted by both 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) (i) (viii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council further granted the opportunity to the Complainant and Respondent Architect to make submissions on the quantum of punishment before any punishment is announced. The Complainant requested for suspension of registration of Respondent. The Respondent Architects requested he may be warned or reprimanded as it his first instance and he was already suffering because of the incident and his career would be ruined. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter Ordered as under: The Respondent Architect is reprimanded and directed to not repeat such actions in future.						
ITEM NO.07	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT/ RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE IN RESPECT OF COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO IT.						
	The Disciplinary Committee upon conduct of detailed inquiry as per Council of Architecture Rules, 1973 has submitted its Report(s) in respect of the following cases : <table><tr><th>S. No.</th><th>Complaint No.</th><th>Particulars</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>CA/DC/494 – Deputy Chief Engineer, MCGM, Mumbai V/s. Ar. B. R. Gandhi, Ahmedabad;</td><td> The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that an incident of fire happened at terrace of Kamala Mill Compound, Mumbai. The Government of Maharashtra appointed Municipal Commissioner, MCGM to enquire into the incident of fire. The Commissioner in his report observed that Architect is the professional who conceptualizes the plan and ensures its execution as per the prevailing Development Control Regulation. For the proposals in Kamala Mill layout, Owner M/s. Kamala Mills Limited has appointed Ar. B.R. Gandhi. The Architect has submitted proposal for the additions/ alterations and change of activity under File No.DB/732/GS/A in the premises of Kamala Mill </td></tr></table>	S. No.	Complaint No.	Particulars	1.	CA/DC/494 – Deputy Chief Engineer, MCGM, Mumbai V/s. Ar. B. R. Gandhi, Ahmedabad;	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that an incident of fire happened at terrace of Kamala Mill Compound, Mumbai. The Government of Maharashtra appointed Municipal Commissioner, MCGM to enquire into the incident of fire. The Commissioner in his report observed that Architect is the professional who conceptualizes the plan and ensures its execution as per the prevailing Development Control Regulation. For the proposals in Kamala Mill layout, Owner M/s. Kamala Mills Limited has appointed Ar. B.R. Gandhi. The Architect has submitted proposal for the additions/ alterations and change of activity under File No.DB/732/GS/A in the premises of Kamala Mill
S. No.	Complaint No.	Particulars					
1.	CA/DC/494 – Deputy Chief Engineer, MCGM, Mumbai V/s. Ar. B. R. Gandhi, Ahmedabad;	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that an incident of fire happened at terrace of Kamala Mill Compound, Mumbai. The Government of Maharashtra appointed Municipal Commissioner, MCGM to enquire into the incident of fire. The Commissioner in his report observed that Architect is the professional who conceptualizes the plan and ensures its execution as per the prevailing Development Control Regulation. For the proposals in Kamala Mill layout, Owner M/s. Kamala Mills Limited has appointed Ar. B.R. Gandhi. The Architect has submitted proposal for the additions/ alterations and change of activity under File No.DB/732/GS/A in the premises of Kamala Mill					





			Compound at Trade House (i.e. Existing building "A") 3r Floor on 13.02.2017 online and the same were approved on 16.02.2017. The Commissioner's enquiry report states that the Respondent Architect has failed to perform his job and responsibilities of an Architect as prescribed in the provisions of the Development Control Rules, 1991. It is also stated in the Complaint that as per directions of Hon'ble Bombay High Court in PIL (L) No.4 of 2018 and PIL (L) No.6 of 2018, a Three members Committee headed by Justice Shri Arvind V. Samant, Former Chief Justice, High Court of Kerala, was appointed and it submitted its report. The Judicial Inquiry report at para 71 reads as under : <i>Firstly, in respect of the Architect – Shri B.R. Gandhi, he is the proprietor of M/s. B.R. Gandhi & Associates, holding License No.G/96. His role leaves much to be desired. He appeared before us and stated that he was based in Ahmedabad and visits Mumbai only once or twice in 3 months. He was the Architect engaged by the owners of Kamla Mills-Ltd. and his draftsman, Shri Raju has prepared the plans for change of user from I.T. Office to restaurant. He however, made it clear that the preparations of plans, finalizing the same and submitting the same to the MCGM, was done by Shri Raju, who had visited the site in 2017. As stated earlier, restaurant 1 above stated functioning in December 2016, whereas MoJo's Bistro started functioning in April 2017. Shri Gandhi admitted that he had never visited the site and he went by Shri Raju's oral version. He was neither aware as to when the work of furnishing and decorating the restaurant had started, and when was it completed, nor was he aware of the fact that the fire games were being played in the restaurants where Hookah was being served. He further admitted that he had not obtained the completion certificate for the work done under his signature, in as much as, Shri Raju was authorized to use his digital signature. He further stated that he had not signed any papers plans for this job and left it entirely to Shri Raju....."</i>
--	--	--	--



			Further, the Judicial Committee summarized its report as under : <i>"xxx firstly, role of the Architect B.R. Gandhi :- We hold that Shri Gandhi was not acting responsibly in the discharge of his duties as an Architect. Hence, we think it absolutely necessary to inform the Council of Architects to initiate appropriate action against Shri B.R. Gandhi. xxxxxx"</i> The Complainant thus requested for appropriate action against Respondent Architect. The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted as under: - The Occupation Certificate for the said building – Kamala Mill (Trade House) was granted on 09.04.2012. The plans for change of activity from IT office to Restaurant on 3rd Floor were granted approval on 16.02.2017. - Para 4.8.1 of the Judicial Committee Report, which reads as under : <i>"This is one of the buildings in Kamala Mill layout namely, "Trade Housing building A" having existing basement + ground + 2 upper floor + 3rd part (lower & upper level) where fire broke out on lower 3rd floor on 29.12.2017. As far as structure under reference is concerned occupation certificate to extension to Building A at 3rd Floor in Tower "A" wing was granted on 31.03.2012.</i> <i>The Architect had submitted amended plans on 01/10/2014 for addition alteration and change of user in existing building "A" (i.e. Trade House building under reference) This was approved on the plan for addition & alterations to the extensions to the existing building "A" was approved on 14.11.2017. The Architect did not propose any amendment to the part 3rd floor of building "A" in the area where the license for these establishment was granted."</i>
--	--	--	---

Success



Infusion

			iii) In all the plans the terrace had always been open to sky and not for any other activity. iv) The complaint is filed to save the erring officers of the Municipal Corporation who have failed to ensure implementation of various provisions of Municipal Corporation Act. v) No wrong doing and negligence or dereliction while performing his duties as an Architect. vi) There was no occasion for him to inspect the work done as the same was never done under his authority or order. He was not appointed by his client to do the interior work at restaurants and the illegally enclosed terrace where this mishap occurred. vii) He has performed his duties and responsibilities as prescribed in Development Control Rules 1991 and there are no irregularities whatsoever in getting sanction for change of user. viii) His responsibility does not relate to the illegal work done by the owners of the two restaurants where the mishap occurred. ix) Once the occupation certificate is obtained and owners occupies the building, the responsibility of Architects comes to an end. Architect cannot be held responsible for any illegal work which is carried out in building subsequently. x) The work in two restaurants was done by owner through their Interior Designer. The client did not ask him to supervise the restaurants. His role was restricted to obtaining change of user from I.T. Office to Restaurant. xi) No site visit from Architect was required for this permission.
--	--	--	---

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

			xii) The entire case may be examined from the angle of the role and responsibilities of the Architect in the said project. The Disciplinary Committee sought following documents from the complainant: 1. Application for change of user/ addition/ alternation submitted by the Respondent Architect. 2. Copy of approval/ permission granted by the MCGM along with relevant conditions. 3. Copy of Bye-laws/ Development Control Rules for dealing with such type of projects. The Respondent submitted that the fire took place outside the approved premises. It happened on illegally encroached area by the Developer and therefore he cannot be liable for the same. The Committee noted that Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai vide letter no.EB/732/GS/A dated 15.02.2017, addressed to the Respondent Architect granted approval for change of activity on 3rd floor lower level of existing building "A" from Office (I.T.) to Restaurant (Commercial) and additional alteration in ground floor IT unit of existing buildings Times Tower Wing "A", etc. on the following conditions : 1. That the revised N.O.C. for parking layout shall be submitted before asking completion certificate. 2. That the de-novo letter from Director of Industries shall be submitted before asking for completion certificate of the work. 3. That the premises shall be put to use for the user activity as per the approval plan only. 4. That the certificate from Structural Engineer for proposed partition was shall be submitted. 5. That the condition of NOC from CFO shall be complied with and the completion certificate from CFO shall be submitted before asking for completion.
--	--	--	---

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

			6. That NOC from Health Department for restaurant user shall be obtained & submitted before completion. 7. That the NOCs from relevant Department/ Authorities for restaurant user & Commercial user shall be obtained before starting the activity. The Disciplinary Committee noted that the approval for additions and alterations in the building was granted on the undertaking of the Architect that the same will be carried out under his supervision, as per Appendix-XI of the Development Control Rules. Further, the Committee also noticed that the approval letter for Additions and Alterations is addressed to the Respondent Architect to comply with the above stated conditions. He was required to submit a completion certificate, after completion of work, in Appendix- XX to the Commissioner, for occupancy of the Building. However, in the present case no such exercise was undertaken. The stand of the Architect that his role was limited to obtaining permission/ approval for additions/ alternation in the building cannot be accepted. He was required to supervise the additions and alterations in the building, as per undertaking submitted by him, to ensure that the same was done as per approved plans. The Respondent did not produce any document showing his services were terminated after approval of Building Plans additions/ alterations in Kamala Mill Compound. Further, even in case the client has done away with his services he ought to have intimated the same to the Municipal Corporation. No such action or record was produced by the Respondent Architect before the Committee. The Disciplinary Committee after taking note of the Enquiry Report of the Municipal Commissioner as well as the Enquiry Report of the Three Member Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in PIL (L) No.4 of 2018 and PIL (L) No.6 of 2018, concluded that
--	--	--	--

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

		Respondent Architect did not act responsibly in the discharge of his duties as an Architect. The Respondent Architect though contested the observations made by Enquiry Committees of MCGM about his role in the building before the Disciplinary Committee but did not challenge them either before these Committees itself or before Higher Judicial forums/ High Court to get these observations expunged/ removed from the report. The Committee, therefore, unanimously finds the Respondent Architect guilty of professional misconduct for violation Regulation 2 (1) (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that both Complainant and Respondent Architect be summoned to appear before the Council in the next meeting to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972. Further, a copy of the report of Disciplinary Committee be provided to both the parties. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to concerned parties.
2.	CA/DC/496 – Shri A. S. Shapurwala, Mumbai V/s. Ar. Narendra B.P. Chitroda, Navi Mumbai	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Respondent Architect was not appointed through proper channel by the developer. No NOC has been taken from the partner/firm of previous Architects and their fees was also not paid by the developer. The Complaint further stated that the documents submitted for occupation certificate are incomplete. The conditions of Letter of Intent and commencement certificate issued by Municipal Corporation have not been fulfilled. The IOD, Layout plan and Occupation certificate are totally different. The conditions set out by Chief fire officer are not complied with. The life of occupants is at danger as there is no provision for access of

Indira



M. S. Mishra

		fire tender. The OCC was applied without completion of work and giving wrong address of developer. The Respondent Architect in his Statement of Defence stated that Ar. Arvind B. Naik (previous Architect) was appointed in his personal capacity and not as partner of M/s. Kumamekar & Naik. The Developer applied to SRA on 10/11/2015 for termination of appointment of Mr. Naik on grounds of gross misconduct. However, during pendency, Mr. Naik expired on 10.08.2016. The Developer had paid all professional fees to Mr. Naik upto that stage and also had made excess payment. Appointment of Respondent Architect was made on 18.08.2016 by Developer after obtaining due approval from SRA. Respondent further submitted that various allegations made in the complaint are false, baseless and without any merit. The application for OCC of Sale Building was made to SRA and the file is under scrutiny and if there are any pending works, which the Respondent denies in toto, then same would be completed under the supervision of Respondent by Developers. The respondent further submitted that construction of site was as per last approved plan and there was no deviation as alleged by the Complainant. The Complainant is a habitual litigant and is misusing the various avenues available to extract undue advantage. The Disciplinary Committee during its hearing held on 01.08.2022 specifically sought response from Advocate representing the Respondent Architect to the Slum rehabilitation authority letter no. SRA/ED/OW/2020/26604/L dated 11.12.2020. In response the Respondent Architect through his Advocate vide email dated 09.08.2022 submitted his response before the Disciplinary Committee.
--	--	--

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

		The Respondent Architect stated that the Complainant has some personal grudges against the developer i.e. M/s Venus enterprises. The Complainant is abusing due process of law and filed the case with sole intention to pressurize the Respondent and fulfill the unreasonable and unjustifiable demands. The Complaint has raised primary allegations against the Respondent Architect. However, majority of his allegations are against the developer who has not been made party in the complaint. The Disciplinary Committee observed that in the reply filed by the Respondent Architect on 09.08.2022 no specific clarification/ response about the Letter dated 11.12.2020 issued by SRA to the Developer and Respondent Architect has been furnished except stating that the same was replied by the developer vide letter dated 23.01.2021 (after a period of almost one year). The Committee deems it very important to extract the contents of letter dated 11.12.2020 of SRA as under: - 1) <i>Since the sale bldg. is allowed to be occupied from your end for which O.C. is not granted, you are hereby directed to submit your explanation within a week after receipt of this letter also to vacate the building unauthorizedly occupied.</i> 2) <i>The safety of the residents including those who have been permitted to occupy the flats unauthorizedly by you is of paramount importance. You are directed to ensure the same by taking all measures mandated under prevailing regulation/law for ensuring safety of life and property.</i> 3) <i>You are also directed to submit copy of the CFO NOC, lift inspector certificate, structural stability of relevant authority and any such NOCs which is necessary to ensure the safety of life of the residents.</i> 4) <i>It is observed that there is a lackadaisical attitude on your part to resolve the issue which is pending since long.</i>
--	--	---

Arcauf



M. S. S. S.

		The above letter is addressed to (1) M/s Venus Enterprises, Mumbai (2) Ar. Narendra B.P. Chitroda, Architect. The Disciplinary Committee concluded that the Respondent Architect has failed to take reasonable care of his Professional obligations and failed to respond to the serious issues raised by SRA in letter dated 11.12.2020 for the project in question. The Committee thus found the Respondent Architect guilty of Professional Misconduct for violating Regulation 2 (1) (i), (iii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that both Complainant and Respondent Architect be summoned to appear before the Council in the next meeting to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972. Further, a copy of the report of Disciplinary Committee be provided to both the parties. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to concerned parties.
3.	CA/DC/523 – Shri Anand Prakash Gupta, Delhi V/s. Ar. Surendra Singh, Ghaziabad.	The Council perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Paradise Mall in Rajouri Garden, Delhi, was constructed by M/s. Gold Cause Construction Pvt Ltd. and Mr. Surinder Singh, Respondent Architect was the Architect of M/s. Gold Cause Construction Pvt Ltd. (Builder). The Complainant has booked 2 shops (Shop no. F-39 and F-40) from the builder. The agreement to sell had description of area of these 2 shops. However, because of a dispute with the Builder, the complainant procured the copy of the approved drawings from the local authority/DDA which was having different dimensions than the sale agreement. Hence, the Complainant approached the Competent Court which

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

		appointed an advocate as Local Commissioner for needful report. The Local Commissioner relied on the drawings prepared by the Respondent Architect which was having dimensions as 8-foot front (wide) shops. Whereas as per the dimensions given in the plan sanctioned by DDA, the front(wide) dimensions are 17.5 foot and 18 foot. The Respondent Architect without actually visiting the site prepared a false drawing of the 2 shops under question and submitted to the Local Court Commissioner. The Complainant submitted that the Respondent Architect has committed professional misconduct and is guilty of Regulation 2(1)(i) (iii)(viii) and (x) of the Architects professional conduct Regulations, 1989. The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he prepared the draft plan/ drawings at the instance of one Mr. Upadhyaya who is his childhood friend. He further stated that he had not visited the site and was not aware of the issue between the Complainant and the builder and was under impression that it is a modified/partition drawing. He also submitted that he was not paid any fees nor was appointed by M/s. Gold Cause Construction for preparing any building plans. The Respondent Architect during the hearing held on 24.01.2022 stated that the Statement of Defence filed by Mr. Ankit Gupta in this complaint on his behalf was also not authorized by him. Mr. Ankit Gupta was the Advocate of the builder. The Committee then asked the Respondent Architect to send an email confirming his statement that the Statement of Defence submitted on his behalf by Advocate Ankit Gupta was not authorized by him. The Respondent Architect agreed that he would submit an email by evening of 25th January, 2022 to this effect. The Respondent Architect also stated that he would also send a clarification mail to the Complainant in the matter with a copy to the Council.
--	--	---

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

			Further, during the hearing held on 06.05.2022, it was noted that in previous hearing the Respondent Architect was asked by the Committee to send a letter to his friend, Mr. Upadhyaya, stating that drawing has been misused in a legal case, without his consent and henceforth, he would withdraw his consent for any use of that drawing, other than for personal use of this friend, within 7 days with a copy to Registrar, COA. The Respondent Architect was also asked to send an e-mail confirming his oral statement before Committee that the Statement of Defence submitted on his behalf by Advocate Ankit Gupta was not authorized him. The Committee noted that the Respondent did not submit any communication to his friend (Mr. Upadhyay) about misuse of drawing prepared by him for personal use of his friend, and hence withdrawing the use of the said drawing for any other purpose(s), with a copy of such e-mail to the Registrar, COA. Further, in the email sent about Statement of Defence submitted by Advocate Ankit Gupta, the Respondent Architect retracted his oral statement made before the Committee and stated that he has forgotten during the DC meeting held on 24.01.2022 about appointment of Advocate Ankit Gupta by him and the Advocate now has been asked not to reply or represent the case on his behalf. The Committee during its hearing held on 01.08.2022 again informed the Respondent Architect that in the hearing held on 06.05.2022 he sought adjournment on the ground that he would submit his reply after consulting his advocate and that he would also write a communication to his friend (Mr. Upadhyay) about misuse of his drawing by his by him. The Committee asked the Respondent Architect whether he has filed a Police complaint or any FIR regarding misuse of his drawing? The Respondent Architect informed that he has sent an email to his friend Mr. Upadhyay but has not filed any Complaint or FIR with Police. The Respondent Architect further stated that he had
--	--	--	--

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature]

			made the drawings as a friendly gesture not for any official use. The Advocate of the Complainant invited the attention of the Committee towards Paragraph 3 and 4 of the Statement of the Defence filed by the Respondent Architect, which are extracted as under: <i>".....3. It is submitted that in the natural course of business, my Client was approached by M/s. Gold Cause Construction Pvt. Ltd. And was requested to render his professional services to prepare the drawing/ maps of some shops situated at Paradise Mall, Plot No.23, District Centre, Shivaji Place, New Delhi.</i> <i>4. Accordingly, my client had, after duly following all the prescribed procedures and techniques for measurement, prepared the site map/ drawings of the various shops at Paradise Mall, Plot No.23, District Center, Shivaji Place, New Delhi, and submitted it to M/s. Gold Cause Construction Pvt. Ltd....."</i> The Advocate of the Complainant also invited the attention of Committee towards the consent letter of the Respondent Architect to be appointed as Local Commissioner for measurement of shops in case of Anand Prakash Gupta V/s Gold Core, pending in the Court of Ms. Sugandha Aggrawal, Ld., ADS, Tis Hazari, Court, Delhi. He Further submitted that the Respondent Architect intentionally submitted the false measurements in the drawing and tried to cause loss to his client. He submitted that it is a fit case of Professional Misconduct case on the Part of Respondent Architect. The Disciplinary Committee after going the through the entire records and submissions made by parties noted that the Respondent Architect acted negligently by preparing drawings/ plans different from actual dimensions or as per sanctioned plan. The Respondent also tried to mislead the Committee by stating in one hearing the Statement of Defence that the submissions by the Advocate Ankit Gupta are not authorized by
--	--	--	---

Aggrawal



Ankit Gupta

		him and later on he stated that he forgot about appointment of Advocate Ankit Gupta by him. The Committee thus found the Respondent Architect guilty of professional misconduct for violation of Regulations 2 (1) (iii), (viii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter accepted the report of the Disciplinary Committee and decided that both Complainant and Respondent Architect be summoned to appear before the Council in the next meeting to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972. Further, a copy of the report of Disciplinary Committee be provided to both the parties. Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to concerned parties.		
ITEM NO.8	TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE ARCHITECTS, GENERAL PUBLIC AND GOVT. AGENCIES.			
	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.: 555 Resolved that: <table><tr><td>1.</td><td>CA/DC/537 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Gandigude OM Prakash, Sangareddy against Ar. Jattu Prabhat Bhanu, Hyderabad, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Complainant entered into an agreement with Respondent for construction and Architecture services on 7.08.2020 . The Respondent was paid Rs. 86 Lakhs for the project. An Additional amount of Rs. 50 thousand was paid for getting construction permission and plans of drawing etc.</td></tr></table>		1.	CA/DC/537 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Gandigude OM Prakash, Sangareddy against Ar. Jattu Prabhat Bhanu, Hyderabad, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Complainant entered into an agreement with Respondent for construction and Architecture services on 7.08.2020 . The Respondent was paid Rs. 86 Lakhs for the project. An Additional amount of Rs. 50 thousand was paid for getting construction permission and plans of drawing etc.
1.	CA/DC/537 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Gandigude OM Prakash, Sangareddy against Ar. Jattu Prabhat Bhanu, Hyderabad, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Complainant entered into an agreement with Respondent for construction and Architecture services on 7.08.2020 . The Respondent was paid Rs. 86 Lakhs for the project. An Additional amount of Rs. 50 thousand was paid for getting construction permission and plans of drawing etc.			



	After breaching the terms and conditions the Respondent is not completing the building construction. The Respondent started complaining to Municipality that the construction is done in violation of building plans. He also started blackmailing for extracting money. He has done same thing with other people also. The Complainant requested for taking action against the Respondent. The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he has received only Rs. 54 lakhs from complainant. The municipal fees was Rs. 1 lakh 20 thousand and complainant had paid only Rs. 50 thousand. The complainant himself has applied for Municipal approval with the drawings made by the Respondent. The complainant defaulted in payment since first stage and thereafter he engaged some other person without cancelling the contract with the Respondent and assessing the work done by the Respondent which is worth Rs.74 Lakhs. He entrusted the work to some other architect to avoid difference of payment and also balance of payment. The Council after deliberations noted that the complaint was purely about construction work and decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect as there was no allegations about architectural services. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
2.	CA/DC/538 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Shameema Jahabar, Tamil Nadu against Ar. C. Sownderya, Tamil Nadu, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that he entered into an agreement with Respondent on 22.08.2021 for a residential building . The Respondent agreed to construct and deliver the building within 6 months from the commencement of works at site. The Respondent agreed to total cost of building as Rs. 32 Lakhs 52 thousand and 3 hundred rupees which shall be paid by the complainant as per the milestone schedule . The Complainant had paid Rs. 11 lakh to the Respondent. However, he delayed the work on one pretext or the other. Since no meaningful work was undertaken for the amount already paid. The complainant did not make further payments and requested the Respondent to complete the work as per the agreement. However, the Respondent in spite of several requests did not do anything and resorted to intimidatory tactics. The Respondent has abandoned the work and resorting to unethical practices. The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he was running a construction company in the name of Lu Hen Archy at Thanjavur. The complainant approached him and requested to construct the residential house at Thanjavur. The agreed estimated cost was Rs. 32 Lakhs 52 thousand and 3 hundred rupees. The Respondent spent Rs 10 lakh towards construction material



Handwritten signature

	and Rs. 2 Lakh towards construction instruments but the complainant did not pay the balance amount of Rs. 8 lakh and paid only Rs. 5 lakhs. Due to delay in payment the Respondent was unable to construct the building on time. He further submitted that the Complaint was motivated and filed with an ill intention. The Council after deliberations noted that the complaint was purely about construction work and decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect as there was no allegations about architectural services. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
3.	CA/DC/539 - Shri Sushil Jain, Noida against Ar. Deepak Singhla, New Delhi, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Respondent Architect was engaged for Architectural Consultancy services and allied services vide contract dated 14.08.2017. Following flaws/deficiency were found in his services : 1) Lack of physical measurement on the actual site before start of the construction. 2) Unprofessional Behaviour and abdication/non acceptance of responsibility. 3) Non submission of details and exact measurement and drawings and details of variations and impact on the measurement of the plot. 4) Structural mistake in respect of beams on the roof of ground floor (RCC slabs) . 5) Leakages/Seepages from the roof, walls and Eaves(Chajjas) and also the sunken portion. 6) Lack of supervision despite weekly visits. 7) Faculty drawings and structure reinforcement calculations. 8) Non reporting of the change in structure and other construction plan to the owners, and not obtaining prior permission from the owners. The Complaint requested taking punitive action against the Respondent. The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the Complainant approached the Respondent in the year 2017 for providing architectural consultancy services. The Respondent shared a consultancy offer on 14.08.2017. Based on verbal acceptance of consultancy offer the Respondent proceeded with the design of the house. The measurements were taken as supplied by the Complainant. Based on the recommendation of the Respondent, the Complainant appointed M/s. Green Leaf Construction Pvt. Ltd as civil contractors. The basement walls, columns and roof were cast as per drawings given by Structural Engineer Mr. Sunil Arora. The Respondent is not responsible for the leakage on roof, walls or sunken areas. The day-to-day supervision shall be duty of site engineer. Mr. Sunil Arora was changed by the Complainant with another Structural Engineer Mr. R.N. Gupta. After his appointment lot of drawings were changed. The Respondent continued to work till October 2019. Thereafter, the Complainant decided to appoint Ms.Iram Sultana as the




Infantish

	Interior designer. The entire finished false ceilings and sections of walls and stonework were ripped out by the new designer. The Respondent was removed from doing the interiors and the scope of work altered as such. The sole reason for the Petitioner's grievance can be attributed to random changes in the architectural plan and unapproved construction. On account of change of designer and random decision of Complainant without consulting Respondent. The Respondent worked diligently and put more than 3850 hours of work. The Council after deliberations noted that the Respondent Architect cannot be blamed for flaws/defects in the construction as the Complainant had his specialized consultants to supervise and execute construction and carry out interiors. The Council decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
4.	CA/DC/536 - Shri Prakash M. Mule, Town Planner, Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation against Ar. Swapnil S. Mangla Wagh, Ulhasnagar, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Respondent Architect submitted plan for sanction under risk based rule for an already constructed building. Since permission got delayed, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in PIL No.119 of 2011 directed the Commissioner Municipal Corporation to give hearing to the concerned Petitioner during the period of hearing given to the petitioner Municipal Corporation found following facts : a) The risk based plan submitted by Mr. Swapnil Wagh shows that building basement was used for godown, ground floor for commercial purpose & first floor for residential purpose. However as per the site verification entire building was used for commercial purpose. b) The plot under reference has frontage of road below 12 mtr width & as per D.C rule applicable in 2019 total commercial use on the suit land was not permissible for plot facing road below width of 12 meter. c) It is found that the development work on the site is not as per plan sanctioned by Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation also it is found that the said plot is illegally subdivided without approval from Revenue Authority. Accordingly, the Municipal Commissioner directed for filing of complaint against the respondent Architect. The Respondent Architect in defence stated that the Complaint is false, frivolous and unwarranted hence liable for rejected. A similar complaint no. CA/DC/488/2021 was filed on same facts and same was dismissed by the Council in its 74th meeting held on 19.12.2020 by holding that no case of Professional misconduct is made out as the building was already approved/regularized by the competent authority.



Swapnil

	The Respondent came to know from the owners that the owners had submitted the building proposal to the corporation on 21.02.2014. The Corporation did not call any information nor refused its permission. After expiry of statutory period of 60 days if no communication received from corporation then the building plan is treated as deemed to be approved. The owners as a matter of abundant caution also applied to the Corporation for compounding the construction. The owners paid assessment amount to the corporation. The Respondent submitted proposal dated 15.09.2018 to the corporation for the approval of building/ structure based on risk based categorization. The corporation demanded some amount and same was paid and building submission certificate was also issued. The owners gave the building on lease to Reliance Company for erection of mobile towers and corporation gave permission for the same. The Council after deliberations noted that no fault can be found with the Respondent Architect and decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
ITEM NO.9	TO CONSIDER REQUEST RECEIVED FROM COMPLAINANT FOR WITHDRAWAL OF COMPLAINT FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT IN CA/DC/531 – SHRI HARISIMARAN SINGH SANDHU & ORS V/S. AR. SUDHIR VOHRA.
	The President informed the members that the Council received a complaint for alleged professional misconduct from Shri Harisimaran Singh Sandhu & Ors against Ar. Sudhir Vohra on 22.11.2021. The Council in its last meeting after considering the Complaint and Statement of Defence of Respondent Architect referred the matter to Disciplinary Committee for detailed investigation. However, the office of the Council on 19.08.2022, received a letter dated from Ar. Sudhir Vohra, Respondent attaching the letter dated 17.08.2022 from the Complainants withdrawing their complaint for alleged professional misconduct against him. The Council also sent confirmation letters to the Complainant asking him he has to say anything further in the matter. No response was received from him. The Council after deliberations the dismissed the Complaint as “Withdrawn”. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
ITEM NO.10	TO TAKE NOTE OF APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT FOR CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL UNDER SECTION 3(3) (c) OF THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972.
	The President informed the members that Shri M. L. Soni, Returning Officer & Director, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, vide notice F.NO.4-15/2022-TS.VI dated 23rd September, 2022, has initiated the process of elections of Members



Handwritten signature in blue ink.

	of Council under Section 3(3) (c) of the Architects Act, 1972. The last date for receipt of objections on the Electoral Roll was 6th October, 2022. The Returning Officer has also notified the schedule of elections. The Hon'ble Members noted the information.																																													
ITEM NO.11	TO TAKE NOTE OF LAUNCH OF MANUAL OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE COUNTRY.																																													
	The President informed the members that Manual of Architectural Practice as approved by the Council has been printed in Five Volumes and launched at following places all over India for spreading awareness about the same: <table><tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>Date</th><th>Place</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>25.06.2022</td><td>Mumbai</td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>26.06.2022</td><td>Trivandrum</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>22.07.2022</td><td>Indore</td></tr><tr><td>4.</td><td>5.08.2022</td><td>Bengaluru</td></tr><tr><td>5.</td><td>14.08.2022</td><td>Ranchi</td></tr><tr><td>6.</td><td>20.08.2022</td><td>Chennai</td></tr><tr><td>7.</td><td>27.08.2022</td><td>Faridabad</td></tr><tr><td>8.</td><td>28.08.2022</td><td>Chandigarh</td></tr><tr><td>9.</td><td>04.09.2022</td><td>Raipur</td></tr><tr><td>10.</td><td>10.09.2022</td><td>Nagpur</td></tr><tr><td>11.</td><td>23.09.2022</td><td>Kochi</td></tr><tr><td>12.</td><td>03.10.2022</td><td>Imphal</td></tr><tr><td>13.</td><td>04.11.2022</td><td>Lucknow</td></tr><tr><td>14.</td><td>06.11.2022</td><td>Delhi</td></tr></table> The launch events were organized in collaboration with concerned IIA Chapter/ Centres and in Imphal it was organized by Manipur Architects Forum.	Sl. No.	Date	Place	1.	25.06.2022	Mumbai	2.	26.06.2022	Trivandrum	3.	22.07.2022	Indore	4.	5.08.2022	Bengaluru	5.	14.08.2022	Ranchi	6.	20.08.2022	Chennai	7.	27.08.2022	Faridabad	8.	28.08.2022	Chandigarh	9.	04.09.2022	Raipur	10.	10.09.2022	Nagpur	11.	23.09.2022	Kochi	12.	03.10.2022	Imphal	13.	04.11.2022	Lucknow	14.	06.11.2022	Delhi
Sl. No.	Date	Place																																												
1.	25.06.2022	Mumbai																																												
2.	26.06.2022	Trivandrum																																												
3.	22.07.2022	Indore																																												
4.	5.08.2022	Bengaluru																																												
5.	14.08.2022	Ranchi																																												
6.	20.08.2022	Chennai																																												
7.	27.08.2022	Faridabad																																												
8.	28.08.2022	Chandigarh																																												
9.	04.09.2022	Raipur																																												
10.	10.09.2022	Nagpur																																												
11.	23.09.2022	Kochi																																												
12.	03.10.2022	Imphal																																												
13.	04.11.2022	Lucknow																																												
14.	06.11.2022	Delhi																																												

[Signature]



[Signature]

	Further, complementary copies of the Manual have been sent to Chief Secretaries of all States/ UTs, all Architectural Institutions, Secretary and other officers of Ministry of Education, all Council members, Hon'ble Finance Minister, Hon'ble Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs, Hon'ble Commerce Minister, Cabinet Secretary, Govt. of India, CEO NITI Aayog, Hon'ble Chief Ministers of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Gujarat, Kerala, Tamilnadu, Governor J&K, Governor, Punjab, Governor Reserve Bank of India, CMDs of HUDCO, NBCC, PNB, SBI, NHB, etc. The Council members appreciated the efforts made to spread awareness about architectural profession and also about Manual to various authorities.
ITEM NO.12	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. Ar. Maitreyi Chander Gupta; and 2. Ar. Arvind Kumar Ahirwar. The President further informed that the term of members elected from amongst Heads of Architectural Institutions has ended and the process of election is already underway and on 24th November, 2022, results would be announced by the Returning Officer. The President and Vice-President felicitated the following members who were elected under Section 3(3) (c) 1. Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta; 2. Ar. Abhay V. Purohit; 3. Ar. Amit Kumar Garg' 4. Ar. Jayalakshmi V.; and 5. Ar. P. Satheesh Kumar 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.
ITEM NO.13	TO CONSIDER AND ACCORD CONCURRENCE ON THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022-23 AS APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL.



Infu-mil

	The Council perused the Budget estimates of the Council of Architecture for the financial year 2022-23 as approved by the Executive Committee and ratified the same. Further, the Council members desired that the Budget Estimates for the financial year 2023-2024 should also indicate the sub-heads of income as shown in various TRCs. Further, in case expenditure under any head is more than the Budgeted amount, the approval for revised estimates and expenditure should be obtained.										
ITEM NO.14	ANY OTHER ITEM WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR.										
I)	TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE ARCHITECTS, GENERAL PUBLIC AND GOVT. AGENCIES.										
	The Council perused 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.: 556 Resolved that: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SL. No.</th><th>Complaint No./ Name of Complaint</th><th>Respondent's Name</th><th>Member to whom the Complaint was referred for prima facie opinion.</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td><td colspan="3"> CA/DC/541 - Shri Prashant Waghmare, City Engineer, Pune Municipal Corporation, Pune against Ar. Siddarth Harischandrakar, Pune, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Sanctioned plans are not matching with the actual construction on site. Any construction carried out by the developer in deviation to sanctioned plan should have been brought by the Respondent Architect to the notice of the local authority. During the site visits of various projects following deviations have been observed: 1) Illegal construction in parking and on terrace. 2) Engulfing common passage and addition of same in flat area. 3) Extending room area by enclosing open balcony and Architectural projections. 4) Increasing building height other than sanctioned height. 5) Converting free of FSI/ AHU area in habitable room. 6) Changes in partition wall/room sizes. 7) Violation of marginal distances. Above deviations have resulted into violations of FSI and Development Control Rules. </td></tr> </tbody> </table>			SL. No.	Complaint No./ Name of Complaint	Respondent's Name	Member to whom the Complaint was referred for prima facie opinion.	1.	CA/DC/541 - Shri Prashant Waghmare, City Engineer, Pune Municipal Corporation, Pune against Ar. Siddarth Harischandrakar, Pune, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Sanctioned plans are not matching with the actual construction on site. Any construction carried out by the developer in deviation to sanctioned plan should have been brought by the Respondent Architect to the notice of the local authority. During the site visits of various projects following deviations have been observed: 1) Illegal construction in parking and on terrace. 2) Engulfing common passage and addition of same in flat area. 3) Extending room area by enclosing open balcony and Architectural projections. 4) Increasing building height other than sanctioned height. 5) Converting free of FSI/ AHU area in habitable room. 6) Changes in partition wall/room sizes. 7) Violation of marginal distances. Above deviations have resulted into violations of FSI and Development Control Rules.		
SL. No.	Complaint No./ Name of Complaint	Respondent's Name	Member to whom the Complaint was referred for prima facie opinion.								
1.	CA/DC/541 - Shri Prashant Waghmare, City Engineer, Pune Municipal Corporation, Pune against Ar. Siddarth Harischandrakar, Pune, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that the Sanctioned plans are not matching with the actual construction on site. Any construction carried out by the developer in deviation to sanctioned plan should have been brought by the Respondent Architect to the notice of the local authority. During the site visits of various projects following deviations have been observed: 1) Illegal construction in parking and on terrace. 2) Engulfing common passage and addition of same in flat area. 3) Extending room area by enclosing open balcony and Architectural projections. 4) Increasing building height other than sanctioned height. 5) Converting free of FSI/ AHU area in habitable room. 6) Changes in partition wall/room sizes. 7) Violation of marginal distances. Above deviations have resulted into violations of FSI and Development Control Rules.										



	The Response of the Respondent Architect is that during the course of construction, the Developer or the person causing construction has the right to seek revised sanction. After coming in to force of Unified Development Regulations there is a specific provision which permits ancillary FSI to be utilized for availing the building potential even in case where the building plans are sanctioned under previous Development Control Rules. In all the projects /sites the work is done well within the frame work of the regulations and there is no violation of any FSI or extra FSI. The Respondent also informed that Occupancy Certificate has already been obtained and some internal changes have been done by the individual occupants without information and knowledge of the Architect. The Council after deliberations noted that nothing wrong had been committed on the part of the Respondent Architect and decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
2.	CA/DC/543 - Shri Anand Bhalve, Pune against Ar. Saleel D. Deshpande, Pune, the Council noted that the complaint of the Complainant is that the Complainant signed an agreement M/s. Happho V. Mart Solutions Pvt. Ltd., to construct an independent house. The company appointed the Respondent Architect and he obtained sanction of the building plan from local authorities. However, neither the company nor the Respondent Architect ensured that the construction work is in accordance with the sanctioned building plan. The Plan submitted by the Respondent was not proper. After the first-floor slab was cast, the Complainant received a letter from PMRDA that they have rejected the plinth CC request. The Plinth broke while casting the first-floor slab and the bottom of the slab became convex in shape. The complainant asked for NOC from the Respondent Architect. However, he has not provided the same. The response of the Respondent Architect is that he prepared the building plan as per Govt. lay out and obtained the approval from the concerned authorities. As per the agreement with the M/s Happho V. Mart Solutions Pvt. Ltd., the Respondent's mandate was only to obtain approval of the building plan. He had no role in construction and development of petitioner's house. On 8th June, 2022, the Respondent received an email from the Complainant requesting for an NOC from change of Architect. In the contractual spirit, the Respondent informed M/s. Happho regarding the requirement of NOC from Respondent. M/s. Happho informed that there are few commercial issues which need to be resolved between the parties and Respondent should not issue NOC. The Council deliberated in the matter and noted that Respondent Architect should have issued NOC for appointment of another architect for the project and should not have waited for resolution of disputes between the Complainant and the Contractor. The Council, therefore,

Received



M. P. S. M. S.

	opined that there is a prima facie case against the Respondent Architect and referred the matter to Disciplinary Committee for detailed investigation as per Council of Architecture Rules, 1973. The decision of the Council be informed to the concerned parties.
II)	TO TAKE NOTE OF NOTIFICATION DATED 25.10.2022, ISSUED BY THE JOINT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVT. OF INDIA, NOTIFYING VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT, COA. The President informed the members that the Joint Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, vide notification dated 25.10.2022, has notified the vacancies in the office of the President and Vice-President, Council of Architecture and elections would be conducted by the Returning Officer appointed by the Ministry. The Members noted the information.
III)	CONSIDERING THE PH.D. ACQUIRED WITHOUT UNDERGOING MASTER'S DEGREE COURSE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FACULTY MEMBERS OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS. Shri Punit Sethi, Member, with the permission of the Chair requested that all Ph.D. holders who have acquired their qualification before coming into force of COA (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, be considered eligible for faculty positions. The Council deliberated in the matter and decided that all faculty members who have not undergone Master of Architecture Course but have undergone or enrolled upto 31.10.2020, for Ph.D. in Architecture or allied subjects should be considered eligible for faculty positions. The Council further decided that the Ph.D. Degree should awarded by Faculty of Architecture or Planning of the concerned University.
IV)	SCHOLARSHIP SCHEME FOR ECONOMICAL DISTRESSED STUDENTS. The President informed the members that the Executive Committee has approved the Scholarship Scheme for Economical Distressed students studying B.Arch. Course in COA approved institutions. The scholarship would be granted to 100 students all over India. The President requested the Registrar-Secretary to circulate the approved scheme to all members of the Council and also requested the members to send their views/ comments within 15 days.
V)	ENHANCEMENT OF SITTING FEES FOR ATTENDING MEETINGS OF COUNCIL AND OTHER COMMITTEES.



Handwritten signature in blue ink.

	Ar. Vijay Garg, member, with the permission of the Chair suggested that the sitting fees for attending the meetings of the Council and other Committee be enhanced to Rs.10,000/- from existing Rs.5,000/- for Council meeting and Rs.4,000/- for Committee meetings. The Council, accordingly, passed the following Resolution: Resolution No.:557 Resolved that : The sitting fees for attending Council Meetings be enhanced to Rs.10,000/- per day for attending Council meeting and for meetings of Committees of the Council.
VI)	GRANT OF ONETIME RENEWAL AT THE TIME OF REGISTRATION.
	Members deliberated the issue of the Registration and Renewal of Architects and after deliberations resolved as under : Resolution No.:558 Resolved that : (i) The Council of Architecture Rules, 1973 be amended to allow acceptance of Onetime payment of renewal fees, along with Registration Fees, as applicable, from the applicants applying for registration as an Architect under the Architects Act, 1972, in case the applicant is opting for payment Onetime payment of Renewal Fee along with Registration Fees; and (ii) The Onetime payment of Renewal Fee by the applicant along with Registration will be subject to submission of Degree, issued by the Competent Authority, by the applicant. The Council directed the Registrar-Secretary to take opinion in the matter from Chartered Accountant of the Council before proceeding further to avoid any accounting/ taxation complication.
The Vice-President thanked the President, Members of the Council for attending the meeting and making their valuable contribution. She also thanked the Registrar-Secretary, Administrative Officer and other officers and employees of the Council for organizing such a fruitful meeting and also for successful conduct of Pratyasha programme to celebrate 50 years of enactment of the Architects act, 1972 on 6th November, 2022. The meeting ended at 6:00 p.m.	