

MINUTES OF THE 77TH MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE, HELD ON FRIDAY, 15TH JULY, 2022, FROM 10.30 A.M. ONWARDS, IN CASUARINA HALL, CONVENTION CENTRE, INDIA HABITAT CENTRE, LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI – 110003.

PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS :

1.	Ar. Amitava Roy	22.	Ar. Vishal Arun Kumar Vyas
2.	Ar. Abhijit D. Shirodkar	23.	Ar. Nand Lal Chandel
3.	Ar. Naveen Sharma	24.	Ar. Harinder Arora
4.	Ar. Punit Sethi	25.	Ar. Gajanand Ram
5.	Ar. Lalichan Zacharias	26.	Ar. Vidyadhar Sadashiv Wodeyar
6.	Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal	27.	Ar. P. S. Rajeev
7.	Ar. Minakshri Jain	28.	Ar. Nadisha V. M.
8.	Ar. Abhay V. Purohit	29.	Ar. Aldrina K. Marak
9.	Ar. Dr. Amogh Kumar Gupta	30.	Ar. George Lalzuia
10.	Ar. Amit Garg	31.	Ar. Sushant Kumar Patra
11.	Ar. Jayalakshmi V.	32.	Ar. P. Vaitianadin
12.	Ar. P. Satheesh Kumar	33.	Ar. Ritu Singh
13.	Ar. R. Thanigai Arasu	34.	Ar. Sanjiban Datta
14.	Ar. Naveen Kanithi	35.	Ar. T. Loganathan
15.	Ar. Bapilu Chai	36.	Ar. Ravi Kumar R.
16.	Ar. Atonu Baruah	37.	Ar. Dr. Vandana Sehgal
17.	Ar. R. Ramesh Kumar	38.	Ar. Manish Chakraborti
18.	Ar. Anil Kumar	39.	Er. Sandip Kumar Deb
19.	Ar. Kapil Setia	40.	Er. H.K. Mittal
20.	Ar. Arvind Kumar Ahirwar	41.	Dr. G.S. Inda
21.	Ar. Vijay Garg		

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

The following members were granted leave of absence:

1.	Ar. Marwin Caridade Gomes	4.	Ar. Benjusingh Nongthombam
2.	Ar. Maitreyi Chander Gupta	5.	Ar. V. Neilazo Metha
3.	Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah	6.	Ar. Rajesh Pradhan

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

1.	Ar. Mahendra Pratap	3.	Ar. Shashi Mohan Srivastava
2.	Ms. Saumya Gupta		

The Registrar-Secretary welcomed the Hon'ble President, Hon'ble Vice-President and Hon'ble Members attending the 77th 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. For the information and benefit of new members the President, COA, made a small presentation of initiatives and policies implemented by Council during his tenure.

Thereafter, the regular agenda of the meeting was taken up

ITEM NO.01	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE 76 th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The President informed the Members that the Minutes of 76th Meeting of the Council held on 25.02.2022 were circulated to the members on 30.06.2022. He assured the members that in future delay in circulation of minutes would not happen.</p> <p>With the permission of the Chair, Ar. Punit Sethi, Member stated that in last meeting he sought a clarification from the Chair about Council's collaboration with Ethos for organising "Arcause" a walk from Kolkata to Delhi and Budget Head and amount spent by Council on this initiative, however, the same has not been recorded in the Minutes.</p> <p>The President clarified that the Council entered into collaboration with Ethos as part of its activities under COASOCIAL for spreading awareness on Architecture. The funds were spent from the earmarked budget for COASOCIAL by the Executive Committee. The Council spent Rs.8,98,000/- for conduct of the awareness campaign and for creation of digital content of the programme. The President further clarified that since it was a clarification to Ar. Punit Sethi and not a decision of the Council in respect of particular item, hence, it was not recorded in the minutes</p> <p>With the permission of the Chair, Ar. Gajanand Ram enquired about condoning the excess payment, if any, made due to grant of higher pay-scale by the Council and other issues to Shri R. K. Oberoi, Registrar, COA.</p> <p>The President clarified that after having legal consultations on the issue of recovery from employee(s) and perusing SC Judgements, namely, Judgement dated 18.12.2014, in Civil Appeal No.11527 of 2014 (State of Punjab Vs. Rafiq Masih) and recent judgement dated 02.05.2022 in Civil Appeal No.7115 of 2010 (Thomas Deniel Vs. State of Kerala) and also going through DOPT Office Memorandum No.18/03/2015-Estt.(pay-I) dated 02.03.2016, it was decided to</p>

	<p>not to make any recovery in the matter since there was no misrepresentation or fraud from the end of the concerned employee.</p> <p>These SC judgements held that "if excess amount was not paid on account any misrepresentation or fraud of the employee of if such excess payment was made by the employer by applying a wrong principle for calculating the pay/ allowance or on the basis of particular interpretation or rule/ order which is subsequently found to be erroneous, such excess payment of emoluments or allowances are not recoverable".</p>				
ITEM NO.02	ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE MINUTES OF THE 76th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.				
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary briefed the members on the action taken report on the Minutes of the 76th Meeting of the Council held on 26th February, 2022.</p> <p>The Hon'ble Members noted the action taken report.</p>				
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.				
	<p>The Council granted ex-post facto approval to the action taken by the Registrar for restoring names of 3936 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 21.02.2022 to 23.06.2022.</p>				
ITEM NO.04	APPROVAL FOR REMOVAL OF NAMES FROM REGISTER OF ARCHITECTS:				
	i) ON REQUEST FROM THE CONCERNED ARCHITECT:				
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Resolution No. :549</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <p>(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:</p>				
	Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Registration no.	Reason of Removal Name

1	Ms. Sejal Ranka	Bangalore	CA/2020/1222 81	Residing in USA.
2	Ms. Nishita Mohta	Delhi	CA/2017/8176 4	Not practicing as an Architect.
3	Mr. Siddharth R	Hyderabad	CA/2017/8653 8	Not practicing as an Architect.
4	Ms. Karishma Yashwant Seema Tandel	Raigad	CA/2017/8391 2	Not practicing as an Architect.
5	Mr. Yusuf Mazhar Farida Arsiwala	Mumbai	CA/2017/8092 7	Residing in Canada.
6	Ms. Siddhi Vasisth	New Delhi	CA/2009/4503 3	Not practicing as an architect.
7	Ms. Reha Guha	Kolkata	CA/2019/1090 86	Residing in Canada.
8	Mr. Vishnu Govind Bhatwadekar	Yavatmal	CA/1975/0098 3	Does not wish to practice architecture due to old age.
9	Ms. Asha T. Laxminarayan	Bangalore	CA/1980/0554 0	Does not wish to practice Architecture.
10	Ms. Tanya V. Prabhu Verlekar	Goa	CA/1997/2210 8	Out of India since the year 1998.
11	Mr. Rony Gee George	Kottayam	CA/2011/5370 1	Residing in United Arab Emirates.
ii) DUE TO DEATH:				
<p>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.</p> <p>The Council decided to remove their names in terms of Section 29 (1) (b) of the Architects Act, 1972 and passed the following resolution:</p> <p>Resolution No.:550</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <p>(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.</p>				

	Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Registration (Death Cases) No.
	1.	Sh. Manikarao Balaramji Gode	Nagpur	CA/1976/02942
	2.	Sh.Sishir Dey	Kolkata	CA/1975/01198
	3.	Sh. Arun Damodar Vagal	Mumbai	CA/1985/09117
	4.	Sh. Odilio Cajeten Fernandes	Mumbai	CA/1983/07824
	5.	Sh. Mohd. Anisul Haq	Hyderabad	CA/1975/01964
	6.	Sh. Anil Baraya	Delhi	CA/1986/10310
	7.	Sh. Somasekhar Dhotrad	Hubli	CA/1992/15126
ITEM NO.05	TO CONSIDER APPROVING THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2022-2023.			
	<p>The President informed the members that Executive Committee in 235th Meeting held on 02.12.2021 approved the Academic Calendar for the Academic Session 2022-2023 for grant of approval/ extension of approval to the architectural institutions as per the minimum standards prescribed by the Council. Subsequently, the same was further revised by him in view of pandemic of COVID-19 and after consideration of requests received from the Institutions.</p> <p>The Council perused the Revised Academic Calendar and approved the same.</p>			
ITEM NO.06	TO TAKE NOTE OF PROGRESS MADE FOR CARRYING OUT INTERIOR WORK AT COA OFFICE AT NBCC PLACE, OKHLA, NEW DELHI.			
	<p>The President informed the members that Interior Work in the COA office at NBCC Place Okhla, New Delhi is under Progress and the work will be completed soon. The members noted the information in the matter.</p>			
ITEM NO.07	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE PROGRESS MADE FOR CARRYING INTERIOR WORK AT COA OFFICE AT I.H.C., NEW DELHI.			
	<p>The President informed the members that the Interior Work in the COA office at India Habitat Centre has been completed and the Office is made operational. He also requested the Hon'ble members to have a look of the renovated office premises.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the information in the matter.</p>			
ITEM NO.08	PROGRESS MADE FOR PUBLICATION OF MANUAL OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE.			
	<p>The President informed the members that the Manual of Architectural Practice as approved by the Council in its 75th meeting held on 28th and 29th August, 2021, has been finalized in 5 volumes. The Manual is being printed in lots.</p>			

	<p>The first launch of Manual has taken place on 25th June, 2022 at Mumbai which was attended by eminent Architects and academicians. The second launch was done at Thiruvananthapuram on 26th June, 2022 in the presence of Smt. Sharada G. Muraleedharan, IAS, Addl. Chief Secretary, Local Self Govt. Department, Govt. of Kerala. The Manual was also presented to Hon'ble Chief Minister Kerala and Chief Secretary, Kerala.</p> <p>The Members suggested that the copy of the Manual be sent to Chief Secretaries, PWD Ministers of all the States and UTs for its adoption.</p> <p>Further, the members requested the President to discuss the contents of manual with CVC, NITI Aayog, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Urban Development, as these major stakeholders involved in regulating/ monitoring and approving construction of buildings and appointment of Architects for the same.</p>							
ITEM NO.09	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT/ RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE IN RESPECT OF COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO IT.							
	<p>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:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>S. No.</th><th>Complaint No.</th><th></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td><td>CA/DC/461 - Shri S.R. Mahajan, A.E., MCGM, Mumbai against Ar. Suhas Mahant, Mumbai.</td><td> <p>The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant is that the Respondent Architect had submitted a proposal to the Complainant's office regarding redevelopment of a residential Plot/ building showing the plot as vacant and not submitted plans showing rehabilitation of 15 nos. of existing tenants, those were still living in that building. It was also stated in the Complaint that Respondent Architect had admitted his mistake that he did not duly verify the facts by demanding the letter or agreements with the tenants from Developer before submission of proposal to Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that at the time of submission of proposal he has mentioned that existing structure already demolished and plot is vacant. His submission was based on the information provided by client (Developer) that settlement with all the existing tenants is done by him before demolishing of existing buildings. Hence, he missed out to mention about families living in the building, at the</p> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		S. No.	Complaint No.		1.	CA/DC/461 - Shri S.R. Mahajan, A.E., MCGM, Mumbai against Ar. Suhas Mahant, Mumbai.	<p>The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant is that the Respondent Architect had submitted a proposal to the Complainant's office regarding redevelopment of a residential Plot/ building showing the plot as vacant and not submitted plans showing rehabilitation of 15 nos. of existing tenants, those were still living in that building. It was also stated in the Complaint that Respondent Architect had admitted his mistake that he did not duly verify the facts by demanding the letter or agreements with the tenants from Developer before submission of proposal to Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that at the time of submission of proposal he has mentioned that existing structure already demolished and plot is vacant. His submission was based on the information provided by client (Developer) that settlement with all the existing tenants is done by him before demolishing of existing buildings. Hence, he missed out to mention about families living in the building, at the</p>
S. No.	Complaint No.							
1.	CA/DC/461 - Shri S.R. Mahajan, A.E., MCGM, Mumbai against Ar. Suhas Mahant, Mumbai.	<p>The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant is that the Respondent Architect had submitted a proposal to the Complainant's office regarding redevelopment of a residential Plot/ building showing the plot as vacant and not submitted plans showing rehabilitation of 15 nos. of existing tenants, those were still living in that building. It was also stated in the Complaint that Respondent Architect had admitted his mistake that he did not duly verify the facts by demanding the letter or agreements with the tenants from Developer before submission of proposal to Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that at the time of submission of proposal he has mentioned that existing structure already demolished and plot is vacant. His submission was based on the information provided by client (Developer) that settlement with all the existing tenants is done by him before demolishing of existing buildings. Hence, he missed out to mention about families living in the building, at the</p>						

			<p>time of submission of proposal by him, and re-accommodation of the existing tenants was not shown.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that as per Deed of Conveyance of the plot there were 58 tenants in the existing building known as Rashmi Kunj, comprising of Ground + Three Upper Floors. Out of which the Developer has settled with 43 tenants. The Developer allegedly misguided about existence of 15 nos. of existing tenants, which were also later shifted to other place after demolition of dilapidated building by MCGM.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect admitted his mistake about not verifying the facts by demanding consent letter and agreements of tenants and assured that such kind of act will not happen again on his part and sought sympathetic consideration of his case.</p> <p>During the Course of the enquiry by the Committee, it was also noticed that the Respondent Architect had resigned from the project on 21.06.2017 and another architect Mr. Ankit Jain had obtained Municipal Commissioner's approval for the revised plans on 11.02.2019.</p> <p>During the last hearing of the Committee on 06.05.2022, the Complainant informed that the Municipal Commissioner has given in principal approval, and the architect is expected to submit the drawings for a formal approval (including approval from various concerned departments), however, such drawings have not been submitted by the Respondent Architect for further approval. He stated that the Committee can decide the matter.</p> <p>The Disciplinary Committee after carefully examining the Complaint, Statement of Defence and the other documents and submissions made before it, observed that the Respondent Architect has failed to submit the factual information in his plans before Municipal Corporation while seeking its approval for redevelopment of the concerned project. The Respondent has also admitted the same. It is a case of lapse on the part of the Respondent Architect to take reasonable care</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>while providing his professional services. Thus, the Respondent Architect is guilty of professional misconduct for violation of Regulation 2(1) (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>The Council after detailed 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.</p>
2.	CA/DC/493 - Ms. Madhu Kishwar, New Delhi against Ar. Nabin Patra, New Delhi.	<p>The Council perused of the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the complaint was filed with the Council in March 2019. The matter was duly referred to the DC in July 2019 in 71st Meeting of the Council. The Complainant entered into a Tripartite agreement on 09.11.2015 with M/s Globe Construction Company and Ar. Nabin Patra (Respondent Architect).</p> <p>The Respondent Architect sent an estimate for Architectural Design and Project Management Consultancy and Supervision for Rs. 20,10,000/-, along with a scope of work. Work began, and the Respondent appointed a Supervisor. But he showed up only twice in the first month of construction and after that the Respondent said he would get the construction work supervised through his Juniors. He also made a dummy company (M/s. geometric Design Pvt. Ltd.) in 2016 to make illegal gain from Manushi Sangathan and this company has been paid Rs. 31,13,666/- . In addition, he has exhorted Rs. 36,17,608/- in the name of his dummy company M/s. ERR & Integration Pvt Ltd.</p> <p>The Complainant further stated that the office is not ready yet and the said Architect has also stolen valuable materials and equipment.</p>

			<p>The complaint alleged following acts of commission and omission on the part of the Respondent Architect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Criminal breach of trust, outright fraud & extortion; b) Serious flaws in architectural plans and execution leading to denial of completion certificate by MCD. c) Unilaterally, morphing from an architect into a supplier of equipment and construction material in violation of the terms of contract and without authority. d) Outright thefts and cheating. e) Refusal to give proper Bills for material and equipment purchased. f) Fabrication of fake documents. g) Impersonation & misrepresentation of facts with malafide intention. h) Purchase of sub-standard construction material without authority to derive illegal gains and misappropriation of funds. i) Procuring and installing substandard equipment without authority. j) Charging more than cost of equipment and material. k) Manipulation of records. l) Refusal to hand over necessary documents/ warranty certificate; m) Huge cost escalation and charging more money than what was written in contract. n) Damaging the credibility of Manushi Sangathan by impersonating as member of Board of governors. o) Inaccurate and highly flawed drawings, etc. <p>The Complaint in question relates to the supply of following services by the Respondent Architect to Manushi Sangathan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Architectural Design Services. B) Project management consultancy services. C) Interior Design. D) Supplying of materials etc. <p>While Architectural Services, Project Management Consultancy services, Interior Design services were rendered through M/s. Geometric Design Management Pvt. Ltd., the supplies,</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>materials were provided through M/s. ERR and Integration Pvt. Ltd. The Respondent Architect is Director in both the companies.</p> <p>The Disciplinary Committee informed the parties that it would investigate the alleged professional misconduct on the part of the Respondent Architect only in respect of Architectural Services provided by him for the project in question, limiting to the scope of work duly signed between both the parties.</p> <p>The Complainant during hearing before the Disciplinary Committee summarized the Complaint as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Respondent Architect has not provided the complete services and extorted huge amount of money, running into crores, from them. He left the work in very shoddy manner. In spite of their objections on installation of AC's in Ceiling and other materials, the Respondent Architect continued with the same and put the Complainant to a huge loss. The Respondent did not install the lift as desired by Complainant but a local made more costly lift was installed. 2. The Respondent Architect overcharged the Manushi Sangathan for various items. He stole the furniture and impersonated as a member of Manushi Trust. 3. His fees were about Rs.13 Lakhs but he took around Rs. 1.5 Crores from the Manushi Sangathan. There were structural flaws in the building. No stair case to reach water and STP tanks above terrace were provided. The lift shaft was not properly designed, and it got filled with water. 4. The Respondent Architect left the building in a dilapidated condition whereas his responsibility was to fully complete the building and obtain completion certificate. The Respondent Architect failed to provide the completion of the building and also kept the original documents with him.
--	--	--	--

			<p>5. The Respondent Architect made Two Dummy Companies (i.e.M/s. Geometric Design Management Pvt. Ltd., and M/s. ERR and Integration Pvt. Ltd.) where he and his wife Ms. Tapaswini were Directors, and did not complete the assigned work.</p> <p>The Complainant further submitted that their Complaint can be categorized in three parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The poor quality of services provided by the Respondent Architect. 2. Collection of huge/ illegal amount from the Complainant contrary to the agreement. 3. The deficient services by the Respondent Architect resulting in losses to the Complainant. <p>The Complainant further clarified that an experience certificate was issued to Contractor M/s. Globe Construction Company, which also contained the name of Architects & PMC M/s. Geometric Design MS Pvt. Ltd., as the Contractor wanted experience certificate to apply to Delhi Metro and the same should not be treated as completion certificate or performance certificate of the Respondent Architect. The Complainant submitted that the Respondent Architect is guilty of violation of Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulation 1989.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect, in his defence, submitted as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The complainant has been involved in sharing fake news and making false allegations. The Respondent Architect has mentioned various fake news and allegation in which the complainant was involved. 2. The building plan was already sanctioned, and his scope of work was execution and supervision. The Complainant never complained to him about the Architectural Services rendered by him. The dispute arose only when she started to use the space allotted to the Manushi Sangathan for
--	--	--	---

			<p>Commercial purposes though doing so was illegal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Complainant did not pay him the complete fees and started making Complaints at several forums. 4. The Complainant has intent to grab their hard-earned money to cause them wrongful losses. 5. Obtaining completion of the building was not in his scope of services. But as a goodwill gesture after revising the building plans, he helped the complainant in sanction/completion of building plans from Municipal Authorities and no additional fees was charged/received for the same. 6. He has not charged any extra amount for consultancy and all amount(s) were charged for supplies and building materials provided by a different company. <p>The Respondent Architect also submitted a statement stating the scope of work and their satisfactory completion. As regards the payment of fees, the Respondent Architect submitted a statement that total fees due for architectural services was Rs.13,85,000/- and he has also charged enhancement to fees @ of Rs. 10% per annum which amount to Rs.2,77,000/-. Whereas the actual fees received by the Respondent Architect was only Rs. 11,77,250/-.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect also submitted that the Complainant, though was founder of an NGO (Manushi Sangathan) but she wanted to put the building on rent for commercial purposes which was not allowed as per By-laws. The defined use of land was for the purpose of Charitable Women Welfare Center and no other purpose whatsoever. It was only after his objection to commercial renting of the premises that the Complainant started making Complaint at different forums including police authorities. She was fully satisfied with the Architectural Services provided by the Complainant and also with the construction of</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>building. The Respondent also clarified about the allegations of materials such AC, Lifts, etc.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that the complaint is not maintainable and should be closed.</p> <p>The Committee examined in detail the Complaint as well as the Statement of Defence and other relevant documents submitted by both the parties and noted that 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Committee specifically sought documentary evidence from the Complainant about the following allegations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 has led to constant tussles with the builder. (iii) Any supporting document about the allegation, "...endless delay in submitting working drawings for services, etc. leading
--	--	--	--

			<p>to compounded delays in execution of the project."</p> <p>(iv) A matrix in form of a table, wherein first column all the deliverables (as per singed 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.</p> <p>But the Complainant did not provide the above information, till date, rather sent an email expressing her exasperation for the alleged delay that is being caused. Hence the DC decided to make a final recommendation based on the documents and facts available on record.</p> <p>The Committee, after considering all the documents and submissions made before it, feels that the Respondent Architect ought not to have engaged himself in supplying material for the project in question being a professional and should have refrained himself to act like a contractor, in addition to his responsibility as the Architect.</p> <p>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 natural conflict of interest within the work.</p> <p>Thus, the Committee is of the view that though the Complainant could not prove, beyond doubt, the lapse 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.</p> <p>Thus, the Disciplinary Committee found the Respondent Architect is guilty of Professional Misconduct for violating 2(1)(i)(viii)(x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>The Council after detailed 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.</p>
3.	CA/DC/530 - The Registrar, COA against Ar. Harshit Sadh, Vadodara	<p>The Council noted that the complaint was filed by the Registrar, COA, in terms of decision of the Full Council taken at its 75th Meeting held on 28th and 29th August, 2022, against the Respondent Architect for his role in facilitating online cheating in NATA 2020 Examination, through Parul University Whatsapp Group, which was held online both as Centre Based Test and Home Based Test.</p> <p>Before taking up this Complaint, the Committee asked the Respondent, if he has any objection to continuation of Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta, as a member of the Disciplinary Committee, to investigate the complaint against him, because Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta was also Convenor of the committee which examined the Role of Parul University in organizing cheating in NATA 2020 Exam.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect confirmed that he had no objection in continuation of Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta in the matter.</p> <p>This Complaint was considered by the Disciplinary Committee on 24.01.2022 and 06.05.2022 and on both days Complainant and the Respondent Architect were present before the Disciplinary Committee.</p> <p>The Complaint of the Complainant is that the Respondent Architect was working as a faculty member in the Parul Institute of Architecture and Research, Parul University, Vadodara and created a Whatsapp Group with the name "Parul Entrance Awareness" and provided live answers of questions asked in examination of NATA 2020</p>

			<p>conducted by the Council as Centre Based Test and Home-Based Test due to Covid -19 Pandemic.</p> <p>The Committee during its hearing held on 24.01.2022 asked the Respondent Architect to submit his Statement of Defence on the complaint/ allegations against him. All the relevant documents were also sent to the Respondent Architect to enable him to file his reply. However, the Respondent Architect did not file any reply.</p> <p>The Committee in its last hearing held on 06.05.2022, asked the Respondent as to why he did not file his written statement. The Respondent replied that he has already submitted his response to the Council in the matter and now would not like to submit anything further and stated that we would submit an e-mail/ reply stating the same by Monday, 9th May, 2022.</p> <p>The Respondent vide his e-mail dated 09.05.2022, submitted as under :</p> <p><i>"I am writing this mail to submit my response as asked through mail, telephonic communication and the second hearing held on 6th may regarding the matter. I have no new facts to share on the matter. But I would like to use this opportunity to put my point forward about the offsets of the matter and request for an empathetic decision/judgement in the matter.</i></p> <p><i>The group was not created for the intent of cheating and the information delivered on the group was helpful for students who could not afford or access education for entrance exams due to pandemic and/or monetary reasons. It didn't came to my mind that students may be clicking pictures from a live examination and are asking for answers.</i></p> <p><i>The students who were involved in unfair means had already taken admissions in architectural institutes two years ago and might be in their 4th semester as of now. The institute I was part of during the incident was punished by reducing seats and now the institute has been given its seats back. The legal matter between the institute and COA is dissolved as per my knowledge. I was punished by</i></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>the university as I was asked to discontinue my job on immediate basis and that was a time when institutes and offices were reducing their staff because of the pandemic and there were no job opportunities at that time. It was difficult for me to manage my responsibilities towards my family and be unemployed for 9 months. I am still managing to pay my debts. I have been living in a constant fear of what will happen and how it will further impact my career and those who are dependent on me.</i></p> <p><i>I am not a person with compromised ethical values, but I have definitely done a mistake inadvertently, in momentarily foolishness. I understand that it cannot be undone but I assure you that this incident has made me a better and responsible human being and I will make sure that nothing of this sort will ever happen again. I will be a more responsible Architect and teacher, and will be using my knowledge for the betterment of society and fraternity.</i></p> <p><i>I had nothing to gain out of it, and in fact I have gained nothing but disrepute because of this incident. I request you to kindly let go of my mistake as I have suffered a lot because of my actions.</i></p> <p><i>Hoping and requesting for a sympathetic decision in the matter.</i></p> <p>The Committee considered the above email well as the Statement of Confession dated 25.09.2020 filed by the Respondent Architect and email dated 23.11.2020 sent to Council in his favour/ defence. The Committee also perused the Whatsapp Chat and questions and answers shared on the group.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the Respondent Architect has 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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>The Disciplinary Committee, therefore, found the Respondent Architect guilty of professional misconduct for violation Regulation 2 (1) (ii), (viii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>The Council after detailed 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, the decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties.</p>		
ITEM NO.10	<p>TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE ARCHITECTS, GENERAL PUBLIC AND GOVT. AGENCIES.</p>			
	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Resolution No.: 551</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <table> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td> <p>CA/DC/529 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Shrikant Shitole, Mumbai against Ar. Mugdha Madhav Phansalkar, Mumbai, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the respondent Architect was appointed for redevelopment of the Project "Shri complex phase four. The Respondent Architect though aware of the date of the Launching of the</p> </td> </tr> </table>		1.	<p>CA/DC/529 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Shrikant Shitole, Mumbai against Ar. Mugdha Madhav Phansalkar, Mumbai, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the respondent Architect was appointed for redevelopment of the Project "Shri complex phase four. The Respondent Architect though aware of the date of the Launching of the</p>
1.	<p>CA/DC/529 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Shrikant Shitole, Mumbai against Ar. Mugdha Madhav Phansalkar, Mumbai, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the respondent Architect was appointed for redevelopment of the Project "Shri complex phase four. The Respondent Architect though aware of the date of the Launching of the</p>			

	<p>project but kept on dragging the submissions on some pretext or the other lame excuses. As per the complaint, the Respondent Architect has not fulfilled his obligation assigned till date. The Complainant not received the hard copy or soft copy of detailed elevation or other related plans /drawings & Schematic sections in CAD format, complete set of working drawings of residential and commercial along with the details for construction. The Complaint also stated that the Architect having unprofessional, adamant behaviour and architect started sharing internal data and information of the said firm with others for his personal gains. The Architect also not issued the invoices as per stage of work as stage of work is still incomplete.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his statement of defence submitted that he had given all the plans, modification, area calculations, presentation drawings, etc. from time to time as per complainant's requirements and to his satisfaction. After complying with all legal requirements, commencement certificate issued on 13.03.2019 by Kalyan Dombivali Municipal Corporation. However, the Complainant directed the respondent not to submit full proposal to get the commencement certificate for entire project as new DCR rules are likely to be implemented very soon and they will get more FSI. After the finalization of DCR rules, the complainant asked the Respondent Architect to re do the entire exercise according to the new bylaws. As the same was the extra work and not coming in scope of the respondent Architect as per appointment letter dated 1.02.2017. The Respondent denied all the allegations made by the Complainant and stated that she would give NOC and other documents after receiving of Professional fees and requested that complaint be dismissed.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided that there is a prima facie case in the matter and the complaint be referred to Disciplinary committee for detailed investigation in terms of provisions of Council of Architecture Rules, 1973.</p> <p>Accordingly, the complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
2.	<p>CA/DC/531 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Harisimran Singh Sandhu & Ors., Delhi against Ar. Sudhir Vohra, Delhi, the Council noted that as per the complaint Mrs. Deepak Kaur is owner of 20 percent share in the property and same has been marked for use and occupation. Mrs. Deepak Kaur was desirous of making a building in her portion and accordingly building plans were finalized for FAR 1.2 and signed by all the co-owners. Mr Sudhir Vohra the respondent was engaged to undertake this project, who had prepared all the plans & documents. The said building proposal for 'Demolition & Reconstruction Vide Scheme no. NDMC/BP/0045/19-20 date 19.11.2019' was filed online by the Respondent Architect Mr. Sudhir Vohra. Thereafter certain inspection and surveys were carried out with respect to the said property. The</p>

	<p>Complainant raised certain concerns and discrepancies in the plans. Thereafter, the country face periodical lockdowns, however during the sanctioning process, the project Respondent Architect did not share any information, progress, shortcoming, or inspection reports and survey with the Petitioners.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect Ar. Sudhir Vohra did not share any information with the petitioner and all the resubmission of plans & documents filed before the NDMC were endorsed with the signatures of the petitioners by forgery and fabrication. Based on these forged signatures, he resubmitted and amended plans. The Chief Architect Mr. Rajiv Sood NDMC, New Delhi sanctioned building plans vide order dated 03.09.2020. The Complainant disputed the sanctioned plan as the same was obtained under their forged and fabricated signatures and without their knowledge and consent.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect is having License no. CA/1980/05696 and he was appointed for this project at 5 Jantar Mantar Road, New Delhi - 110001. The Architect had executed a Form A-1(chapter 2,2.0) with respect to the proposed building plans. Thus, the Respondent Architect is guilty of professional misconduct.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the complainant, Shri Sandhu had made a series of police complaints against his clients Mrs. Deepak Kaur and him for alleged fraud in the matter of sanctions given by the NDMC to his clients. However, the police had not felt that there was any substance in them and did not register any FIR. The Complainant also filed a Petition under section 156(3) CRPC in case no. 1575 of 2021. The Hon'ble Court had dismissed the Complainant's contentions and reiterated that no cognizable offence has been made out. The Respondent further stated that the complainant is misuses the justice system by filing frivolous complaints. It is further stated that it is purely a property dispute between the sister (Mrs. Deepak Kaur) and the complainant himself.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided that there is a prima facie case in the matter as Respondent Architect appears to have used scanned signatures of complainant to seek approval of building plan and therefore, the complaint be referred to Disciplinary Committee for detailed investigation in terms of provisions of Council of Architecture Rules, 1973.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
3	<p>CA/DC/532 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Mohd. Asif, Mumbai against Ar. Suraj Subhash Patil, Mumbai, the Council noted that the complaint against the Respondent Architects is that he wrongly mentioned Petitioner flat no. 803, in the table -21 submitted to MCGM. In</p>

	<p>fact, developer allotted Petitioner flat no. 1201 and entered into Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement on 16.10.2020. The Agreement was duly registered with the office of Sub-Registrar of Assurance, Mumbai City. As Developer allotted flat no. 1201, he also issued allotment letter and also submitted fresh list of Tenants allotment to MHADA on 07.09.2020. The respondent was well aware about the same however with malafide intention he put flat no. 803 instead of flat no. 1201 in table 21.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in its defence stated that the earlier Mr. J.G. Kawa & Associates, Architects has submitted the proposal for re-Development of the Plot no. 1773 of Bicula Division at Sankali street 3rd cross lane, Biculla Mumbai. In this case Al-fateh Cooperative Housing Society had submit a representation to Hon'ble Municipal Commissioner on 23.12.2019 regarding 10 years delay in Completion of project by developer M/s. Royal realtors. It was decided between old tenants and 42 purchasers to form cooperative Society and to complete the incomplete work. The Society appointed Suraj Subhash Patil as their New Architect by submitting NOC/ resignation along with work status from earlier Architect. The Respondent submitted that the allegations made by the Complainant are sub-judice in Court of Law and arbitration proceedings and no grievance remains.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations in the matter noted that the matter is sub-judice in City Civil Court. Accordingly, the Council decided to keep the matter in abeyance till the disposal of matter by Court of law.</p> <p>Accordingly, the complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
4	<p>CA/DC/533 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Dilip Maruti Kharat, Pune against Ar. Rajesh Narayan Shinde, Pune, the Council noted that as per the complaint the Complainant is the owner of the Property and the Respondent Architect deals in designing and supervision /construction of buildings.</p> <p>It was further stated that the Complainant was facing difficulty for work as it was the precondition of the Village Localities that entire civil work relating to any construction has to be carried out by the villagers or any local person known to the villagers. After due discussion with the Respondent Architect, it was agreed between both the parties that house permission and approval of drawing etc., will be done through "Gram Panchayat. Further, the Respondent promised the Complainant that all the related civil work and permissions will be managed as the Respondent was having the prior experience and assured the Complainant that the work would be done. However, the Respondent did not hold up to their end of bargain. No plans, drawing was carried and out nor it was shown to the complainant and further all decisions were taken by the respondent without any prior consultation. Furthermore, in believing in the promises</p>

	<p>and assurances given by the Respondent regular payments were disbursed to the Respondents account by the Complainant as per the quotations raised by the Respondent. However, the Respondent provided poor quality of services and work. He has not provided any documents related to pending civil work though payments were made in time. Respondent caused great financial losses and mental harassment to Complainant.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that Complainant engaged him to draw Architectural Design of the site as per his instructions and also asked to carry out the construction for the same. The Respondent submitted a draft proposal to the complainant on 11.11.2018 for an area of 1584 sqft. But as the area increased by the Complainant, the Respondent resubmitted a draft proposal and quotation on 18.11.2018. These proposals and quotations were without Respondent's sign or official stamp or COA Registration no. The complainant orally agreed to the conditions and process mentioned by the Respondent, however, he never submitted any relevant and legal authorized documents to understand the specific location of the site, restrictions on the site. Thus, the Respondent could not prepare final architectural design. The complainant requested the Respondent to provide a separate quotation on labour and material basis. The Respondent carried out work as labour not in the capacity of an Architect for the site. The complaint is filed to harass the Respondent Architect.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided that there is a prima facie case in the matter as there appears to be some lapses and the complaint be referred to Disciplinary committee for detailed investigation in terms of provisions of Council of Architecture Rules, 1973.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
5	<p>CA/DC/534 – With regard to complaint filed by Shri Krishna S/o Damodar Landge, Nagpur against Ar. Shweta Ashok Gotmare, Nagpur, the Council noted that as per complaint, the Complainant engaged the Respondent Architect for carrying out renovation work of his flat. The Complainant paid Rs. 10,07,500 (cash) to the Architect. When the respondent Architect denied that the Complainant paid such amount, he filed a Police Complaint in police station Wadi, Nagpur town, Maharashtra against the respondent Architect with subject "Complaint for taking actions against accused for the offenses of Cheating, fraud, criminal mis-appropriation of money, criminal breach of trust and causing unlawful loses to the complainant by accused. The Complainant further stated that the Respondent Architect used sub-standard material and failed to complete the renovation work in time and still some miscellaneous and finishing work remains to be done.</p>

	<p>The Respondent architect in his defence denied all the allegations made by Complainant. The Respondent stated that the Complainant paid Rs 8,00,000/- only for the said work and suddenly started to change major work done by him. The Respondent also stated that the Complainant behavior was totally abnormal and started using foul language. The Respondent Architect has done the interior of the Complainant house and finished the entire work but the Complainant has insisted to do extra work and the Complainant is not ready to pay for extra work. Hence the complaint be dismissed</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided that there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect as there no written agreement and there is no proof of payment as all payments were done in cash. The Council, therefore, dismissed the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
6.	<p>CA/DC/535 - With regard to complaint filed by Shri Sunil Narayan Menon, Mumbai against Ar. Ajit Pandarinath Redkar, Mumbai, the Council noted that Complainant is a Member of Pestom Sagar Cooperative Housing Society Limited. He has stated that the Deputy Registrar (M Word) issued order in February 2019 appointing Administrative Committee to take care of day-to-day work of Society. The Deputy Registrar further issued an order to Administrative Committee dated 27.10.2021 to stop all activities related to re-development/self-Redevelopment and work to complete process and get the managing Committee elected.</p> <p>The Administrative Committee of the Society appointed the Respondent Architect on 21st February, 2021, however, there is no mention of either Self redevelopment or joint self-Redevelopment in the appointment letter. The Respondent Architect has submitted two incorrect & manipulated documents to BMC to seek permission. The Respondent Architect has re-submitted documents for obtaining "CC" and tendered faulty letters signed by now dismissed Secretary Mr.Sunil Mokha on 30.05.2022. It is further stated in the complaint that the Respondent Architect contrary to the rules and regulations knowingly indulged in malpractices for selfish actions. He is causing great loss to common man like the Complainant. The complainant has already lost his flat as the building is demolished and in the joint self-redevelopment everything is done as per the wishes of few unscrupulous individuals. The complainant requested that all permissions and approval granted on the basis of incorrect documents be revoked so that no Architect cheats hapless and helpless common members of any cooperative society limited.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence stated that the complaint is inter-se dispute between the members of the Society and between Members and Development Manager.</p>

	<p>The Respondent stated that the Complainant has no privity of contract with him. He was neither appointed by the Complainant nor any consideration was received from him. Thus, the complainant has no locus to file such complaint with the Council.</p> <p>The subject matter is a joint self-development project of Pastom Sagar and Vishnu Shakti Society. The building has already been demolished, IOD and CC has been procured and as on date the work of foundation is in progress.</p> <p>The plans for the joint self-Redevelopment were submitted in accordance with law and there are no illegalities in submissions of plans for self-development.</p> <p>All the plans and approvals have been duly approved by the Municipal Corporation and there is no illegality in procuring the approvals and or the plans. The Architect as a professional is limited to follow the bye laws as per the relevant DCPR and get project approved from concerned authority and the same is duly approved by the MCGM. The Respondent Architect requested that the complaint be dismissed and there is no cause of action in the complaint.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter decided that there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect as development work is carried out by the Developer and not the Respondent Architect. The Council, therefore, dismissed the complaint.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Complainant and Respondent Architect be informed of the decision of the Council.</p>
ITEM NO.11	MATTERS FOR INFORMATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.
I)	INSPECTION & APPROVAL PROCESS OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2022-2023.
	<p>The President informed the members that process for grant of approval for the academic session 2022-23 to Architectural Institutions for extension of approval for Diploma courses, B.Arch. and M.Arch. Courses has commenced. Further, proposals for starting new institutions are also being considered.</p> <p>The Council desired that process be completed at the earliest since last dates for completing admission of students are approaching in many states.</p>
II)	ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
	<p>The President informed the members that Central Government has appointed Shri Syed Ekram Rizvi, Joint Secretary, Dept. of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, as Returning Officer for conduct of elections for the 5 vacancies of members of the Executive Committee.</p>

	The Elections are scheduled to be held on 16 th July, 2022. The President conveyed his best wishes to the prospective candidates who wish to contest the elections of members of EC.																				
III)	CONDUCT OF NATIONAL APTITUDE TEST IN ARCHITECTURE (NATA) 2022.																				
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council has successfully conducted First Test of NATA 2022 (National Aptitude Test in Architecture) for admission to First Year of 5-year B.Arch. Degree Course at architectural institutions throughout the country.</p> <p>The Test was held on June 12, 2022 at 134 centres in the country and 6 international centres. The Test was a computer-based Test conducted in two sessions at designated Test centres – 1st session from 10.00 am to 01.00 pm and 2nd session from 2.30 pm to 05.30 pm.</p> <p>Out of total 6675 candidates registered for the first session, 5979 candidates appeared in the First session and out of 5685 candidates, 5094 candidates appeared in Second Session. Thus, out of total 12,360 registered candidates for first Test, 11074 candidates appeared in the two sessions. Out of 11074 candidates appeared for the First Test, 10080 candidates have qualified the test.</p> <p>As on 30.06.2022, 16654 candidates have registered for the Second Test to be conducted on 7th July, 2022 and 12958 candidates have registered for the Third Test to be held on 7th August, 2022.</p> <p>As mentioned in NATA 2022 Brochure, in case a candidate appears for 2 Tests, best of the 2 scores shall be taken as the valid score and in the case of 3 attempts, the average of the 2 best scores shall be taken as valid score.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>																				
IV)	ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS ADMITTED BY ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS.																				
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council is granting enrolment to students admitted into First Year of B.Arch. Course by Architectural Institutions all over India. The enrolment numbers are issued by the Council based on the online information furnished by the institutions.</p> <p>Year wise details of enrolment numbers issued by the Council to students of B.Arch. Course in the last 3 years as on date are as under:</p> <table><tr><th>Academic year</th><th>Total Enrolments</th><th>Male</th><th>Female</th><th>Transgender</th></tr><tr><td>2021-2022</td><td>11083</td><td>4835</td><td>6248</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2020-2021</td><td>15410</td><td>7143</td><td>8266</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>2019-2020</td><td>15580</td><td>7422</td><td>8157</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	Academic year	Total Enrolments	Male	Female	Transgender	2021-2022	11083	4835	6248	0	2020-2021	15410	7143	8266	1	2019-2020	15580	7422	8157	1
Academic year	Total Enrolments	Male	Female	Transgender																	
2021-2022	11083	4835	6248	0																	
2020-2021	15410	7143	8266	1																	
2019-2020	15580	7422	8157	1																	

	<p>The majority of the members expressed their serious concern over decreasing number of admissions/ enrolments in B.Arch. Course and urged that immediate steps should be taken to attract good talent to Architecture course. The President informed the members that following factors are affecting admissions in Architecture Course:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low demand in real-estate sector; 2. Duration of Course is 5 years whereas everyone wants earn income in shortest duration possible; 3. Due to Covid-19 pandemic IT sector is in more demand; 4. Some institutions have high fees; 5. Recent Supreme Court judgement in Mukesh Goyal cases held that anyone can practice architecture without calling himself as an architect. <p>After having detailed deliberations, the Council members suggested following ways and means to deal with situation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course contents and syllabus of B.Arch. Course/ M.Arch. courses need to be taught in such a way that it directly meets requirement of market and provides employment avenues to the Architects in different fields. 2. Introduction of Short-term courses and vocational courses to develop skills, as is also provided in NEP. 3. To frame policy so that architectural posts in government sector, local bodies and architectural institutions, are filled on time. 4. Encouragement to Architect to work in other fields. 5. Reduction in duration of Architecture Course to 4 years. 6. Amendment in Architects Act to restrict practice of Architecture to architects only. 7. Enter into reciprocal arrangements with foreign countries to facilitate movement of architects to foreign countries. 8. Spreading awareness in society through newspaper notifications and social media about the important role of architect in the society. <p>The President informed the members that he has already initiated necessary steps in the above directions. The Council has produced short films to spread awareness about architecture and encourage students towards architecture course. The Council is also giving adds in FM and holding outreach programme in all parts of the country. He also informed that Council has already recommended the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, to amend Section 37 of the Act.</p> <p>The President assured the members that he would take all necessary initiatives to overcome this issue.</p>
V)	SUPPLY OF INFORMATION UNDER THE RTI ACT.
	<p>The President informed the members that after the last meeting of the Council, the office of the Council has received 29 RTI Applications and 02 RTI Appeals in terms of the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005, as on 04.07.2022.</p>

	<p>All applications and appeals have been dealt with as per the provisions of the RTI Act.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
VI)	ACTION ON COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST MISUSE OF TITLE AND STYLE OF ARCHITECT BY QUACKS.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council has received 15 complaints against persons who were using title and style of architect. The Council has issued notices to all persons. 12 have submitted their reply and apologized that they will not commit such mistake in future. Three persons have been issued reminders to comply with the directions of COA.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
VII)	UPGRADATION OF WEBSITE OF THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE.
	<p>The President informed the members that website of the Council has been upgraded and further improvements are being made from time to time to make it more user friendly and informative.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
VIII)	TO CONSIDER THE PROGRESS MADE REGARDING RECOGNITION OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE EMPLOYEES CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND TRUST.
	<p>The President informed the members that after amendment in the CPF Trust Deed as per the suggestions of Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Agarwal, Member, COA, the Trustees have requested Chartered Accountant Shri Manish Goyal to complete the formalities for recognition of Council of Architecture Employees Contributory Fund Trust by the Income Tax Department and other authorities.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
IX)	TO TAKE NOTE OF PUBLICATION OF BOOKS BY THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The Council has purchased following books at concessional rates for distribution to Architectural Institutions for promotion of architectural education and profession:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amazing Timber Resorts 2. LC's Villa Shodhan 3. cpka : Five Decades of India's Built Environment 4. Mahesh Architecture 5. Unbuilt Volume-2 6. Architecture for Well Being 7. Biome Diaries

	<p>The members were informed that more books are being procured shortly and would be distributed to Architectural Institutions for benefit of students.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
X)	<p>TO TAKE NOTE OF THE PROGRESS MADE REGARDING APPOINTMENT OF ARCHITECT FOR PREPARATION OF DRAWINGS/ PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE BUILDING AT BANGALORE.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that after allotment of land by the Government of Karnataka in Bangalore University Campus, the Council has decided to conduct Two Stage open Architectural Design Competition for selection of Architect for designing, planning and supervision of the Council's Center of Excellence Building.</p> <p>The Jury to assess the first stage design competition was held from 30th April to 2nd May 2022.</p> <p>The Jury of first stage Competition consist of following members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ar. (Prof.) Neelkanth Chhaya, Head; 2) Ar. N Mahesh; 3) Ar. Dilip Chatterjee; 4) Ar. Chitra Vishwanath; 5) Ar. Sheila Sri Prakash 6) Ar. Sanjay Kanvinde; 7) Ar. Narendra Denge; 8) Ar. Namita Singh; 9) Ar. Vivek Gupta; 10) Ar. Mala Mohan; 11) Ar. Madhav Raman; 12) Shri Ranjeet Hoskote, Author and Critic; and 13) Ms. Shiny Varghese, Journalist and Author <p>The President, Vice President, Ar. Kapil Setia, EC Member and Ar. Vidyadhar Sadashiv Wodeyar, Council Member, Ar. Salil Randive briefed the jury members about the requirements of the Council, procedure to be followed in the competition and site details, etc.</p> <p>The Jury has selected following 5 entries for second stage of the Competition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) UIC No. COEBDC/0383/2022- Ar Anirvan Ghose, Gurugram, Haryana-CA/1997/21648 2) UIC No. COEBDC/0469/2022- Ar Shilpa Arvindbhai Mevada, Ahmedabad, Gujarat-CA/2014/65607. 3) UIC No. COEBDC/0496/2022- Ar. Shashank B Muralidhar, Mysuru, Karnataka-CA/2018/101863

	<p>4) UIC No. COEBDC/0612/2022- Ar.Ramakrishna P, Hyderabad, Telangana-CA/2016/78127.</p> <p>5) UIC No. COEBDC/0641/2022- Ar.Madhu Jagdish Malukani, Ahmedabad, Gujarat-CA/2015/67834</p> <p>The selected participants have been communicated to prepare and submit their detailed proposal for 2nd stage of the Competition. The Jury for the 2nd Stage of the Competition is scheduled to be held on 30.07.2022.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XI)	<p>TO TAKE NOTE OF INTRODUCTION OF E-OFFICE, TRC PORTAL, E-LIBRARY, API FOR VERIFICATION OF ARCHITECTS BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES, BY THE COUNCIL.</p>
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that e E-office portal of Council having features such as, Task Management, e-Communication, Digital Office, Employee Management, Alerts and Notifications, Dak Management, File Management System, has been made operational.</p> <p>Further, Samarthya portal is also completed. This portal shall be a platform for cooperation and collaboration between Schools of Architecture and practising architects to share/upload their course material on the porta, online training of Architects, Digital Library, compile documentation of research, organizing and publishing details of the various Awards programs & Competitions and act as digital platform for the conduct of jury for the students, schools, jury and public at large.</p> <p>Apart from this, the Portal also endeavors to provide opportunities for placement for practical training, employment of architects and employment of faculty members in the schools of Architecture.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XII)	<p>AMENDMENTS IN THE RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION REGULATIONS OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE.</p>
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that Committee on amendments in Recruitment and Promotion Regulations of the Council suggested to submit a revised proposal to the Central Government for its approval and the same has been submitted to the Central Government.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XIII)	<p>PUBLICATION OF MONTHLY NEWSLETTER IN E-FORMAT AND MAGAZINE "ARCHITECTURE TIME SPACE AND PEOPLE" IN E-FORMAT (BI-MONTHLY).</p>

	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that Council has appointed Ms. Pranati Satti as assistant editor of Council's digital News Letter (<i>CouncilNews</i>) and Magazine (<i>Architecture time space and people</i>). Four issues of newsletter have been published and one issues of Magazine have been published.</p> <p>With the permission of the Chair, the members raised the issue of shortage of Journals in Architecture. The Council should accredit journals. Members representing IIA informed that IIA Journal is accredited by UGC.</p> <p>The President requested the members representing IIA to explore the possibility of having common journal of COA and IIA. The President further suggested that the link of IIACAD can also be there on COA portal. He further offered that COA portal would also provide link for making application for IIA Membership.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members appreciated the proposals made by the President and unanimously agreed that further steps be taken to implement them so that COA and IIA can work for the betterment of Architectural Education and Profession in the country.</p>
XIV)	CONDUCT OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITION ON BEHALF OF NHLML, NHAI, GOVT. OF INDIA, FOR DESIGN OF BUS SHELTERS.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council is conducting the Design Competition on behalf National Highway and Logistics Management Ltd., a 100% owned company of NHAI for selection of design for construction of Bus Shelters across all National Highways in India.</p> <p>The entries are invited in two categories i.e. Architects and General public. The Council has received about 2500 entries.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information and appreciated the initiative taken by President, COA.</p>
XV)	SIGNING OF MOU WITH INDIAN PLUMBING ASSOCIATION.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council earlier had an MOU with Indian Plumbing Association to work together for betterment of Architectural profession and Education. However, the same could not be renewed in between.</p> <p>The COA and IPA have entered into an MOU to work together for conducting training programs, workshops, webinars, etc. The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XVI)	SIGNING OF MOU WITH SERVICES EXPORT PROMOTION COUNCIL (SEPC).
	<p>The President informed the members that Council and SEPC have entered into an MOU to work together for promoting Export of Architecture services and also</p>

	<p>to facilitate MRA between Council and foreign Architects registration authorities and other related issues.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XVII)	<p>FELICITATION OF AR. GEETA BALAKRISHNAN ON COMPLETING "ARCAUSE" A WALK FROM KOLKATA TO NEW DELHI.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that Council collaborated with M/s. ETHOS, an NGO, for undertaking a walk by Ar. Geeta Balakrishnan from Kolkata to New Delhi to highlight the role of Architects and value addition architecture profession makes in the lives of common people. The walk was named as "Arcause". It started on 13th February 2022 and successfully completed on 24th April 2022.</p> <p>In order to recognize and appreciate the efforts of Ar. Geeta Balakrishnan, the Council on 1st May 2022 organized a felicitation program. Ar. Gita was felicitated by President, Vice-President, COA. Ar. Kapil Setia, EC Member and Council members from Delhi NCR region and Heads of Architectural Institutions in Delhi NCR attended the programme.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members appreciated the initiative taken by Council.</p>
XVIII)	<p>TO TAKE A NOTE OF THE DRAFT MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE COURSES.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that the PG Board has prepared the Draft Minimum Standards for Master of Architecture Courses. The same were placed before the Council in its last meeting held on 26th February, 2022. The Council decided to seek suggestions from the Council members.</p> <p>Accordingly, suggestions were received from Dr. Ranee Vedamuthu, the then Member, COA. The PG Board after considering the suggestions has finalized the minimum standards.</p> <p>The members perused the suggestions given by Dr. Ranee Vedamuthu and after deliberations approved the Minimum Standards for Master of Architecture Courses.</p>
XIX)	<p>TO TAKE NOTE OF THE REFORMS IN DIPLOMA COURSES.</p>
	<p>The Council of Architecture vide its letter dated 13.05.2022 has circulated the Minimum Standards of Architectural Education Guidelines 2022 for 3-year Diploma in Architecture/Architectural Assistantship courses to the Council members for approval through circulation.</p> <p>The office has received suggestions from few members which were incorporated in the final document and after approval from the Chairman Executive</p>

	<p>Committee, the same were circulated to all the diploma awarding institutions for their information and compliance.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
XX)	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE REVISED CAREER ADVANCEMENT SCHEME (CAS) AS FINALISED BY PROF. P. M. KANWINDE.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 75th Meeting held on 28th and 29th August, 2022, considered the Career Advancement Scheme as prepared by the One-man Committee of Prof. Pushkar Kanwinde and decided to refer the same to Dr. Ranee Vedamuthu, Member, COA, Dr. Kavita D. Rao, Member, COA and Dr. Vandana Sehgal, Member, COA .</p> <p>The Council received the suggestions from all three members and same were sent to the One-man Committee of Prof. Pushkar Kanwinde to finalise the CAS Scheme as per the suggestions of Council members. Prof. Pushkar Kanwinde after making appropriate changes has submitted the final CAS Scheme to Council.</p> <p>With the permission of the Chair, Ar. Punit Sethi, Member, stated that this Scheme needs certain modifications/ changes, such as, in performance table mention of "Associate Professor" is required, in experience instead of completed projects "ongoing projects" should be mentioned, pay-scale should be as per COA Minimum Standards 2020 and a footnote be inserted as "Pay-scale as per applicable relevant rules".</p> <p>The President requested all the members to send their suggestions within 15 days so that CAS can be finalized and circulated to all architectural institutions for implementation.</p>
XXI)	RELAXATION OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO B.ARCH. COURSE FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2022-2023.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council had earlier relaxed/amended the eligibility criteria for admission to B.Arch. Course, as prescribed in the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, for the academic session 2020-2021, 2021-2022, due to Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Similarly, for the academic session 2022-2023, the Council passed Resolution No.549 dated 29.03.2022, vide letter dated 29.03.2022, by circulation of papers and proposed that Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, be further amended to relax the requirement of having 50% marks in aggregate at 10+2 level and 50% marks in PCM subjects and all Centrally Funded Technical Institutes (CFTIs) be allowed to make admission in B.Arch. Course based on JEE Paper 2.</p> <p>The Ministry vide its letter No.4-03/2021-TS.VI dated 27.06.2022, approved the amendments in the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural</p>

	<p>Education) Regulations, 2020. Accordingly, the Council has notified the same in the Gazette of India on 30.06.2022.</p> <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above information.</p>
ITEM NO.12	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 have constituted/ re-constituted several Committees. The details of the Committees are as under:
i)	Sub-Committee on preparation of Scheme for conduct of Professional Examination:
	The President, Council of Architecture has constituted a Sub-Committee consisting of Prof Abhay Purohit, Convenor, Ar. Lalichan Zacharias, Member, Ar. Kavita Daryani Rao, Special Invitee, and Prof. PSN Rao, Special Invitee, to prepare a scheme of Professional Examination before granting registration as an Architect by Council to persons who possess recognized qualification and also for upgradation of existing registered Architects.
ii)	Re-constitution of Scrutiny Committee:
	<p>The President, COA, has reconstituted the Scrutiny Committee to scrutinize the assessment reports of institutions submitted by the Expert Committees which inspect various institutions for extension of approval of B.Arch./M.Arch./Additional intake in the existing B.Arch. course and introduction of B.Arch./M.Arch. degree courses for the academic session 2022-2023 and to submit its reports/recommendations to EC for further consideration.</p> <p>The Committee consists of following Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ar. Vandana Sehgal, Convenor • Ar. Gajanand Ram, Member • Ar. Arvind Kumar Ahirwar • Ar. Maitreyi Chander Gupta, Member • Ar. Abhijit Digambar Shirodkar, Member • Ar. Nilakshi D. Sarma, Special Invitee •
iii)	Sub-Committee on Merger and takeover of Architectural Institutions.
	The President, COA, constituted a Sub-Committee to prepare guidelines/norms for merger of institutions of same Trust/ Society/ University/ Sponsoring body and change in Trust/Society/University/Sponsoring body by a new sponsoring body for taking over an institution so that the sponsoring bodies/institutions may apply for the same to the Council.

	<p>The Committee consists of following Members:</p> <p>i) Prof. Pushkar M. Kanvirde; and</p> <p>ii) Ar. Paramjit Singh Ahuja.</p>														
iv)	<p>Constitution of Jury for conduct of Design Competition for the Council's Centre of Excellence Building at Bengaluru.</p>														
	<p>The President, COA, has constituted the Jury of following members to assess and shortlist the entries received from participants for Building of Council's Centre of Excellence at Bengaluru :</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>• Prof.Neelkanth Chayya, Convenor</td><td>• Ar.N. Mahesh, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar.Dilip Chatterjee, Member</td><td>• Ar.Sheila Sri Prakash, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar.Sanjay Kanwinde, Member</td><td>• Ar.Narendra Dingle, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar.Mala Mohan Member</td><td>• Ar.Namita Singh, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar. Vivek Gupta, Member</td><td>• Ar.Chitra Vishwanath, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar.Ranjeet Hoskote, Member</td><td>• Ms.Shiny Verghese, Member</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Ar.Madhav Raman, Member</td><td></td></tr> </table>	• Prof.Neelkanth Chayya, Convenor	• Ar.N. Mahesh, Member	• Ar.Dilip Chatterjee, Member	• Ar.Sheila Sri Prakash, Member	• Ar.Sanjay Kanwinde, Member	• Ar.Narendra Dingle, Member	• Ar.Mala Mohan Member	• Ar.Namita Singh, Member	• Ar. Vivek Gupta, Member	• Ar.Chitra Vishwanath, Member	• Ar.Ranjeet Hoskote, Member	• Ms.Shiny Verghese, Member	• Ar.Madhav Raman, Member	
• Prof.Neelkanth Chayya, Convenor	• Ar.N. Mahesh, Member														
• Ar.Dilip Chatterjee, Member	• Ar.Sheila Sri Prakash, Member														
• Ar.Sanjay Kanwinde, Member	• Ar.Narendra Dingle, Member														
• Ar.Mala Mohan Member	• Ar.Namita Singh, Member														
• Ar. Vivek Gupta, Member	• Ar.Chitra Vishwanath, Member														
• Ar.Ranjeet Hoskote, Member	• Ms.Shiny Verghese, Member														
• Ar.Madhav Raman, Member															
v)	<p>Constitution of Sub-Committee on granting equivalence to foreign PG Qualifications with Master's Degree in Architecture awarded by Indian Universities.</p>														
	<p>The President, COA, has constituted a Sub-Committee for suggesting ways and means for granting equivalence to Foreign Architectural PG Qualifications with Masters' Degree in Architecture awarded by Indian Universities. The Committee consists of following members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ar.Vandana Sehgal, Convenor 2. Ar.Abhijit Shirodkar, Member 3. Ar.Minakshi Jain, Member 4. Ar.Kavita Daryani Rao, Special Invitee 5. Ar.P.S.N. Rao, Special Invitee 														
ITEM NO.13	<p>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONTRIBUTION OF OUTGOING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.</p>														
	<p>The President informed the members that since the last meeting of the Council term of following members have ended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ar. Rane Vadamuthu, 2. Ar. Yogita Rai, 3. Ar. Chandan Parab, 4. Ar. Bansan Singh Thangkhiew, 5. Ar. Anita Samyal, 6. Ar. Nupur Banerjee, 7. Ar. Narmada Devi Yumnam, 														

	<p>8. Ar. Nilakshi Sarma, and 9. Ar. Anuradha Bali.</p> <p>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.</p>
ITEM NO.14	ANY OTHER ITEM WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR.
I)	TO RECONSIDER THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE IN RESPECT OF DISCIPLINARY ENQUIRY NO. CA/DC/240.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council received a complaint of professional misconduct from Shri R. Ramaraju, Convenor, Professional Services Board, IIA, Tamilnadu Chapter, Chennai, for alleged professional misconduct against following Architects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shri C.N.Raghavendran, Architect, Chennai; 2. Shri Partha Ghosh, Architect, New Delhi; 3. Shri C.P Kukreja, Architect, New Delhi; 4. Shri R.Sundram, Architect, Bangalore; 5. Shri Deepak Mehta, Architect, Mumbai; and 6. M/s. Jurong Consultants, Bangalore. <p>The complaint relates to inviting tenders by Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority dated 10.09.2003 for selection of Design for New Secretariat Complex at Kottur, Chennai. The Council vide its letter dated addressed to 18.09.2003, requested the Member Secretary, CMDA, to amend the notification issued by them and conduct an Architectural Design Competition.</p> <p>The Council in its 44th Meeting held on 20th September, 2022, considered the complaint and statement of defence of Respondent Architects and decided that there exists a prima facie case of professional misconduct against all Respondent Architect(s) and Architects of M/s Jurong Consultant and, therefore, referred the complaint of Disciplinary Committee for a detailed investigation and submission of its report as per the procedures laid down under Rules 36 and 37 for the Council of Architecture Rules, 1973. However, the Shri C.N. Raghavendran filed a writ petition before Hon'ble Delhi High Court and the Hon'ble Court directed <i>that final outcome be kept in a sealed cover before the Court.</i></p> <p>The Petitioner also challenged the Regulation 2 (1) (xiv) and (xvi) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989, by contending that the same is in violation of Article 19 of Constitution of India and imposes unreasonable restriction on the right to carry on a profession and also Article 21 of the constitution.</p>

The Disciplinary Committee submitted its Report to the Council and the same was considered in 46th Meeting of the Council held on 30th November, 2005. The Council after going through the Report of the Disciplinary Committee found that all Respondent Architects are guilty of professional misconduct under Regulation 2(1)(iv) of the Architect (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.

The Council summoned the Respondent Architects to appear before it to provide them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972 before passing any order.

However, the High Court vide its order dated 08.05.2006 passed the following order :

"Pending further orders, any action taken pursuant to the order of the Disciplinary Committee including the personal hearing of petitioner scheduled for 27.05.2006 by the Council of Architecture shall not take place in so far, the petitioners are concerned."

The matter was again considered in 47th Meeting of the Council held on 26th & 27th May, 2006. Except the petitioner (Ar. C.N. Raghavendran), all the Respondents Architects were reprimanded by the Council.

The President further informed that the matter is now pending before Hon'ble Delhi High Court since 2006 and came up for hearing on 05th July, 2022. The Senior Advocate of the Council has suggested to reconsider the matter considering the long pendency from last 16 years, age of petitioner and also the fact that the petitioner is a Padma Shri Awardee by Government of India.

The Council members deliberated the matter at length and observed that withdrawing the Disciplinary proceedings against the Petitioner at this stage would not be proper as the Council had already found five architects guilty of professional misconduct in the same matter and they would also approach High Court seeking different legal remedies. The members were also of the view that if the Senior Architects in the profession do not follow the code and conduct and ethics then how would young architects follow the same. The members noted that the Regulations framed by the Council under Section 22 prevails over any other law in force in India. Hence, Regulations should be followed by all Architects.

The members after deliberations authorized the President, COA, to take appropriate decision in the matter.

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 in hybrid mode in the pandemic situation.

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.