

MINUTES OF THE 80th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE, HELD ON 02ND SEPTEMBER 2023 (SATURDAY), FROM 10:30 A.M. ONWARDS IN CONFERENCE HALL, HOTEL RADISSON BLU, AMRITSAR, PUNJAB.

PRESENT:

Ar. Abhay V. Purohit : President (In Chair)
Ar. Gajanand Ram : Vice-President

MEMBERS :

1.	Ar. Habeeb Khan	23.	Ar. Nand Lal Chandel
2.	Ar. Abhijit D. Shirodkar	24.	Ar. Harinder Arora
3.	Ar. Navin Sharma	25.	Ar. Vidyadhar S. Wodeyar
4.	Ar. Punit Sethi	26.	Ar. P. S. Rajeev
5.	Ar. Lalichan Zacharias	27.	Ar. Aldrina K. Marak
6.	Ar. Minakshi Jain	28.	Ar. Benjusingh Nongthomban
7.	Ar. Ashutosh Kumar Aggarwal	29.	Ar. George Lalzuia
8.	Ar. Kiran S. Mahajani	30.	Ar. V. Neilazo Metha
9.	Ar. Millind Kollegal	31.	Ar. Sushant Kumar Patra
10.	Ar. Radhika Nagpal	32.	Ar. Tarun Garg
11.	Ar. K. Senthil Kumar	33.	Ar. P. Vaitianadin
12.	Ar. R. Thanigai Arasu	34.	Ar. Ritu Singh
13.	Ar. R. Ramesh Kumar	35.	Ar. Rajesh Pradhan
14.	Ar. Naveen Kanithi	36.	Ar. T. Loganathan
15.	Ar. Bapilu Chai	37.	Ar. Ravi Kumar R.
16.	Ar. Atonu Baruah	38.	Ar. Manish Chakraborti
17.	Ar. Kapil Setia	39.	Er. Mahavir B Chopda
18.	Ar. Sandeep Laxman Bangde	40.	Er. Sandip Kumar Deb
19.	Ar. Vijay Garg	41.	Dr. G.S. Inda
20.	Ar. Vishal Arun Kumar Vyas		
21.	Ar. Marwin C. Gomes		
22.	Ar. Sanjeev Kumar		

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	2.	Ms. Saumya Gupta
3.	Ar. Anil Kumar	4.	Ar. Yogesh Kumar Garg
5.	Ar. Sanjiban Datta	6.	Ar. Vandana Sehgal
7.	Ar. Sashi Mohan Srivastava		

No information was received, about their absence, from following members :

1.	Ar. M. P. Singh	2.	Ar. Nadisha V. M.
----	-----------------	----	-------------------

The Registrar-Secretary welcomed the President, Vice-President and members of the Council and thanked them for sparing their valuable time for attending the 80th Meeting of the Council at the Holi City of Amritsar. The Registrar-Secretary congratulated the President and Vice-President for their first meeting.

The Hon'ble President welcomed and thanked the Hon'ble Vice-President and members for attending the 80th meeting of the Council. The Council felicitated the Immediate Past-President Ar. Habeeb Khan, Immediate Vice-President Ar. Sapna and Former Member Er. H. K. Mittal for their valuable services and contribution in the Council as President, Vice-President and Member of the Council, respectively.

The President welcomed the new members attending the meeting and the members also congratulated President and Vice-President for their first meeting. Thereafter, the regular agenda of the meeting was taken up.

ITEM NO.	PARTICULARS OF THE ITEMS
01	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE 78th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Minutes of 78th Meeting of the Council were circulated to the Hon'ble Members on 25th November, 2022. No comments were received on Minutes from any member.</p> <p>The Council after perusal of the Minutes of 78th Meeting approved and the same were signed by the President.</p>
02	ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE MINUTES OF THE 78th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	The Registrar-Secretary briefed the members on the action taken report on the Minutes of the 78 th meeting of Council. The Hon'ble Members noted the action taken report.
03	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE 79th (EMERGENT) MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The President informed the members Minutes of 79th (Emergent) Meeting of the Council were circulated to the Hon'ble Members on 27th March, 2023. Ar. Vishal Vyas, Member, vide his letter dated 05.04.2023, has sent his views/ observations on the Minutes.</p> <p>The members perused the Minutes and the letter dated 05.04.2023 of Ar. Vishal Vyas, Member, and after deliberations approved the Minutes and the same were signed by the President.</p>
04	ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE MINUTES OF THE 79th MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
	The Registrar-Secretary briefed the members on the action taken report on the Minutes of the 79 th meeting of Council. The Hon'ble Members noted the action taken report.

05	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 5964 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 18.10.2022 to 31.07.2023 .																																																					
06	APPROVAL FOR REMOVAL OF NAMES FROM REGISTER OF ARCHITECTS:																																																					
a)	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.</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. :561</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> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sl. No.</th><th>Name of Architect</th><th>State/City</th><th>Regn. No.</th><th>Reason for Removal of Name</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Ar.Himanshu Shekhar</td><td>Bhagalpur</td><td>CA/2020 /123424</td><td>Do not want to Practice as an Architect</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Ar. Alankrita Negi</td><td>Delhi</td><td>CA/2017 /85522</td><td>Currently settled in Australia</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Ar. Shyamalima Buragahain</td><td>Tinsukia (Assam)</td><td>CA/2018 /101619</td><td>Currently settled in Ireland</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Ar. Yogesh Bajirao Jadhav</td><td>Kolhapur</td><td>CA/2017 /86735</td><td>Not getting Sufficient Work/Client</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>Ar. Aparna Nilesh Adhikari</td><td>Kolhapur</td><td>CA/2010 /48533</td><td>Due to daughter's parenting</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>Ar. Yash Jeena</td><td>Noida</td><td>CA/2019 /113981</td><td>Do not want to Practice as an Architect</td></tr> <tr> <td>7</td><td>Ar.Swathi Suvara</td><td>Bangalore</td><td>CA/2019 /107623</td><td>Pursuing Higher Education-abroad</td></tr> <tr> <td>8</td><td>Ar. Nitin Bhimgonda Desai</td><td>Kolhapur</td><td>CA2001/ 27600</td><td>Currently settled in USA</td></tr> <tr> <td>9</td><td>Ar. Akansha Singh</td><td>Ghaziabad</td><td>CA/2015 /71398</td><td>No reason provided</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Regn. No.	Reason for Removal of Name	1	Ar.Himanshu Shekhar	Bhagalpur	CA/2020 /123424	Do not want to Practice as an Architect	2	Ar. Alankrita Negi	Delhi	CA/2017 /85522	Currently settled in Australia	3	Ar. Shyamalima Buragahain	Tinsukia (Assam)	CA/2018 /101619	Currently settled in Ireland	4	Ar. Yogesh Bajirao Jadhav	Kolhapur	CA/2017 /86735	Not getting Sufficient Work/Client	5	Ar. Aparna Nilesh Adhikari	Kolhapur	CA/2010 /48533	Due to daughter's parenting	6	Ar. Yash Jeena	Noida	CA/2019 /113981	Do not want to Practice as an Architect	7	Ar.Swathi Suvara	Bangalore	CA/2019 /107623	Pursuing Higher Education-abroad	8	Ar. Nitin Bhimgonda Desai	Kolhapur	CA2001/ 27600	Currently settled in USA	9	Ar. Akansha Singh	Ghaziabad	CA/2015 /71398	No reason provided
Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Regn. No.	Reason for Removal of Name																																																		
1	Ar.Himanshu Shekhar	Bhagalpur	CA/2020 /123424	Do not want to Practice as an Architect																																																		
2	Ar. Alankrita Negi	Delhi	CA/2017 /85522	Currently settled in Australia																																																		
3	Ar. Shyamalima Buragahain	Tinsukia (Assam)	CA/2018 /101619	Currently settled in Ireland																																																		
4	Ar. Yogesh Bajirao Jadhav	Kolhapur	CA/2017 /86735	Not getting Sufficient Work/Client																																																		
5	Ar. Aparna Nilesh Adhikari	Kolhapur	CA/2010 /48533	Due to daughter's parenting																																																		
6	Ar. Yash Jeena	Noida	CA/2019 /113981	Do not want to Practice as an Architect																																																		
7	Ar.Swathi Suvara	Bangalore	CA/2019 /107623	Pursuing Higher Education-abroad																																																		
8	Ar. Nitin Bhimgonda Desai	Kolhapur	CA2001/ 27600	Currently settled in USA																																																		
9	Ar. Akansha Singh	Ghaziabad	CA/2015 /71398	No reason provided																																																		

	<table><tr><td>10</td><td>Ar. Anil Madhav Kale</td><td>Thane</td><td>CA/1987 /11026</td><td>Due to old age-related issues</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>Ar. Mihir Milind Chikodikar</td><td>Pune</td><td>CA/2019 /115181</td><td>Currently settled in Canada</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>Ar. Dadasaheb Chandsaheb Nadaph</td><td>Pune</td><td>CA/1987 /10541</td><td>Do not want to Practice as an Architect</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>Ar. Tukaram Kawadu Nandanwar</td><td>Pune</td><td>CA/1987 /09886</td><td>Due to old age-related issues</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>Ar. Sanjeev Ganpat Bhosale</td><td>Raigad</td><td>CA/1991 /14082</td><td>Do not want to Practice as an Architect</td></tr></table>	10	Ar. Anil Madhav Kale	Thane	CA/1987 /11026	Due to old age-related issues	11	Ar. Mihir Milind Chikodikar	Pune	CA/2019 /115181	Currently settled in Canada	12	Ar. Dadasaheb Chandsaheb Nadaph	Pune	CA/1987 /10541	Do not want to Practice as an Architect	13	Ar. Tukaram Kawadu Nandanwar	Pune	CA/1987 /09886	Due to old age-related issues	14	Ar. Sanjeev Ganpat Bhosale	Raigad	CA/1991 /14082	Do not want to Practice as an Architect																			
10	Ar. Anil Madhav Kale	Thane	CA/1987 /11026	Due to old age-related issues																																									
11	Ar. Mihir Milind Chikodikar	Pune	CA/2019 /115181	Currently settled in Canada																																									
12	Ar. Dadasaheb Chandsaheb Nadaph	Pune	CA/1987 /10541	Do not want to Practice as an Architect																																									
13	Ar. Tukaram Kawadu Nandanwar	Pune	CA/1987 /09886	Due to old age-related issues																																									
14	Ar. Sanjeev Ganpat Bhosale	Raigad	CA/1991 /14082	Do not want to Practice as an Architect																																									
b)	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.:562</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> <table><tr><th>Sl. No.</th><th>Name of Architect</th><th>State/City</th><th>Registration No.</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Ar. Rajkumar Navamani Davidar</td><td>Coimbatore</td><td>CA/1990/13427</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Ar. Subodh Bhikaji Bandekar</td><td>Mumbai</td><td>CA/1986/09715</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Ar. D.T. Vinod Kumar</td><td>Secunderabad</td><td>CA/1987/11045</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Ar. Gokul Ranjan Das</td><td>Mumbai</td><td>CA/1997/20905</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Ar. Balkrishna Vithaldas Doshi</td><td>Ahmedabad</td><td>CA/1975/01352</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>Ar. Chandravadan Parikh</td><td>Vadodara</td><td>CA/1975/01226</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>Ar. Sakshi Ahuja</td><td>Delhi</td><td>CA/2010/50150</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>Ar. Meenakshi K. Jain</td><td>Ahmedabad</td><td>CA/1980/05490</td></tr><tr><td>9.</td><td>Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah</td><td>Bhopal</td><td>CA/1991/13677</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>Ar. Sunny Antil</td><td>Delhi</td><td>CA/2019/113071</td></tr></table>	Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Registration No.	1	Ar. Rajkumar Navamani Davidar	Coimbatore	CA/1990/13427	2	Ar. Subodh Bhikaji Bandekar	Mumbai	CA/1986/09715	3	Ar. D.T. Vinod Kumar	Secunderabad	CA/1987/11045	4	Ar. Gokul Ranjan Das	Mumbai	CA/1997/20905	5	Ar. Balkrishna Vithaldas Doshi	Ahmedabad	CA/1975/01352	6	Ar. Chandravadan Parikh	Vadodara	CA/1975/01226	7	Ar. Sakshi Ahuja	Delhi	CA/2010/50150	8	Ar. Meenakshi K. Jain	Ahmedabad	CA/1980/05490	9.	Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah	Bhopal	CA/1991/13677	10	Ar. Sunny Antil	Delhi	CA/2019/113071
Sl. No.	Name of Architect	State/City	Registration No.																																										
1	Ar. Rajkumar Navamani Davidar	Coimbatore	CA/1990/13427																																										
2	Ar. Subodh Bhikaji Bandekar	Mumbai	CA/1986/09715																																										
3	Ar. D.T. Vinod Kumar	Secunderabad	CA/1987/11045																																										
4	Ar. Gokul Ranjan Das	Mumbai	CA/1997/20905																																										
5	Ar. Balkrishna Vithaldas Doshi	Ahmedabad	CA/1975/01352																																										
6	Ar. Chandravadan Parikh	Vadodara	CA/1975/01226																																										
7	Ar. Sakshi Ahuja	Delhi	CA/2010/50150																																										
8	Ar. Meenakshi K. Jain	Ahmedabad	CA/1980/05490																																										
9.	Ar. Rakesh Singh Kushwah	Bhopal	CA/1991/13677																																										
10	Ar. Sunny Antil	Delhi	CA/2019/113071																																										
07	TO HEAR THE FOLLOWING ARCHITECTS FOUND GUILTY OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT BY THE COUNCIL:																																												
a)	CA/DC/461 – SHRI S. R. MAHAJAN, A.E., MCGM, MUMBAI V/S. AR. SUHAS MAHANT, MUMBAI.																																												

<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on 15th July 2022, after considering the report of the Disciplinary Committee, decided to summon both the Complainant and the Respondent Architect to appear before the Council to provide them opportunity of hearing to put forth their submissions and for deciding the matter finally in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act 1972.</p> <p>However, Respondent Architect did not appear in the 78th meeting held on 07.11.2022, though Complainant appeared. The Council in order to provide one more opportunity of hearing decided to defer the hearing to next meeting.</p> <p>Accordingly, both the Complainant and Respondent were issued notices to appear before the Council in its 80th Meeting to be held on 2nd September, 2023 for providing them hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972 and passing appropriate orders.</p> <p>The Complainant was represented by Shri H. C. Bhagat, AE, MCGM. The Respondent Architect sent an email expressing his inability to attend hearing and about his acceptability of the decision as may be taken by the Council in his absence.</p> <p>The President requested the Complainant to briefly state his complaint. The Complainant stated 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. Though there were 58 tenants on the same and out of which 43 were rehabilitated by the Developer. However, Respondent Architect did not disclose about non-rehabilitation of 15 nos. of existing tenants, who were still living in that building. This was a deliberate lapse and suppression of information on the part of the Respondent Architect to a Statutory Authority.</p> <p>The Complainant also stated that subsequently 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. The Complainant requested the Council to take strict action against the Respondent to stop such types of lapses.</p> <p>The Council perused the Statement of Defence of Respondent Architect and noted that at the time of submission of proposal to MCGM the Respondent had mentioned that existing structure already been demolished and plot was vacant. This submission was based on the information provided by Client (Developer) that settlement with all the existing tenants had been done by him before demolishing of existing buildings. Hence, the Respondent did not mention about families living in the building at the time of submission of proposal by him, and re-accommodation of the 15 existing tenants was not shown.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted in his Statement of Defence 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 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 the Council that such kind of act would not happen again on his part and sought sympathetic consideration of his case.</p> <p>The Council also noted 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>The Council after deliberations accepted the Report of Disciplinary Committee and found that the Respondent Architect was guilty of Professional Misconduct for violation of Regulation 2 (1) (iii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>The Council invited the Complainant to the meeting hall and informed that Respondent Architect is found guilty of professional misconduct and whether Complainant has to say anything on the quantum of punishment to Respondent Architect.</p> <p>The Complainant stated that the Respondent had acted negligently and admitted his misconduct, he must be punished by the Council for submitting false undertaking/information to the Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>The Council deliberated the matter at length and after deliberations the Council Ordered to suspend the Respondent Architect from practice as an Architect for a period of 6 months. The Respondent Architect shall surrender his Certificate of Registration as an Architect during this period to Council.</p> <p>The Registrar-Secretary was directed to inform the decision of the Council to the Complainant and Respondent Architect.</p>
b)	<p>CA/DC/494 - DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER, MCGM, MUMBAI V/S. AR. B. R. GANDHI, AHMEDABAD.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 78th Meeting held on 7th November 2022, after considering the report of the Disciplinary Committee, decided to summon both the Complainant and the Respondent Architect to appear before the Council to provide them opportunity of hearing to put forth their submissions and for deciding the matter finally in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act 1972.</p> <p>Accordingly, both the Complainant and Respondent were issued notices to appear before the Council in its 80th Meeting held on 2nd September, 2023, for providing them hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972 and passing appropriate orders.</p> <p>No one was present on behalf of Complainant. The Respondent Architect was present personally.</p> <p>The President requested the Respondent Architect to present his case before the Council.</p>

The Respondent in brief stated that the place where fire took place was not under his scope of work. He was not Architect for that particular place. Occupation Certificate was already granted by MCGM. Mr. Raju, his Draftsman acted on his behalf and he never disowned his actions. The Respondent only applied for change of use from IT office to Restaurant. There was no encroachment on terrace when additions and alterations took place. The encroachments done later on by the Developer were demolished by MCGM twice. The Respondent did not provide any drawing for the terrace floor.

Thereafter, the Respondent was asked to wait outside meeting hall.

As Complainant was not present, the Council referred to the Complaint and also perused the report of the Disciplinary Committee and noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was about 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 stated 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 was 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 :

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....."

Further, the Judicial Committee summarized its report as under :

“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”

The Council also perused the Statement of Defence of Respondent Architect where he stated as under:

- i) 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.
- ii) Para 4.8.1 of the Judicial Committee Report, which reads as under:
*“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.
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.”*
- 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 encroached 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 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.

	<p>xi) No site visit from Architect was required for this permission.</p> <p>xii) The entire case may be examined from the angle of the role and responsibilities of the Architect in the said project.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Respondent's main content was that the fire took place outside the approved premises. It happened on illegally encroached area by the Developer and therefore, he cannot be made liable for the same.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter observed that no drawings were provided by the Respondent Architect for development of terrace where fire took place. An Architect cannot be made liable for illegal actions/ temporary structure created by the Developer. The MCGM was fully aware of the encroachments being made by Developer repeatedly since they demolished it in past twice and could have sealed the place.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, accepted the contentions of the Respondent Architect and decided that the Respondent Architect is not guilty of professional misconduct and accordingly dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The Registrar-Secretary was directed to inform the decision of the Council to the Complainant and Respondent Architect.</p>
c)	<p>CA/DC/496 – SHRI A. S. SHAPURWALA, MUMBAI V/S. AR. NARENDRA B.P. CHITRODA, NAVI MUMBAI.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 78th Meeting held on 7th November 2022, after considering the report of the Disciplinary Committee, decided to summon both the Complainant and the Respondent Architect to appear before the Council to provide them opportunity of hearing to put forth their submissions and for deciding the matter finally in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act 1972.</p> <p>Accordingly, both the Complainant and Respondent were issued notices to appear before the Council in its 80th Meeting to be held on 2nd September, 2023, for provide them hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972 and passing appropriate orders.</p> <p>The Complainant was present in person. Respondent Architect vide his letter dated 27.08.2023, authorised Mr. Ameya S. Mahajan, Advocate, Mumbai to represent him before the Council.</p> <p>The President first requested the Complainant to present his complaint in brief.</p> <p>The Complainant stated that firstly the appointment of architect was irregular. The documents submitted for occupation certificate were not proper. The SRA issued an explanation letter to Respondent Architect. However, he did not reply. The building was directed to be vacated by the local authority due to non-compliance. About 36 types of works are pending. The Respondent has submitted misleading documents to the Municipal and other authorities for seeking Occupation Certificate. The Respondent also submitted his written submissions which were circulated to all the members of the Council before the meeting.</p>

	<p>The President, thereafter, requested the Advocate of the Respondent Architect to make his submissions in the matter.</p> <p>He submitted that the complaint was filed to harass the Architect and Developer. He stated that in the year 1995, Slum Dwellers formed a Cooperative Housing Society namely, "CTS 3 Vijay SRA CHS Co-operative Housing Society, for development of plot belonging to MHADA in Mumbai. Ar. Arvind B. Naik was appointed as an Architect by developer M/s. Venus Enterprises for development.</p> <p>The Complainant has suppressed the fact that he was one of the partners of M/s. Venus Enterprises and was expelled due to his serious breach and violation of terms and conditions of Partnership Deed.</p> <p>The Complainant has failed to point out any such specific professional misconduct committed by the Respondent. The Complainant has used the Council as a tool to harass the developer along with respondent for his ulterior motives.</p> <p>The Respondent had already obtained the Occupation Certificate of A to C wing of Rehab Building. No wrong representation was made to the concerned authority in Occupation certificate as alleged. The application for OC of sale building is made with SRA and the file is under Scrutiny and if there are any pending works, which the Respondent did not agree, then same would be completed by the Developer under the supervision of the Respondent. He requested that the complaint be dismissed.</p> <p>Thereafter, both the Complainant and the Advocate of Respondent were asked to leave the meeting hall.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter observed that the Complainant was earlier partner in the Developer's Firm. The allegations against the Respondent Architect were that he applied for Occupation Certificate of the Building without completion of work of the building.</p> <p>The Council noted that as per Respondent Architect out of Four towers 3 towers have already been granted Occupation Certificate and the Developer would complete the fourth tower also. Further, the application for grant of Occupation Certificate is still being considered by the Competent Authority.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, decided that the Respondent Architect is not guilty of professional misconduct and accordingly dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>Thereafter, both the parties were invited in the meeting hall and were informed about the decision of the Council.</p> <p>The Registrar-Secretary was directed to communicate the decision of the Council to the Complainant and Respondent Architect as per procedure.</p>
d)	<p>CA/DC/523 – SHRI ANAND PRAKASH GUPTA, DELHI V/S. AR. SURENDRA SINGH, GHAZIABAD.</p>

	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 78th Meeting held on 7th November 2022, after considering the report of the Disciplinary Committee, decided to summon both the Complainant and the Respondent Architect to appear before the Council to provide them opportunity of hearing to put forth their submissions and for deciding the matter finally in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act 1972.</p> <p>Accordingly, both the Complainant and Respondent were issued notices to appear before the Council in its 80th Meeting held on 2nd September, 2023, for providing them opportunity of hearing in terms of Section 30 of the Architects Act, 1972 and passing appropriate orders.</p> <p>The Complainant along with his Advocate was present. The Respondent Architect sent a communication about his inability to appear before Council and stated that he would accept the decision of Council, as may be taken in his absence.</p> <p>The President requested the Complainant to present his complaint in brief.</p> <p>The Complainant stated that he booked 2 shops (Shop no. F-39 and F-40) from the builder (M/s. Gold Cause Construction Pvt Ltd.) in the Paradise Mall in Rajouri Garden, Delhi.</p> <p>Due to 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 appointed an advocate as Local Commissioner for needful report.</p> <p>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 feet and 18 feet. 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 who in turn presented the same before the Hon'ble Court. Thus, the Respondent Architect has not acted ethically and is guilty of professional misconduct.</p> <p>The President readout the email dated 28.08.2023 of the Respondent Architect about his absence in hearing.</p> <p>The Council referred the Statement of Defence submitted by Respondent Architect and also submissions made by him as recorded in report of Disciplinary Committee. The Respondent in his defence stated that he prepared the draft plan/ drawings at the instance of one Mr. Upadhyaya who was his childhood friend.</p> <p>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 was 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.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Council also perused the report of Disciplinary Committee and noted that 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.</p> <p>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. 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 his 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.</p> <p>The Council noted the observations of Disciplinary Committee that the Respondent did not send 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Council noted that Disciplinary 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 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 made the drawings as a friendly gesture not for any official use.</p> <p>The Council noted that Disciplinary Committee concluded that 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 him and later on he stated that he forgot about appointment of Advocate Ankit Gupta by him. The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter accepted and concurred with the report of the Disciplinary Committee which found that the Respondent</p>
--	--

	<p>Architect acted irresponsibly, negligently and brought disrepute to the profession of architecture in the eyes of law by submitting drawings/ dimensions to Local Court Commissioner contrary to actual site and thus held him guilty of professional misconduct for violating of Regulations 2 (1) (iii), (viii) and (x) of the Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>Thereafter, the Council invited the Complainant inside the meeting hall and asked him whether he has to say on the quantum of punishment. The Complainant prayed that the Registration of the Respondent Architect be cancelled forever.</p> <p>The Council after holding threadbare deliberations on the conduct of the Respondent Architect decided to suspend the Respondent Architect from practice as an Architect for a period of 12 months. The Respondent Architect shall surrender his Certificate of Registration as an Architect during this period to Council.</p> <p>The Registrar-Secretary was directed to communicate the decision of the Council to the Complainant and Respondent Architect as per procedure.</p>		
08	<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, passed the following Resolution:</p> <p>Resolution No.: 563</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1.</td><td> <p>CA/DC/540 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mrs. Usha Rani, New Delhi against Ar. Jai Bhagwan, (CA/2002/29542), New Delhi, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Respondent Architect had sanctioned new building plan vide I.D. NO.OBP/SPX/2017/ 10037229 dated 23.12.2016. He included the Public Street in the above House Area. He also issued a Completion Certificate of the Building. The Respondent has allegedly committed and unethical act.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he was on the panel of MCD and has only the duty to complete documents and draft a map (whether new building plan or addition/ deletion in the building plan) and forward the same to building Department of the MCD, who were sole authority to sanction/ decline the same. The building plan of the said property was duly sanctioned by MCD.</p> </td></tr> </table>	1.	<p>CA/DC/540 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mrs. Usha Rani, New Delhi against Ar. Jai Bhagwan, (CA/2002/29542), New Delhi, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Respondent Architect had sanctioned new building plan vide I.D. NO.OBP/SPX/2017/ 10037229 dated 23.12.2016. He included the Public Street in the above House Area. He also issued a Completion Certificate of the Building. The Respondent has allegedly committed and unethical act.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he was on the panel of MCD and has only the duty to complete documents and draft a map (whether new building plan or addition/ deletion in the building plan) and forward the same to building Department of the MCD, who were sole authority to sanction/ decline the same. The building plan of the said property was duly sanctioned by MCD.</p>
1.	<p>CA/DC/540 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mrs. Usha Rani, New Delhi against Ar. Jai Bhagwan, (CA/2002/29542), New Delhi, the Council noted that as per the Complaint, the Respondent Architect had sanctioned new building plan vide I.D. NO.OBP/SPX/2017/ 10037229 dated 23.12.2016. He included the Public Street in the above House Area. He also issued a Completion Certificate of the Building. The Respondent has allegedly committed and unethical act.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he was on the panel of MCD and has only the duty to complete documents and draft a map (whether new building plan or addition/ deletion in the building plan) and forward the same to building Department of the MCD, who were sole authority to sanction/ decline the same. The building plan of the said property was duly sanctioned by MCD.</p>		

	<p>The Council after deliberations noted that as the site plan given by the Complainant there was a gully passing along the eastern side of the plot. However, in the site plan given by the Respondent the said gully has not been reflected. Though, in the Deed of Conveyance in favour of Shri Udho Ram S/o Shri Ram Chand, as submitted by Respondent, in schedule I, there was a description of street on eastern side.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
2.	<p>CA/DC/542 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Suresh Lalji Manani, Thane, against Ar. Anil Hassanand Jagwani, (CA/2001/27699), Thane, the Council noted that as per the Complaint the Respondent Architect alleged submitted a Carpet Area Certificate including Service Duct to Developer. Though Service duct was not included in carpet area.</p> <p>The Complainant appointed another architect for undertaking measurements of area jointly with the Respondent Architect. However, Respondent Architect was not responding. The Builder has not done construction as per approved layout. As per plan louvered glass window were to be erected but at site door opening done and without any check by the Respondent Architect. The Respondent has issued false completion certificate and based on the same builder was asking for payments.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the grievance raised by the petitioner is already sub-judice before Maha Rera Authority. There was no privity of contract between the Complainant and Respondent. The Respondent has issued a certificate dated 27.01.2022 mentioning MOFA carpet area as well as RERA carpet area. Petitioner has filed along with complaint the previous certificate dated 10.08.2021. However, after realizing the calculation mistake the Respondent has issued new certificate dated 27.01.2022. The Respondent Architect vide letter dated 14.07.2022 has resigned from the project.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations noted that the Respondent Architect was appointed by the Builder and he has already issued a revised Area Certificate and now resigned from the project. For any deficiency in construction or amenities/ services as promised in the building, the builder is responsible and not the Architect.</p> <p>Based on above facts, the Council decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
3.	<p>CA/DC/544 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Shailesh Mohanlal Karwa, Solapur, against Ar. Suresh Gurupad Dindore, (CA/2008/42615),</p>

	<p>Solapur, the Council noted that Complainant is an Architect who was appointed by M/s. Rishikesh Builders for a housing project consisting 24 flats. Deed of declaration was executed on 02.02.2018 as per Maharashtra Apartment Ownership Act, 1970 and entry has been taken on property card on 29.05.2018. The balance FSI was written as 27.96% (682.39 sqm). Some flat owners registered an association called "Sudeshna Vihar Flat owners Association, Solapur.</p> <p>To minimize the amount of expenses of value, stamp duty & registration charges of balance FSI of developer the Association took a fraudulent certificate from Respondent Architect mentioning wrong area of balance FSI and got market value wrongly calculated from Joint District Registrar Class I and Controller of Stamps, Solapur.</p> <p>The fraudulent certificate was given by Respondent on 27.09.2018 without honesty, integrity, devotion, ethical standards and with partiality. He misused his position, qualification and failed to maintain discipline, professionalism and took up the work without informing the Complainant Architect who was already working and appointed by the Developer for the project.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence stated that he has given Architect's Certificate on the basis of approved/ sanctioned drawings no.1032 of the project dated 30.12.2015 and approval dated 05.01.2016 bearing sanctioned plan no.1319. He further submitted that in case the Complainant believes that the balance FSI is 682.39 sqm., he should furnish revised sanctioned plans from the concerned authority. In case of shortfall amount of stamp duty, it is for the authorities to proceed against the respective party and respondent was not concerned/ involved. He merely gave Architect's Certificate on the basis of documents/ data provided to him. The Complainant described himself as project Architect but in revised deed he has mentioned himself as Grantor/ business partner in the Rishikesh Builders and Developers which is conflict of interest.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations noted that the Respondent Architect was appointed by the Flat Owners Association to give Architect's Certificate based on data / information provided by them. The Respondent Architect has also given a disclaimer about non-responsibility in case of any misrepresentation of facts. The Council also noted that the Complainant has made a complaint regarding under payment of stamp duty and matter is still pending for adjudication by them.</p> <p>Based on above facts, the Council decided that there is no prima facie case of professional misconduct against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
4.	<p>CA/DC/545 - With regard to the complaint filed by M/s. Cable Corporation of India Limited, Mumbai against Ar. Aniket Dilip Mathakar, CA/2010/50758, Mumbai, the Council noted that the Complaint against Respondent was</p>

	<p>that he was engaged by Society/ Kanakia Spaces Private Limited as their Architect and following documents were issued by Respondent Architect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Architect's Certificate dated 12.05.2021 bearing no.ADM/western edge II CHSL/Area Certificate/RO; 2. Letter dated 21.03.2022, to DDR bearing no.AD</Western Edge-II/PCSL/Letter-02; 3. Architect's Certificate dated 17.03.2022. <p>The Complaint alleged that Respondent had submitted false certificate to the District Deputy Registrar Cooperative Societies, Mumbai City, based on which deemed conveyance of a part of the land bearing CTS No.163/A, 165 of Village Magathane, Dattapada Road, Borivali (East) was executed.</p> <p>The Respondent has incorrectly showed additional FSI as part of the revised sanctioned plan, even though it was part of the larger layout whose rights vested with the Complainant. It was also alleged that the certificate issued by the Respondent Architect was an attempt to usurp additional FSI in order to regularize unauthorized construction by the society.</p> <p>The Respondent Architects in his statement of defence refused the allegations and stated that he was appointed for the limited purpose of examining technical facts on record as provided by the society and issue certificate in respect of FSI entitlement of the society and submission to DDR. He had no financial dealings/ professional obligation in the matter and had no locus standing in matter of approval of plans, development permissions and regularization of unauthorized work or issue of usurping FSI.</p> <p>He further submitted that deemed conveyance granted by DDR in favour of housing society called "Western Edge-II premises Cooperative Society Limited" was subsequently quashed by Hon'ble Bombay High Court and matter remanded back to DDR for fresh hearing. Later on, DDR also rejected application for the deemed conveyance.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations noted that Respondent Architect submitted certificate to DDR mentioning technical figures and data including FSI details and calculations of builtup area including percentage shares which was the basis for grant of deemed conveyance to the concerned Housing Society. The Respondent Architect's letter and certificate were perhaps based on the revised plans of Housing Society submitted for approval but not approved.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
--	---

5.	<p>CA/DC/546 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr.Vinod M.S, Mysuru against Ar. Nikhitha Guru, CA/2020/119692, Mysuru, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect was that she proposed to Complainant to provide her architectural services @Rs.120/- per sq.ft which was under negotiation.</p> <p>While the Complainant wanted to see her previous projects but she took her to an under-construction site and promised to take her to completed projects but not showed a single completed project. The Respondent requested the complainant to transfer Rs.50,000/- and told that she would return if deal is not finalised. The Complainant transferred Rs.50,000/- in her account. But even after 3 months the Respondent did not submit a final plan, after the changes suggested by the complainant. The Respondent has refused to payback amount paid to her.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in her defence stated that the Complainant approached her for designing his residence after seeing the construction work of her friend and visited her to discuss the requirements and fees. The Respondent agreed to take up the project and did the conceptual plans with almost 5 meeting with him and 2 different options of plans without any advance.</p> <p>The complainant agreed for one option and asked to develop further. She asked the complainant to pay 25% of the total project fees i.e. 1,15,000/- as advance. But only paid Rs.50,000/- and promised that balance would be paid later on.</p> <p>After final plan, the Complainant asked for working drawings which was refused by Respondent since Rs.65,000/- were due on the Complainant. The Complainant refused to sign the contract and tried to harass the Respondent.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council noted that the Complainant after orally agreeing to certain amount of fees for architectural services to be provided by the Respondent, Architect failed to honour the same and also refused to sign the contract or the quotation offered by the Respondent Architect. The Respondent Architect refused to provide further services only when complainant refused to make further payments as agreed.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, opined that there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
6	<p>CA/DC/547 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Lalit Sachdeva, U.P. against Ar. Anupama Bajaj, CA/1996/19742, U.P., the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect was that she was appointed as an Architect and Project Management Consultant for the completion of the housing project, including complete electrical, plumbing, pop, stone/ tiling, whitewash, fabrication, woodwork,</p>

	<p>wardrobe, lighting etc. but excluding civil work. The Respondent was obliged to handover the keys of the house after completing the project. It was alleged that the Respondent did not complete the project and left things in between and stopped coming to the project site, leaving so many works incomplete, substandard and not as per drawings/ designs shown by her. The Complainant further alleged several discrepancies and unilateral decisions taken by the Respondent Architect for the project.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in her defence stated that since Complainant was known to her and her husband, he requested for her assistance for interior designing work. Without any consideration the Respondent prepared design of Interior decoration and handed over to the Complainant.</p> <p>No responsibility to get any work done or purchase any material was accepted by her. The Respondent only supplied the list of suppliers of materials and Complainant himself appointed them.</p> <p>Because of the close relationship, Complainant on few occasions asked Respondent to talk to suppliers to supply material on credit basis. Though some amount was paid by Complainant but a huge amount is still pending.</p> <p>The Respondent has no contract to render any service to the Complainant. The Respondent has not received a single penny for her obligatory advices.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council noted that the Respondent admitted that she agreed to undertake interior designing work without any consideration as the Complainant was known to her. She further stated that that she suggested list of suppliers and also asked to supply material on credit basis to the Complainant. On the other hand, the Complainant alleged negligence on the part of the Respondent Architect and active role of the Respondent in deciding each and every material and other aspects of house of Complainant. Though no written contract has been provided by either of the parties.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
7.	<p>CA/DC/548 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Arvind Anant Toro, Pune against Ar. Vikas Arunkumar Achalkar, (CA/1994/17606) Pune, the Council noted that the complaint against the Respondent Architect was that he misrepresented to the all the insider and outsider stakeholders by giving false, dishonest assurances regarding layout plan, boundaries of the project/ scheme known as Anandtara's Haritara on S. NO. 415, Village Kondhawe Dhawade, Tal. Haveli, Dist Pune.</p>

	<p>There was variance between boundaries showed on paper and the actual boundaries on site/ project. Respondent misled to the banks and financial institutions not only of the builders but also of flat buyers.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he has not provided any services to the society members. M/s. Anand Tara Properties (Promoter) had appointed him on 27.04.2015 for architectural design of the entire project. The promoter had carried out demarcation on 02.08.2012 through Land Record Office, Haveli, Pune and thereafter it was the responsibility of promoter to maintain the boundaries and possession as per the demarcation.</p> <p>The Respondent prepared the building drawings and plans on the basis of documents provided by the promoter. The Respondent also narrated the entire procedure followed for the project and the fact that the Complainant had purchased the flat vide agreement to sale dated 05.06.2014 and satisfied himself about the all details of property.</p> <p>The Council noted that boundaries of the property, were to be provided to Architect by the owner/ developer. Further, it was the duty of owner/ developer and purchaser to get themselves satisfied with boundaries. Thus, no fault can be attributed to the Respondent Architect.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, decided that there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
8.	<p>CA/DC/549 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Ankit Kumar Garg, New Delhi against Ar. Udit Vishnoi, Uttar Pradesh, the Council noted that the Complainant has stated that he had engaged the Respondent Architect vide Contract dated 25.07.2022. As per the agreement the Respondent was required to prepare all required Drawings, approval of MAP, Construction of building, Exterior & Interior works, completion etc. with an agreed contract value of Rs.29,50,000/- within a period of 6 months from handing over of the site. The site was handed over to him on 26.07.2022.</p> <p>The Complainant transferred the sum of Rs.16,30,000/- through online transfer in the Respondent's and his family member's Accounts. The Respondent was not performing his duty properly and demanding huge money beyond payment plan. Even after lapse of five months, the slab was not casted which shows his unethical & unprofessional behaviour towards discharge of his services. He was not using agreed material and following approved general practice while constructing a house. The Complainant asked him to provide bills/Invoices/working to justify the cost incurred so far as against his advance of Rs.16.30 lakhs, but the Respondent also not provided the same. Else he was using unfair means to threaten the complainant.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his Defence stated that the Complainant entered into agreement dated 08.08.2022 with one Mr. Ujjwal Kumar</p>

		<p>proprietor of Innov Architects and Interiors for preparation of all required drawings, approval of Map, construction of building, exterior & Interior works etc. of his vacant residential plot no. SK 206, Sector-112, Noida.</p> <p>The Respondent was associated with Innov Architects and Interiors, Proprieter Mr. Ujjwal Kumar in the capacity of consultant Architect along with other Architects just for preparation & finalization of drawings, maps and paid site visits in order to ensure that the construction is being done in accordance with the maps prepared by him.</p> <p>The Respondent further submitted that he has prepared the drawings/maps/designs pertaining to the site of the petitioner keeping in view at utmost Architectural standards. Whatever payment has been received by the Complainant has been received as consultancy fees.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council noted that the agreement for construction is between Ankit Kumar Garg and Shri Ujjwal kumar (Father of Respondent Architect) and not with the Respondent Architect individually. However, the quotation for Architecture and Interior works dated 25.07.2022 was issued under the sign and stamp of the Respondent Architect. The foundation layout plan submitted by the Respondent Architect contains the name Innov interiors and Architects. The scope of work in the agreement dated 08.08.2022 include preparation of all required drawings and approval of map. Further, the Respondent Architect was also a witness in the agreement.</p> <p>But the grievance in Complaint was related to non-performance of construction work and use of different materials in the construction of the house of the complainant.</p> <p>The Council therefore opined that as the complaint is not related to performance of Architecture services by the Respondent Architect, there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect. The Council accordingly dismissed the complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
	9	<p>CA/DC/550- With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Sandeep Kumar against Ar. Nishant Shekhar, the Council noted that the Respondent Architect was engaged by Mr. Sanjeev of Purnia, Bihar to provide Architectural consultancy services for many of his projects in the city of Purnia, Bihar. However, the Respondent Architect visited the site and gave adverse remarks/observations against the complainant. Later on, the Respondent Architect sent new and modified designs for all the sites. Thus, the respondent Architect took up the project where the complainant was already working and committed the Professional Misconduct.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the client contacted him in June, 2021 and insisted to visit Purnia, Bihar to have a look at proposed site and review the ongoing projects as value addition. The Respondent Architect Company was to be hired to add value to the project in terms of design and to work as a team with local Architects(complainant).</p>

		<p>A meeting was held with the client in the presence of the Complainant and it was decided that the Respondent would be the project Architect and Complainant would be the local Architect for liaising with local Authorities and to assist the execution team of client for providing necessary inputs as per Respondent's drawings. The respondent has not replaced the Complainant. The respondent was appointed to enhance the designs and give suggestions on cost effective parameters. The Respondent also stated in detail the entire events.</p> <p>The Council after detailed deliberations in the matter noted that the Respondent Architect became the project Architect in place of Complainant, however, no written/formal consent was obtained from the Complainant for the change of their roles for the project as the Complainant had a written agreement dated 10.09.2019 which was neither terminated nor modified by the client.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
10		<p>CA/DC/551- With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Colonel Neeraj Mehta, Andhra Pradesh against the Ar. Harsha S., Karnataka, the Council noted that the complaint against the Respondent Architect was that the Respondent Architect did not provide the Professional Services as agreed between them. The Layout, placement of rooms and functionality were not as per requirement of the Complainant though the same were told to him well in advance. When the observations/ feedback was given to the Respondent Architect he became vituperative, and abruptly withdrew from the project. He defaulted and withdrew from the project abruptly, without giving any notice.</p> <p>When, the Complainant requested the Respondent Architect rightfully and respectfully return the retainer/ signing amount, however the respondent Architect refused.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his Defence stated that he had undertaken the project with utmost empathy towards all those affected by the building of the structure and those to live in it with due consideration of the briefs received by him despite the innumerable limitations of the project.</p> <p>The several services such as the preparation of the area Statement and attending meetings with the Complainant were rendered even before the Respondent sent him Architecture Service proposal and was professionally commissioned.</p> <p>The Complainant has approached the Council with malice denying the performance of all such services rendered to him which are recoverable once professionally commissioned. The project was particularly challenging one given the nature of it, the nuances of the family concerned and the medical and psychological stresses faced by each of them. This was apart from the budgetary limits set by Col. Neeraj Mehta right at the outset. Such consideration necessitated slight variations from the brief which was intimated to the Complainant much in advance.</p> <p>That the amount claimed by the Respondent was the rightful compensation for the services rendered by him to the Complainant, if not more. The design was</p>

		<p>so prepared keeping in mind the requirements and the viability of all factors involved.</p> <p>The Respondent's right to compensation for his substantial portion of work and time dedicated to the project was not washed away just because of the Complainant not being satisfied. The value of work done was considerably higher taking into account that there was a workable design in place. However, the Respondent has made no further claim against it.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations noted that the Respondent Architect received a retainer amount from the complainant and provided conceptual services/ proposals to the Complainant. Retaining of retainer amount after rendering preliminary professional services is not a professional misconduct. Thus, the Council opined that no case Professional Misconduct is made out against the Respondent Architect.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
11	<p>CA/DC/552 – With regard to the complaint filed by Ar. Rutuja Milind Rode, Pune against Ar. Husain H. Dolkawala, Mumbai, the Council noted that the Complaint of the Complainant was that she was appointed as Architect to design new School building of St Joseph High School, Pashan road, Pune, by the Provincial Society of Congregation Jesus & Marry, Pune on 18.06.2018.</p> <p>The Complainant prepared designs and obtained permissions from building department of Pune Municipal Corporation. The Petitioner also helped the Society to float tender for construction. On 11.06.2020, the Complainant applied and obtained the plinth certificate from Pune Municipal Corporation. During lockdown the Society illegally cut 30-40 trees in School premises and encroached into Nala next to it and built areas outside the sectioned plans on 18.07.2022 the Complainant wrote to the Chief Engineer, Pune Municipal Corporation and also to the building department officials of Pune Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>However, the Respondent Architect took up the project and used the drawings and designs prepared by the Complainant and submitted to Pune Municipal Corporation for approval and thus committed Professional Misconduct.</p> <p>The Respondent in his Defence submitted that Provincial Society had posted out a tender/bidding process for appointment of Architects for phase 2 of the project i.e. interiors and liaisoning services and accordingly had invited bids from various Architect/Design firms. Accordingly, a competitive bidding process was carried out. That after several round of presentations, discussions and intensive negotiations with various Architects and designs firms and upon proper evaluations, the said Provincial Society had approved the appointment of the Respondent to prepare designs and be its liaisoning architect for the school projects.</p> <p>The Respondent had never ever illegally copied the intellectual Property rights of drawing and designs belonging to the Complainant.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Complainant has submitted her final bill to the Society/ client on 17.04.2022 and demanded a sum of Rs. 1,31,84,442(One Crore thirty-one lakh Eighty-four thousand four hundred and forty-two) for issuing NOC and leaving the project.</p>	

	<p>However, the client without issuing any notice terminated the services of the Complainant vide letter dated 18.05.2022, sent by Advocate Kiran Kothadiya. Further, though the Respondent Architect accepted the project of the client on 26.09.2022, however the client submitted the Respondent's name to the Municipal Corporation on 14.09.2022 itself while the issue regarding payment of fees of Complainant and termination of services abruptly by the Client (Society) was still pending.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
12	<p>CA/DC/554 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. Mukul Srivastava against Ar. Prashant Pal Singh Lucknow, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect was that he allegedly issued a fictitious certificate for installation of illegal mobile tower of Airtel/Indus towers Pvt. Ltd. on unauthorized constructed roof top of House No.D1/138, Vibhav Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow-10 owned by Mamta Saigal and Alok Saigal. The Lucknow Developed authority passed an order 15.12.2022 for demolition of the illegally constructed mobile tower on the ground that the building was constructed in deviation of the approved building plan dated 21.02.2005.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the complaint was time barred. The professional service was rendered by the Respondent to Bharti Infratel in the year 2007 and the complaint was made by a strange /third person after almost 16 years. Thus, the complaint should be dismissed for being time barred.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that his professional services were commissioned by Bharti Infratel limited by in the year 2007 by raising Purchase order dated 29.08.2007 and 22.12.2007. That on the perusal of the above-mentioned POs, it would be evident that the scope of work to be provided by the Respondent was limited only to providing Structural drawing/design for installation of Mobile Towers on building.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that as per the above-mentioned scope of work, he provided his services of high standard in a professional manner, to the best of his ability integrity and diligence.</p> <p>The Council noted that the Respondent Architect provided his professional services to Bharti Infratel limited for construction of Antina tower as per the policy of the Government of India. No fault was found with the certificate issued by the Respondent Architect and demolition of tower was ordered by Lucknow Development Authority due to the construction of the entire existing building by the owner in deviation of sanctioned building plan. Thus, the Council opined that no case Professional Misconduct was made out against the Respondent Architect and dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
13	<p>CA/DC/556 - With regard to the complaint filed by Shri Sagaya Lenin Bobin, Puducherry against the Ar. Dhinagan S, Cuddalore, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect was that he was appointed as</p>

	<p>junior Architect in the MML Buildtech LLP Puducherry, however, without completion of the design work of the following projects, he left the company:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NSJ Site (construction of hotel) elevation drawing 2) "Arun Resort" full drawing works 3) Marriage Hall-plan& design work. <p>The Respondent joined the competitor company and leaked the all plans, drawing and Architectural design. He gave false reasons/ statement for leaving the job. Because of him the works are stuck in middle stage.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that regarding NSJ site he has finalized the design and given to draftsman for completing the drawing and informed the Complainant. Regarding the Arun resorts, the Respondent replied that he has not given any details. The Complainant has given the project to his draftsman to design the resort. Regarding the Marriage`hall, he stated that he has completed the full designs and drawing by last week of April 2023 and confirmation from the client to proceed further was received.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that he was treated like a slave and he had to work more than 16 hours a day without any increase in the salary. He had to carryout huge projects costs crores of rupees without the help of any Architect, and had to play the role of Senior or Principal Architect. The respondent stated that he was exploited by Mr. Bobin for his Monetary benefits.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that the prima facie Respondent Architect has not committed any Professional Misconduct. Further no documentary evidence regarding leaking of any design/plan to any company was provided with the complaint. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>
09	TO CONSIDER AND ACCORD CONCURRENCE ON THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2023-24 AS APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL.
	The Council perused the Budget estimates of the Council of Architecture for the financial year 2023-24 as approved by the Executive Committee, namely, Recurring Expenses to the extent of Rs.26,33,28,000 and Non-Recurring expenditure to the extent of Rs.10,16,00,000/- along with probable Income Receivable to the extent of Rs.36,49,37,000/- and ratified the same.
10	TO TAKE NOTE OF THE FOLLOWING MATTERS:
i.	APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR FOR AUDITING THE BOOKS OF ACCOUNTS OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022-2023.
	<p>The President informed the members that M/s. V. K. Verma & Co., New Delhi was appointed by the Council as Statutory Auditor for carrying out the audit of accounts for the F.Y.: 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22.</p> <p>He further informed that he has extended the appointment of M/s. V. K. Verma & Co., New Delhi for undertaking the statutory audit of accounts of the Council for the F.Y.2022-23 in terms of Regulation 28(1) of the CoA Regulations, 1982,</p>

	<p>on the same remuneration as approved by the Council in its 75th Meeting held on 28/29.08.2021 i.e. Rs.40,000/-(plus taxes)</p> <p>The Council ratified the decision taken by President, COA and decided that the process of appointment of a new Chartered Accountant be initiated for the financial year 2023-2024.</p>
ii.	<p>DECISION TAKEN BY THE PRESIDENT, COA, ON COMPLAINT OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT AGAINST AR. C.N. RAGHAVENDRAN, CHENNAI.</p>
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that A Complaint for alleged professional misconduct was filed by Ar. R. Ramaraju, inter alia, against Ar. C.N. Raghavendran for participating in the tender issued by CMDA, Chennai, for availing Comprehensive Architecture Services by inviting Designs for New Secretarial Complex at Chennai, allegedly in violation of Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>The Council found a prima facie case in the matter and referred the Complaint to Disciplinary Committee for investigation and report in terms Council of Architecture Rules, 1973, which was challenged by Ar. Raghvendra before Hon'ble Delhi High Court in Writ Petition No. 1437 of 2005. The Hon'ble Delhi High Court restrained the Council from taking any action against the concerned Architect and the matter is pending for adjudication since then.</p> <p>The Council in its 77th meeting held on 15.07.2022 considered the subject matter and noted that the matter is pending before Hon'ble Delhi High Court since 2005 and after considering the matter in detail authorized the President, Council of Architecture to take appropriate decision in the matter based on his submission to Council.</p> <p>As authorised by the Council in its 77th meeting, the President, COA, after considering letter dated 21.02.2023 received from the concerned Architect along with the relevant records related to the complaint as well as the Court case, came to the conclusion that the complaint, which is about 20 years old, and since then was sub-judice before Hon'ble Delhi High Court for adjudication, has lost its relevance and purpose and furthermore, the purpose of COA Regulations is not to punish or harass an Architect but to make him understand and follow the code of conduct and ethics prescribed while practising the profession of Architecture. It is an admitted legal position that Section 22 of the Architects Act is special provision and Regulations framed thereunder [Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989] prevails over any other in force in India.</p> <p>The President, COA, also noted that the Respondent Architect has already expressed his regret in the matter and contended that it was purely an error of judgement in interpretation of the Architects Act and Regulations framed there under vis-a-vis other norms and laws that he participated in the project of CMDA.</p> <p>The President, COA, further noted that, in view of peculiar circumstance of the matter, it would be prudent to close the matter at this stage when a Senior Architect like Respondent Architect, who was conferred with Padma Shri by the</p>

	<p>Government of India for his contributions to the Profession of Architecture, has regretted to Council and reposed his full faith in the Council and norms framed by it for self-regulation of professional conduct of peers.</p> <p>In view of the above, the President, COA decided that the Complaint be closed and complainant and respondent be informed of the decision.</p> <p>The Council noted and ratified the decision taken by the President, COA.</p>
iii.	WRIT PETITION FILED BY AR. BELA GODHA (AGARWAL) BEFORE HON'BLE DELHI HIGH COURT AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council in its 78th Meeting held on 7th November, 2022, found Ar. Bela Godha (Agarwal) guilty of professional misconduct and ordered that her registration as an architect be suspended for a period of one year.</p> <p>However, Ar. Bela Godha challenged the decision of the Council in Hon'ble Delhi High Court in Writ Petition No.16402 of 2022. The Delhi High Court on 29.11.2022 has granted interim stay on the order passed by the Council till next date of hearing. The matter is listed for hearing on 25.09.2023.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
iv.	APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2023-2024 BY THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE.
	a) B.ARCH/ M.ARCH COURSE
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council has granted extension of approval to 367 institutions for imparting B.Arch. Course and 95 Institutions for imparting M.Arch. course for the academic session 2023-2024 based on the online assessment of the applications or inspection conducted by the Council.</p> <p>4 institutions have been granted additional intake in the existing B.Arch. course. 3 new institutions have been granted approval for introduction of 5-year B.Arch. degree course and 7 institutions were granted approval for introduction of M.Arch. course.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
	b) DIPLOMA COURSES
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that for the academic session 2023-2024, the Council has granted extension of approval for imparting Diploma in Architecture/ Architectural Assistantship/ Interior Design course to 77 existing Diploma Institutions and 16 new Diploma institutions have been granted approval for introduction of New Diploma, based on the application forms submitted by them.</p>

	<p>Further, 31 existing Architectural Institutions imparting 5-year B.Arch. degree course have also been granted approval for introduction of Diploma in Architecture/Architectural Assistantship/Interior Design based on the application forms submitted by them.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
v.	<p>CONDUCT OF NATA 2023 BY COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE FOR ADMISSION TO B.ARCH. DEGREE COURSE.</p>
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council has successfully conducted the NATA 2023 Tests thrice, in two shifts, for admission to B.Arch. Course. The First Test was held on 21.04.2023, 2nd on 03.06.2023 and Third Test on 09.07.2023.</p> <p>A total of 21693 unique candidates appeared in the all the three tests of NATA 2023 and 20552 unique candidates qualified in NATA 2023.</p> <p>NATA Co-ordination Committee consisting of Former President Ar. Habeeb Khan, National NATA Convenor, Ar. Sapna Prabhakar, Convenor, Ar. R Ramesh Kumar, Member, Ar. Shirish Sukhatme, Special Invitee, Ar. Ajay Kulkarni, Special Invitee, Ar. Mauktik Trivedi, Special Invitee were throughout involved in conduct and monitoring of the examination.</p> <p>The Council appointed centre observers, city observers, state observers at all the centres in order to monitor and supervise the smooth conduct of examination. The staff of the Council worked tirelessly to ensure smooth conduct of NATA Tests, evaluation of the exam and for announcement of results.</p> <p>Further, it was also informed that 4th NATA Test would be held on 17th September, 2023, in view of revision in eligibility for admission to B.Arch. Course and to afford opportunity to all eligible students to seek admission in B.Arch. Course.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
vi.	<p>AMENDMENTS IN THE ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO B.ARCH. COURSE.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that he discussed the issue related to revision in eligibility criteria for admission to Architecture Course with the Ms. Saumya Gupta, JS(TE), Ministry of Education, Govt. of India so that the same can be brought at par with Engineering Course.</p> <p>Accordingly, approval of the full Council was sought vide letter dated 05.06.2023 by circulation of papers, for amending the eligibility criteria for admission to B. Arch course.</p> <p>After approval of the Resolution by the Full Council the same was submitted to the Ministry for their approval. The Ministry vide its letters dated 17.07.2023 approved amendments in Regulation 4(1) of the Council of Architecture</p>

	<p>(Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, for the academic session 2023-2024 as under :</p> <p><i>“(1) No candidate shall be admitted to architecture course unless she/he has passed 10+2 or equivalent examination with Physics and Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with either Chemistry or Biology or Technical Vocational subject or Computer Science or Information Technology or Informatics Practices or Engineering Graphics or Business Studies with at least 45% marks in aggregate or passed 10+3 Diploma Examination with Mathematics as compulsory subject with at least 45% marks in aggregate.”</i></p> <p>Further, Ministry vide its letter dated 19.06.2023, approved the amendments in Regulation 4(2) of the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, as under :</p> <p>“(2) The candidate needs to qualify an aptitude test in architecture conducted either by NTA (i.e. JEE) or “NATA” conducted by the Council of Architecture.”</p> <p>The Council accordingly issued notification in gazette of India.</p> <p>Further, the proposal dated 02.03.2022 of Council for amending the eligibility on the lines of NEP by removing requirement of PCM subjects and conduct of bridge courses by Institutions, as decided by Council in its 76th Meeting held on 26.02.2022, is still pending for consideration of the Ministry.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
vii.	<p>ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN COMPETITIONS BY THE COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE ON BEHALF OF MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS, GOVT. OF INDIA AND MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS, GOVT. OF INDIA.</p>
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that Council has conducted following Architectural Design Competitions through its online portal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Architectural Design Competitions on behalf of Ministry of Road Transport and Highways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Standardisation of Bus Shelters to be constructed on all National Highways. b. Construction of Intermodal Station at Katra, Jammu and Kashmir. c. Beautification of boundary wall of all National Highways. d. Erection of Iconic Structure between Dhaula Kuan to T1 IGI Airport, New Delhi. 2. Architectural Design Competition on behalf of Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Govt. of India, for design of Toilets as part of Swachha Bharat Mission 2.0 – Urban. <p>The Juries were conducted for all the above competitions and reports of the juries were submitted to the concerned authorities for further appropriate action.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
viii.	<p>CONDUCT OF INDIA ART ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN BIENALLE 2023.</p>

	<p>The President informed the members that the Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India, in collaboration with Council of Architecture is organizing India Art, Architecture and Design Biennale 2023 between 8th December, 2023 to 14th December, 2023.</p> <p>The themes for the event are Doors, Gardens & Rock Art, Baolis/ Stepwells, Temples, Architectural Wonders, Indigenous Design and Women in Architecture & Design.</p> <p>The Council is a knowledge partner to the event and would be supporting the biennale by providing key note speakers, conduct of exhibitions, quiz competitions etc.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
ix.	ENHANCEMENT IN SITTING FEES FOR ATTENDING MEETINGS OF COUNCIL AND ITS COMMITTEES.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council in its 78th Meeting held on 7th November, 2022 vide 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.</p> <p>The same was submitted to the Ministry of Education for its approval in terms of Section 11 of the Architects Act, 1972.</p> <p>The Ministry vide its letter no.4-45/2014-TS.VI dated 25.05.2023, informed that the sitting fee in other autonomous / statutory bodies is Rs.5,000/- only, therefore the rate of sitting fee for attending meetings of Council be retained at Rs.5,000/- per day sitting.</p> <p>Further, it was informed that sitting fees for other Committee meetings was enhanced from Rs.4,000/- to Rs.5,000/- per meeting in terms of Section 11 of the Architects Act, 1972.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
x.	COMPLETION OF INTERIOR WORK OF COA OFFICE SPACE AT NBCC PLACE, OKHLA, NEW DELHI.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the interior work of COA office at NBCC Place, Okhla, Phase-1, New Delhi, has been completed and the office is fully functional since March, 2023.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xi.	GRANTS-IN-AID/ SCHOLARSHIP TO ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS/ STUDENTS FROM THE GOVT. OF INDIA.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council brought to the notice of the Secretary, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, about discontinuation of grants and scholarship by AICTE to architectural institutions and students.</p>

	<p>The Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, after acceding to the request of the Council vide its letter no.4-06/2023-TS.VI dated 30.06.2023, has asked AICTE to continue disbursement of scholarship/ grant for Architecture Courses until further orders.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xii.	VIOLATIONS OF THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972 BY SBI BY ADVERTISING POSTS RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITH THE TITLE AND STYLE OF ARCHITECT.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the State Bank of India has advertised certain posts relating to information technology field and were named with word architect. The Council has objected to the same and advised the SBI to remove the word architect with all such posts. However, the SBI has refused to change the nomenclature of the posts.</p> <p>The Council through its Advocate has taken up the matter with the Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India, for taking remedial action in the matter to stop violation of the Architects Act, 1972.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations suggested that Ministry Finance and Ministry of Education, Govt of India, be requested to intervene in the matter.</p>
xiii.	MEETING WITH PRESIDENT, INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS INDIA, KOLKATA.
	<p>The President informed the members that in order to discuss the issues of mutual concern including the proposal for amendments in the Architects Act, 1972, the President and Registrar-Secretary had a meeting with the President of Institution of Engineers (India) in the month of June 2023. The IEI has also nominated 5 persons as their nominees to have discussions in future.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xiv.	MEETING WITH CHAIRMAN, AICTE REGARDING APPROVAL FOR IMPARTING B.PLAN./B.DES. AND M.PLAN/ M.DES. COURSES TO EXISTING ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER RELATED ISSUES.
	<p>The President informed the members that he met the Chairman, AICTE and discussed the issue of stopping of grants to Architectural Institutions by AICTE and also possibility of approval by AICTE for imparting B.Plan/ B.Des., M.Plan/ M.Des. Courses to architectural institutions considering them as existing Institutions. The Chairman, AICTE has assured positive action in the matter.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xv.	MOU ENTERED INTO WITH DEPWD, GOVT. OF INDIA.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council of Architecture and Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan),</p>

	<p>Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India have entered into an MOU for the cause of empowerment of persons with disabilities and for carrying out objects of Rights of Persons with Disability Act.</p> <p>As per MOU COA and DEPwD would work together to develop a comprehensive document/ manual comprising of best practices of existing guidelines/ documents/standards (national as well as international) as a ready to use reference to all the Architects and other building professionals for making universally accessible norms and their implementation. The COA and DEPwD would also work together to facilitate the Architects by developing a certified course to create expertise for them to conduct accessibility audits of the buildings all over India.</p> <p>In pursuance of the MOU, the Council has constituted a Sub Committee to prepare Manual for Universal Accessibility for Architecture, Infrastructure public spaces and interiors to be followed in all buildings all over India.</p> <p>The Council has also constituted another Sub-Committee for detailing and finalizing the curriculum and contents of the Training module for Certification of Auditors to audit the public buildings on Universal Accessibility.</p> <p>Further, to begin with 27 Architectural Institutions have been selected to act as centres to imparting Training on Universal Accessibility. The Institutions have been requested to nominate 2 faculty members from their Institution and one Architect from practice with at least experience of 15 years in order to train these experts for carrying out further training of Auditors at their respective centre.</p> <p>It was also informed that the Council would commence Training programme on Universal Accessibility w.e.f. 11th September, 2023,</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xvi.	MOU ENTERED INTO WITH AIEEE.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that Council of Architecture and the Alliance for an Energy Efficient Economy (AEEE) have entered into an MOU on 20th May, 2023 to collaborate and share knowledge among the Architectural Institutions in India leading to better industry-readiness of students.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xvii.	MOU ENTERED INTO WITH CGBMT (CENTRE FOR GREEN BUILDING MATERIALS AND TECHNOLOGY).
	<p>The Registrar- Secretary informed the members that the Council entered into an MOU with CGBMT on 03rd August, 2023 with an objective to disseminate knowledge related with Sustainable sector amongst concerning organizations, officials, professionals, consultants, executors and other stake holders.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>

xviii.	MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF ARCHITECTS REGISTRATION BOARD, UK, FOR HAVING RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that Council of Architecture and Architects Registration Board (ARB), UK, decided to have a meeting on 2nd June, 2023, to discuss and deliberate the issue of entering into reciprocal arrangements for recognition of architectural qualifications in each other's country so that students, professionals and institutions in each other's country can benefit.</p> <p>The ARB officials first informed about the provisions of the Architect Act in UK and other relevant norms for registration of Architects in UK. They also informed that they are in the process of amending some of the requirements for registration as an Architect. They stated that after consultations and discussions they would come out with the proposal for having reciprocal arrangements.</p> <p>The President, COA made a presentation highlighting the provisions of the Architects Act, 1972, duties and functions of the Council, number of Architects, number of Institutions in India and process followed for registration as an architect and for approval of architectural institutions for imparting recognized qualifications.</p> <p>Both sides agreed to have further discussions in order to arrive at consensus for entering into Mutual Recognition Agreement for recognition of Architectural Qualifications in each other's country.</p> <p>The President, COA, invited the officials of ARB to visit India and also to have a look on Architectural institutions in India.</p> <p>Further, a delegation of Indian Architects held a meeting with ARB Officials in UK during their visit to UK Design week on 27th June, 2023. The matter is being further discussed and deliberated to arrive at consensus for having MRA.</p> <p>The Council noted the above information.</p>
xix.	CONSTITUTION OF FOLLOWING COMMITTEE(S) BY THE PRESIDENT/ EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that in order to carry on the objectives of the Architects Act, 1972, following committees have been constituted by the President/ Executive Committee of Council :</p> <p>A. Sub-Committee on preparation of Manual of Universal Accessibility:</p> <p>In pursuance of the MOU between COA and DEPwD, the Council has constituted a Sub Committee to prepare Manual for Universal Accessibility for Architecture, Infrastructure public spaces and interiors to be followed in all buildings all over India consisting of Prof.Kiran Mahajani, as Convenor and Ar.Habeeb Khan, Former President, Ar.P.R.Mehta, Former President, Ar.Paramjit Singh Ahuja, Ar.Prasanna Desai, Ar.Prashant Sutaria, Ar.Sandeep Shikre, Ar.Salil Ranadive,</p>

	<p>Ar.Anand Patel, Ar.Bijal Parikh, Dr.Anjlee Agarwal, Shri Dipendra Manocha, Sh.Honnareddy N., Sh.R.C Meena, Shri R. K. Oberoi, Registrar, COA, Shri Deepak Kumar, AO, COA as Members.</p> <p>The Committee so far has held 20 Meetings which are scheduled every Saturday. The Committee has prepared the structure of all seven volumes of the manual. The Committee has also finalized the course outline for training of auditors.</p> <p>B. Sub-Committee to prepare the detailed syllabus for conducting training of Universal Accessibility Auditors:</p> <p>The Council has constituted another Sub-Committee for detailing and finalizing the curriculum and contents of the Training module for Certification of Auditors to audit the public buildings on Universal Accessibility consisting of Prof. Kiran Mahajani, as Convenor and Ar. Atul Singla, Dr. Manoj Kumar, Ar. Jayashree Deshpande as Members.</p> <p>C. Sub-Committee on incorporation of subject of Climate Change in Course curriculum of B.Arch. Course:</p> <p>In order to address issues related to Climate Change in the context of Architectural education, the President, Council of Architecture constituted a Sub-Committee consisting of Ar.Vishal Vyas as Convenor and Prof. Prasad Vaidya, Prof. Ashok B. Lall, Ar. Sandeep Shikre, Prof. Hina Zia, Prof. Rajiv Mishra, Member, Dr. Vijaylakshmi Iyer, Dr. Anand Achari, Prof. Suresh Murthy, Ar. Swati Puchalpalli, as Members</p> <p>The Committee held 09 meetings and has submitted its report on 14.06.2023 by Ar. Vishal Vyas, Convenor to the Council for incorporation of subject of climate change in the B.Arch curriculum to be imparted by Architectural Institutions. The report of the Committee was placed before Executive Committee in its 251st Meeting held on 24.06.2023.</p> <p>The Council perused the report and approved changes suggested by the Committee and directed that the same be sent to architectural institutions for adoption.</p> <p>D. Online assessment of Form A (Quantitative details) and Form B (Qualitative details):</p> <p>The President, COA constituted a Sub-Committee for online assessment of Form A (Quantitative details) and Form B (Qualitative details) received from institutions for grant of approval for imparting B.Arch./M.Arch. course for 2023-2024 and for further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>The Sub-Committee was provided access to the application forms for extension of approval and were distributed/ allotted online assessment of Form B by the Convenor. Form A was evaluated online by the Software to generate score based on the information filled up by the institutions. Form A carries an overall weightage of 40 while Form B has a weightage of 60.</p>
--	--

Apart from the members of the Sub-Committee, about 100 assessors from academic background from different parts of the country were included in the process after training through conduct of online Orientation Programs for them by the Sub-Committee. The members of the Sub-Committee are as under:

1. Ar. Milind Kollegal, Convenor	2.Ar.Pushkar Kanvinde, Member
3. Ar.Radhika Nagpal, Member	4. Ar.Chirayu Bhatt, Member
5. Ar.Binumol Tom, Member	6. Ar.Anupama Sharma, Member

E. Sub Committee to Prepare Report and Presentation About Architecture Services and Fees:

The Council has constituted a Sub Committee consisting of Ar. Milana M.V. to prepare the report and presentation addressing the issues like,

- i. Why Quality architectural services are necessary for any project related to built environment,
- ii. Why architects shall not be paid less fees less than what is prescribed by the Council of Architecture (through tendering process or otherwise).

F. Sub Committee to Prepare Preliminary Report on Comparative Analysis of Syllabus and Academic Inputs Of B.Arch., B.E./ B.Tech. Civil And M.E./M.Tech:

The Council has constituted a Sub Committee consisting of Ar. Devendra Deshpande and Er.Radhika Deshpande to prepare a Preliminary Report on comparative analysis of syllabus and academic inputs of B.Arch B.E./ B.Tech. Civil and M.E./M.Tech. Structural so as to identify their Skill sets with reference to build environment.

G. Constitution of Juries:

1. The Council in order to evaluate entries received for Architectural Design Competition for Aspirational toilets under Swachh Bharat Mission Urban by Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India constituted jury consisting of Ar. P.R.Mehta as Convenor and Ar. Ritu Singh, Ar. Bansan Singh Thangkhiew, Ar. Persi Engineer, Ar. Salil Ranadive, Ar. Neeraj Gupta, Ar.Sanjay Mohe, Ar. Gita Balakrishnan as Members, Shri V.K. Chaurasia, Joint Adviser, PHEE, Coordinator and Shri R.K.Oberoi, Registrar, COA, Coordinator.
2. The Council in order to evaluate entries received for Ideas Design Competition for IMS Katra constituted jury consisting of Ar. K. T. Ravindran as Convenor and Ar. Prashant Sutaria, Ar. Dean D'Cruz as Members.
3. The Council in order to evaluate entries received for Ideas Design Competition for erection of Iconic Structure at Rao Tula Ram Flyover, IGI Airport, New Delhi constituted jury consisting of Ar.B.R.Mohan as Convenor and Ar. Mauktik Trivedi, Ar. Sabeena Khanna as Members.
4. The Council in order to evaluate entries received for Idea Design Competition for Design of Boundary Walls at National Highways constituted jury consisting

of Ar. Sanjaykumar J. Razdan as Convenor and Ar. Tony Joseph, Ar. Tushar Sogani, as Members.

All the Juries has submitted their recommendations and the same has been submitted to the appropriate authorities/ Ministry for further necessary action.

H. Book Review Committee of Council of Architecture:

The Council constituted Book Review Committee consisting of Prof. Abhay Purohit, President, COA, as Convenor and Prof. Poorva Purohit, Prof. Aparna Surve, Prof. Anand Achari as Invited Members, and Prof. Jayashree Deshpande, as Member, Secretary to encourage the publication and distribution of books/ published material to promote the growth and understanding of architecture. The terms of reference of the Committee are to review the books received for publishing /distribution by COA, to make recommendations / suggestions for distribution of reviewed books and published material to all Schools of Architecture at an affordable cost and to prepare a standard contract with authors/publishers.

I. Re-Constitution of Sub-Committee for Prescribing Fee Structure:

The Committee was reconstituted on 25.04.2023 consisting of Dr.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Ar.Milind Gujarkar, Ar.Abhijit Shirodkar, Ar.Dr.PSN Rao, as Special Invitees. The Committee has submitted its report the same is placed before the Council for consideration by the Hon'ble Members of the Council.

J. Sub-Committee Preparation of Directory of Resource Persons in the Field of Specialization:

The Council has constituted a Sub-Committee on 23.06.2023 consisting of Ar.Pushkar Murlidhar Kanwinde, Convenor and Prof.Prasanna Desai, Member to prepare a directory of experts having specification in different fields so that Council can avail their expertise from time to time.

K.Constitution of Committee to Identify Suitable Names For Making Recommendations For Grant of Padma Awards by Government Of India :

The Council of Architecture has been entrusted with the responsibility to make nomination/recommendations for identifying suitable candidates for Padma awards by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India vide letter dated 25.04.2023.

In order to lay down the criteria for identifying suitable candidates in the field of architecture, the President, Council of Architecture constituted a Committee consisting of Ar.Lalichan Zacharias as Convenor, Ar. Durganand Balsavar, Prof.Ujjwala Chakradeo, Prof.Prasanna Desai, Member, Ar.Jitendra Mehta, as Members.

The Committee was required to develop the criteria for receiving the applications/nominations from Architects online by the Council based on their experience in the concerned field, work done for social and backward classes of people, low-income group persons and their overall contribution to the Architecture Education and/or Profession. The Committee has submitted its preliminary report.

L.Constitution of Sub-Committee to Suggest Ways and Means For Improving Quality Of Architectural Services:

	<p>The Council constituted a Sub-Committee on 02.05.2023 consisting of Ar.Nand Lal Chandel, Ar.Lalichan Zacharias and Ar.Punit Sethi to suggest steps to be taken by the Council of Architecture for improving the quality of Architectural services provided by Architects/Firms in India through voluntary audit of the Architects and Architectural firms.</p> <p>The Council noted the constitution of above committees and appreciated the work done by these committees.</p>																																																
xx.	ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMME UNDERTAKEN AT COATRC(S) AT PUNE AND BHOPAL.																																																
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members the details of Training Program conducted by COA TRC Pune from 1st November 2022 - 11th August 2023 as under :</p> <table><tr><th>Sr. No.</th><th>Title of the program</th><th>Dates</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>The Site and it's Relevance to Design</td><td>7th to 11th November 2022</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>New ways of engaging with History for Architects</td><td>14th to 18th November 2022</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Rethinking the Design Studio</td><td>21st to 25th November 2022</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Approaches to Thesis Orientation & Dissertation at the UG level</td><td>21st to 25th November 2022</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Sustainable Habitat: Design, Planning and Management</td><td>28th November 2022 to 2nd December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>Transition towards Net Zero - The Roadmap</td><td>6th to 9th December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>Art in Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Perspective and its Application in Architectural Design</td><td>12th to 16th December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>Aspiring Research in diverse domains of Architecture</td><td>12th to 16th December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>Interpretations of SDGs in Architecture-History, Humanities and Conservation</td><td>19th to 23rd December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>Tools and techniques for Data Management and Analysis in Architectural Research</td><td>19th to 23rd December 2022</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>Reimagining Urban Voids</td><td>2nd to 6th January 2023</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>Revisiting the role of associated subjects in Architecture Education</td><td>16th to 20th January 2023</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>NEP: Way forward in Architecture</td><td>30th January 2023 to 3rd February 2023</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>Ancient texts on Architecture and Ecology</td><td>6th to 10th February 2023</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>Architectural Heritage Conservation</td><td>13th to 17th February 2023</td></tr></table>	Sr. No.	Title of the program	Dates	1	The Site and it's Relevance to Design	7th to 11th November 2022	2	New ways of engaging with History for Architects	14th to 18th November 2022	3	Rethinking the Design Studio	21st to 25th November 2022	4	Approaches to Thesis Orientation & Dissertation at the UG level	21st to 25th November 2022	5	Sustainable Habitat: Design, Planning and Management	28th November 2022 to 2nd December 2022	6	Transition towards Net Zero - The Roadmap	6th to 9th December 2022	7	Art in Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Perspective and its Application in Architectural Design	12th to 16th December 2022	8	Aspiring Research in diverse domains of Architecture	12th to 16th December 2022	9	Interpretations of SDGs in Architecture-History, Humanities and Conservation	19th to 23rd December 2022	10	Tools and techniques for Data Management and Analysis in Architectural Research	19th to 23rd December 2022	11	Reimagining Urban Voids	2nd to 6th January 2023	12	Revisiting the role of associated subjects in Architecture Education	16th to 20th January 2023	13	NEP: Way forward in Architecture	30th January 2023 to 3rd February 2023	14	Ancient texts on Architecture and Ecology	6th to 10th February 2023	15	Architectural Heritage Conservation	13th to 17th February 2023
Sr. No.	Title of the program	Dates																																															
1	The Site and it's Relevance to Design	7th to 11th November 2022																																															
2	New ways of engaging with History for Architects	14th to 18th November 2022																																															
3	Rethinking the Design Studio	21st to 25th November 2022																																															
4	Approaches to Thesis Orientation & Dissertation at the UG level	21st to 25th November 2022																																															
5	Sustainable Habitat: Design, Planning and Management	28th November 2022 to 2nd December 2022																																															
6	Transition towards Net Zero - The Roadmap	6th to 9th December 2022																																															
7	Art in Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Perspective and its Application in Architectural Design	12th to 16th December 2022																																															
8	Aspiring Research in diverse domains of Architecture	12th to 16th December 2022																																															
9	Interpretations of SDGs in Architecture-History, Humanities and Conservation	19th to 23rd December 2022																																															
10	Tools and techniques for Data Management and Analysis in Architectural Research	19th to 23rd December 2022																																															
11	Reimagining Urban Voids	2nd to 6th January 2023																																															
12	Revisiting the role of associated subjects in Architecture Education	16th to 20th January 2023																																															
13	NEP: Way forward in Architecture	30th January 2023 to 3rd February 2023																																															
14	Ancient texts on Architecture and Ecology	6th to 10th February 2023																																															
15	Architectural Heritage Conservation	13th to 17th February 2023																																															

16	Transformative pedagogy as response to contemporary challenges of Architecture Education and practice	20th to 24th February 2023
17	Conceiving and Completing Research Paper	13th to 17th March 2023
18	Crossing the First Milestone in Research: Tips and Techniques for a thorough Literature Review and Formulating Research Topic in the areas of Architecture, Urban Planning, and Urban Design	17th to 21st April 2023
19	Teaching - Learning and application of History for Architects	17th to 21st April 2023
20	Traditional Indian Architectural Knowledge Systems	8th May 2023 to 12th May 2023
21	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH	29th May 2023 to 2nd June 2023
22	Incorporating Cultural Heritage in Architectural Curriculum and Pedagogy	29th May 2023 to 2nd June 2023
23	Writing Architecture: A critical conscious understanding of using architectural writings in research papers, articles and in exploring innovative allied interdisciplinary fields of Architecture	5th to 9th June 2023
24	Urban India 2047: Shaping the Future of Indian Cities	19th to 23rd June 2023
25	Towards an Impact Driven Architectural Curriculum	3rd to 7th July 2023
26	Interpretations of SDGs in Architecture-Architecture & Design Studies	17th to 21st July 2023
27	Empathy Building Mental Health Workshop	24th to 28th July 2023
28	Connotation of Research in Architecture Journalism: Procedures in Academics and Professional Practice	31st July 2023 to 4th August 2023
29	Water and its role in designing the built environment	7th August 2023 to 11th August 2023
30	"Fostering Quality Architectural Education: Academic Planning, Implementation of learning & Academic Documentation	7th August 2023 to 11th August 2023
Further, list of programs conducted by COA TRC Bhopal from November 2022 August 2023 was as under:		
Sl. No.	Title of the Program	Period
1.	FDP on Emerging Paradigms in Architectural Research A Skill Building Approach	7th to 11th Nov., 2022
2.	FDP on Barrier-free design and Universal Design Principles in Architecture and Planning	14th Nov-18th Nov 2022
3.	FDP on Effective Teaching Methodology in Architecture	28th Nov 2022-2nd Dec 2022

4.	National Level Online Training Program on Applications of GIS & Remote Sensing	3rd Dec- 25 Dec 2022
5.	FDP on Research Paper and Book Chapter writing in Architecture and Planning	5th to 9th December 2022
6.	FDP on Sustainable and Green Built-Environment	12th to 16th December 2022
7.	FDP on Building Resilient Urban Communities	26th December-30th Dec., 2022
8.	STTP on Indian Livable Cities	2nd Jan to 6th Jan 2023
9.	STTP on Design of Building Services and System	09th Jan to 13th Jan 2023
10.	FDP on Rethinking Building Byelaws and Planning Regulations	23rd Jan to 27th Jan 2023
11.	FDP on Urban Disasters-Mitigation and Management	6th to 10th Feb 2023
12.	FDP Sustainable Coastal area Designing, Planning, Protection & Management	13 to 17 Feb 2023
13.	Online Workshop on OpenSource Framework Delineation of Urban Features from UAV Drone Data	20th to 24th FEB 2023
14.	Online Training Program on BIM during Weekend	4th March to 26th March 2023
15.	FDP on Understanding Indian Knowledge Systems in Architecture and Planning	20th March to 24th March 2023
16.	FDP on Research Writing and Publication in Architecture	27th to 31st March 2023
17.	08-Day National Level Training Program on Parametric Tools and Computational Design in Architecture	1st April - 23rd April 2023
18.	FDP on Methodology & Exploration in Architectural and Planning Research	24th April - 28th April 2023
19.	National Online Training on Python for Beginners-Level 1	6th May 2023 to 28th May 2023
20.	FDP on Urban Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change	15th May to 19th May 2023
21.	National Online Workshop on UAV Drone for Urban Feature Delineation an Open-Source Procedure	22nd May to 26th May 2023
22.	FDP on Architecture Urbanism Adapting cities to climate change and Resilience	29th May to 2nd June 2023
23.	National Conference on Multidisciplinary Aspects of Design; Enhancing the Connections_2023	01st June -03rd June 2023
24.	FDP on Learn to Build Interactive Dashboards to Analyse & Present Data Effectively in Architecture and Planning	12 June 2023 - 16 June 2023
25.	National Online FDP on Disaster Management & Urban Resilience	3rd July 2023 to 7th July 2023
26.	National Online FDP on Current Research and Practices in Architecture and Planning	10th July to 14th July 2023
27.	National Online FDP on Integrating	17th July to 21st

		Simulation Software for Optimal Building and Urban Built Environment	July 2023
	28.	National Online FDP on Learning from the Architecture studio Implications for Project-Based Pedagogy	24th July to 28th July 2023
	29.	National Online FDP on Urban Ecological Resilience Initiatives for Sustainable Development	31st July to 4th Aug 2023
	30.	National Online Five-Day Teacher Training Program on Pedagogy in Teaching Architectural Graphics and Presentation	14th Aug 2023 to 18th Aug 2023
	31.	National Online FDP on Sustainable Cities & Communities	21st to 25th August 2023
xxi.	VARIOUS PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY COA IN COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS, ETC.		
	The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council, as per its policy, has supported various events, workshops, seminars as knowledge partner as under:		
	S.No.	Event	Date
	1.	9 th International Design Competition and 3 rd International Design and Research Conference, 2023 organised by Aditya College of Architecture	January 21, 2023
	2.	Virtual National Conference on “Peri Urban Architecture and Planning by Pravara Rural College of Architecture	January, 2023
	3.	“National Level Research Conference” at Smt. Kashibai Navale of Architecture, Pune	February, 2023
	4.	COA as a Knowledge Partner for the NAREDCO Mahi 2 nd Convention at New Delhi	3 rd March 2023
	5.	COA as a Knowledge Partner for the Star India Bird House Design & Photography Competition organized in fond memory of Ar.Balkrishna V.Doshi Ji.	March 2023
	6.	Plumbex India Exhibition organised by Indian Plumbing Association	27 th to 29 th April, 2023
	7.	Inauguration of Open House-students works, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore	05 th May, 2023
	8.	COA as a Knowledge Partner for the Conference conducted by ZION Exhibitions	12 th to 14 th May, 2023
	9.	National Level Conclave on “Future of Architectural Education in India post NEP 2020 organised by Ansal University, Haryana.	2 nd June, 2023.
	10.	Workshop on NEP in Architecture organised by ASADI	July 28 th & 29 th , 2023
	11.	National Conference “Past, Present & Future in Architecture Education, Research and Profession”	July 2023

	12.	OpenSource Project on Universal Design-Project Udit	14 th , 25 th and 26 th July, 2023.
	13.	Smart Lighting India Expo at Pragati Maidan	10 th to 12 th August, 2023
	14.	Geosmart Infrastructure' 23 Conference organised by Geospatial World	August 2023
	The Council noted the above information.		
11	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN QUALIFICATIONS.		
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed that the Central Government had forwarded to Council several requests received by it from many candidates for consideration of recognition of their architectural qualifications awarded by foreign authorities, u/s 15 of the Architects Act, 1972.</p> <p>The Council's Committee on Recognition of Foreign Qualifications had considered their cases and submitted its recommendations.</p> <p>The Council perused the report(s) of the Committee and after deliberations passed the following resolution :</p> <p>Resolution No.:564</p> <p>Resolved that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Request received from Ms. Chiara Chiodero for recognition of B. Arch. Degree awarded by Venice University of Architecture, Italy, cannot be considered as even though the duration of the course of UG programme, the number of hours under the different heads like professional core courses, Building Sciences & Applied Engineering Course etc. do match, however, the mandatory practical training/ Internship is not a part of the course curriculum.2. Request received from Mr. Kuldeepsinh Digivijaysinh Vaghela for recognition of Bachelor of Design in Architecture and Master of Architecture degree from "University of Technology Sydney", Sydney, Australia, cannot be considered as the duration of UG programme is of four years only. Secondly, the number of credits of UG & PG programme taken together also fall short of the minimum number of credits specified by the Council for the UG programme. Thirdly, the mandatory practical training / Internship is not a part of the course curriculum either at UG or PG level.3. Request received from Ms. Sai Snigha Piniseti for recognition of Bachelor of Science in Architecture awarded by Temple University, Philadelphia, USA, cannot be considered as the duration of the UG programme is of four years only. Secondly, the number of credits and the numbers hours under different heads also fall short of the minimum credits prescribed by the Council. Thirdly, the mandatory practical training / Internship is not a part of the course curriculum.		

	<p>4. Request received from Mr. Sahil Jaiswal for recognition of Bachelor of Architecture awarded by The American University in Dubai, be considered for recognition as the same meets minimum standards of architectural education prescribed by the Council.</p> <p>5. Request received from Ms. Aashritha Rajendran for recognition of Bachelor of Design in Architecture & M.Arch. awarded by University of Sydney, Australia, cannot be considered as Bachelor of Design in Architecture, Course of University of Sydney, is of 3 years duration and internship is not a part of the course curriculum. The candidate has not submitted any document related to her M.Arch. Degree.</p> <p>6. Request received from Mr. Mayank Singh for recognition of Bachelor of Engineering Architecture awarded by Southeast University, Nanjing, China, cannot be considered as the Bachelor Engineering Architecture Degree awarded by Southeast University, Nanjing, China is of 4 -years duration and does not meet the minimum standards prescribed by the Council and the course is not comparable with B.Arch. Degree of an Indian University.</p> <p>7. Request received from Ms. Srimoyee Sinha for recognition of Master of Architecture 2 awarded by Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc), USA, be considered for recognition as the PG course is of 2 and half year duration and is open only to students who hold an undergraduate degree in Architecture. The M.Arch.2 is also recognized by NAAB. The cumulative UG and PG credits and number of hours are comparable to the standards prescribed by the Council. Internship is also an integral part of the P.G. Course.</p> <p>8. Request received from Mr. Rupesh Satish Iyengar for Doctorate of Science awarded by Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Switzerland, cannot be considered due to following reasons:</p> <p>a. The nomenclature of the qualification mentioned on Doctorate degree of Mr. Rupesh S. Iyengar is “Doctorate of Sciences” but is not specifically stated “Doctorate of Sciences in Architecture”, as notified in the notification issued by the Central Government, even though it is issued by the Department of Architecture.</p> <p>b. The Doctoral Thesis subject “The Decentralized Approach to Achieve Comfortable Indoor Environment in Tropical Climate Using Low Energy Techniques of Integrated Design” of the degree is not specifically related to only Architecture but can be considered under any of its allied areas.</p> <p>c. On comparing the Academic Regulations of 2000 for “Doctorate of Sciences in Architecture” and 2022 for ““Doctorate of Sciences” prescribed by SFITZ, it was noted that Doctorate of Technical Sciences in Architecture and Doctorate of Sciences are not identical. Further, Academic Regulations of 2000 lists “Doctorate of Technical Sciences” (titled as Dr.sc.techn.) and “Doctorate of Sciences” (titled as Dr.sc.nat.) as two separate doctoral degrees. Hence, the two doctoral degrees are different.</p>
--	--

	<p>d. The notification issued by the Central Government under Section 15 of the Architects Act, 1972, states “Doctorate of Technical Sciences in Architecture awarded by Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (Recognised at par with Ph.D. degree of the Indian Universities)”. However, no documentary proof submitted by the candidate that the revised Doctoral degree “Doctorate of Sciences” awarded by SFITZ is at par with prevalent Ph.D. degree of the Indian Universities like the “Doctorate of Technical Sciences in Architecture”.</p> <p>e. “Doctorate of Sciences” also does not meet the required parameters related to courses, periods of study and subjects of examination, as prescribed by the Council under the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, in order to be considered for recognition under the Architects Act, 1972 and Regulations framed thereunder.</p> <p>9. Appeal received from Mr. Mohit Dobariya for recognition of M. Arch Degree by school of Architecture Planning and Preservation (USA), University of Maryland, cannot be considered due to following reasons:</p> <p>a. The programme of study, M.Arch. of University of Maryland, USA, is of 7 semesters duration (3.5 years) and as such it does not satisfy the duration of study stipulated by the Council of Architecture in its Minimum Standards of Architectural Education Regulations, 1983 as well as 2020.</p> <p>b. Practical Training/ Internship is not a part of the curriculum of the M.Arch. programme, and did not carry academic credits.</p> <p>c. The previous academic programme, B.Tech.(Civil), studied by the candidate is not accredited by the NAAB, as confirmed by the candidate. As such it cannot be considered as qualifying years of study for the purpose of recognition by the Council.</p> <p>Hence, the Appeal of the candidate to recognize his qualification as equivalent to B.Arch. Degree awarded by an Indian University be rejected.</p> <p>10. The request received from Mr. Siddhartha Thomas for recognition of Master of Arts (Honours) in Architecture, The University of Edingurgh, UK, has already been considered and Central Government was recommended to not to recognize this qualification as the duration of the course is of 4 years. The number of credits and the number of hours also fall short of the minimum standards prescribed by the Council. Mandatory Practical Training/ Internship is not a part of the course curriculum. The qualification is equivalent to RIBA Part 1 which is not considered for granting registration as an Architect in UK.</p> <p>The Central Government is requested to take appropriate further action as per the above recommendations of the Council in terms of the provisions of the Architects Act, 1972.</p>
12.	ELECTION OF A MEMBER OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE BY THE COUNCIL IN TERMS OF RULE 35(1)(b) OF COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE RULES, 1973.

	<p>The President informed the members that the Rule 35 of the Council of Architecture Rules, 1973 deals with complaints and enquiries relating to professional misconduct of architects. The relevant provisions are as under:</p> <p>35. Complaints and enquiries relating to professional misconduct of an architect. – (1) (a) <i>All complaints against architects shall be investigated and all enquiries relating to misconduct of architects shall be held by a Committee to be constituted by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette.</i></p> <p>(b) <i>The Committee referred to in clause (a) shall consist of three members, of whom one member shall be elected by the Council from amongst its members; one member from amongst themselves nominated under clause (b) and one member from amongst the members referred to in clause (d) of sub-section (3).</i></p> <p>(c) <i>The Chairman of the Committee shall be elected by the members of that Committee from amongst themselves.</i></p> <p>The President further informed that in terms of Rule 35(1) (b) a member of the Disciplinary Committee is to be elected by the Council as Ar. Amogh Kumar Gupta who was elected as member of the Disciplinary Committee has ceased to be member of the Council and Disciplinary Committee.</p> <p>The President called for nominations from the members who wish to contest for member of Disciplinary Committee. After deliberations names of Ar. Vidyadhar Wodeyar and Ar. Naveen Kanithi were proposed and seconded and it was decided to conduct elections for electing a member of the Disciplinary Committee.</p> <p>The President, COA appointed Registrar-Secretary as Returning Officer to conduct elections and elections were conducted by the Registrar-Secretary by Secret ballot.</p> <p>After elections the votes were counted by the Returning Officer, Ar. Naveen Kanithi got 22 votes and Ar. Vidyadhar Wodeyar got 20 votes and 1 vote was cancelled as it was not in proper format. Accordingly, the Ar. Naveen Kanithi was elected by the Council as a Member of Disciplinary Committee.</p> <p>The Council requested the Central Government to notify the name of Ar. Naveen Kanithi as Member of Disciplinary Committee so that the committee can start its work at the earliest.</p>
13.	TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENTS IN THE ARCHITECTS ACT, 1972.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council in its 79th Meeting held on 12th March, 2023, considered the proposal and need for Comprehensive amendments in the Architects Act, 1972. The members were requested to send their suggestions of definition of “Architecture Services”.</p> <p>The said proposal was re-examined and following issues were identified for amendments in the Architects Act :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Registration and Register of Firms. ii) Introduction of definition of “Architecture Services” so that these services can be reserved for architects;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Introduction of Professional Practice Examination to ensure the competencies of architects entering into profession to practice independently; iv) Introduction of Certificate of Practice for architects. v) Registration of Surveyors. vi) Introduction of LL.P. form of organization for providing architectural services by Architects to save architects from personal and professional liability and to have less cumbersome form of organization with a separate legal entity; vii) Introduction of two schedules for recognized qualification – one for Undergraduate qualifications and another for postgraduate qualifications, so that qualification for registration as an architect and additional qualifications can be differentiated and PG qualifications can be recognised under the Act; viii) Introduction of word “India” in the name of Council of Architecture so as to provide a national level identity to Council. ix) To maintain “electronic” copies of Register of Architects for safe and economic preservation of large-scale data and to ensure smooth access to all concerned. x) Appointment of only an Architect to architectural posts in Government departments to ensure that public buildings are constructed with fullest professional inputs in most aesthetic and functional manner. xi) Introduce prohibition on rendering of architectural services by non-architects. xii) Introduction of prohibitory clause on further registration of architects by local bodies so that architects are not compelled to seek registration in and every local body to practice the profession. xiii) Enabling provisions for charging fees by Council on complaints filed for professional misconduct against architects. <p>The President further informed the members that in order to arrive at consensus over definition of “Architecture Services”, he held a meeting with Institution of Engineers India and other bodies and would hold further discussions/consultations with all the stakeholders.</p> <p>The President requested all the members to go through once again the proposal and send their views/ suggestions within 7 days to Registrar-Secretary.</p>
14.	TO CONSIDER INTRODUCTION OF ENTRANCE TEST FOR ADMISSION TO M.ARCH. COURSE.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on 15th July, 2022, approved the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education for Postgraduate Degree Programme) Guidelines 2022. Clause 4 of these guidelines deals with Admission to Post Graduate full time degree programme.</p> <p>The relevant provisions are as under :</p> <p>(1) No candidate shall be admitted to Post Graduate full-time degree or Certificate programme unless the candidate has passed an examination</p>

	<p>in B.Arch. Degree or equivalent with at least 50 percent aggregate marks or equivalent CGPI.</p> <p>(2) The Candidate needs to qualify an entrance test for Post-Graduation programme in Architecture complying with the Admission Norms prescribed in Appendix-D, regulation 3, sub-regulation (ii).</p> <p>(3) The Competent authorities for admission to the Post Graduate full-time degree programme shall devise a rational method to allot the weightage to the PG entrance test, qualifying examination score, any other process like personal interviews etc. and display the list of merit in a transparent manner.</p> <p>(4) Reservation of seats and relaxation in percentage of marks obtained in the qualifying examination admission shall be as per the reservation policy of Central Government or the respective State Governments.</p> <p>The Council is already conducting aptitude test for admission to B.Arch. course since the year 2006.</p> <p>The President proposed that admissions to M.Arch. Course shall be made in architectural institutions of candidates who qualifies the entrance test conducted by the Council. He also invited the attention of members towards the draft format containing the content was prepared by Dr. Anand Achari on the request of the Council after comparing various common entrance tests which have been conducted in India.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and approved for the conduct of Entrance Test for admission to M.Arch. Course(s) in Architectural Institutions in the Country.</p>
15.	<p>TO CONSIDER INTRODUCTION OF WELFARE SCHEMES LIKE MEDICAL INSURANCE, ACCIDENTAL INSURANCE AND INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR ARCHITECTS.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council has sought proposal from Insurance company in order to facilitate Architects to participate in welfare schemes like Medical Insurance, Accidental Insurance, Professional Indemnity Insurance to meet any eventuality.</p> <p>The facilities shall be provided through Council's portal/ or directly from the portal of the concerned company. He informed that the representatives of M/s. K M Dastur & Co. have been invited to make presentation before the Council.</p> <p>The representatives of the Company made detailed presentations before the members. The members desired that all the policies should offer coverage at least up to the age of 70 years. The Council approved the proposal and also desired that a revised proposal be submitted about facilitating porting of the existing policy to the policies offered by them.</p> <p>The Council decided that to begin with Accidental Insurance Policy be procured by the Council for all Council Members, Experts and Officers and Employees of the Council.</p>

16.	TO CONSIDER ENHANCING ARBITRATION FEES BEING CHARGED BY COUNCIL FOR CONDUCT OF ARBITRATION FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN ARCHITECT AND CLIENT.						
	<p>The President informed the members that Council is appointing Arbitrators for adjudication of disputes between Architects and their clients. Presently, the Council is charging following fees for conduct of Arbitration :</p> <p>a) Study and Administrative Charges : Rs.25,000/- (one-time Charges)</p> <p>b) Sitting Charges (per day) : Rs.7,000/-</p> <p>The above amount was prescribed 10-12 years back and Arbitrators are suggesting for revising this figure.</p> <p>He also informed invited the attention of members towards proposed revision of the charges.</p> <p>The Council after having detailed deliberations approved the following charges for conduct of Arbitration by the Council :</p> <table><tr><td>a.</td><td>Study and Administrative Charges (one-time Charges)</td><td>Rs.50,000/- (if dispute amount is less than 1 crore) Rs.1,00,000/- (if dispute amount is 1 crore or more)</td></tr><tr><td>b.</td><td>Sitting Charges (per day)</td><td>Rs.15,000/-</td></tr></table> <p>The Council also decided that a Training Programme for Arbitrators be conducted to make them aware of legal and technical nitty-gritties involved and requested Er. Sandip Deb, Member, to develop the contents of Training Programme.</p>	a.	Study and Administrative Charges (one-time Charges)	Rs.50,000/- (if dispute amount is less than 1 crore) Rs.1,00,000/- (if dispute amount is 1 crore or more)	b.	Sitting Charges (per day)	Rs.15,000/-
a.	Study and Administrative Charges (one-time Charges)	Rs.50,000/- (if dispute amount is less than 1 crore) Rs.1,00,000/- (if dispute amount is 1 crore or more)					
b.	Sitting Charges (per day)	Rs.15,000/-					
17.	TO CONSIDER REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE FOR PRESCRIBING FEE STRUCTURE FOR B.ARCH. COURSE.						
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council constituted a committee to review and recommend fee structure of B.Arch. course being followed by the Institutions/ Universities in the country and make its report/ recommendations for regulating & formulating Fee Structure for B.Arch. course, which could be referred to as a base document for implementation by various Fee Regulatory Bodies and competent authorities in the States/UTs of the country.</p> <p>The Committee consists of Dr.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Prof. Abhay Purohit, Member, Prof.Abhijit Shirodkar, Member and Dr. PSN Rao, Special Invitee.</p> <p>The report of the Committee was placed before the Council in its 75th meeting held on 28th & 29th August, 2021 and also in 76th Meeting held on 19th February, 2022. The Council requested the Committee to re submit its report.</p>						

	<p>The Committee was re-constituted on 25.04.2023 with Ar.Dr.Vandana Sehgal as Convenor, Prof.Abhijit Shirodkar, Member, Ar.Milind Gujarkar, Special Invitee and Dr. PSN Rao, Special Invitee.</p> <p>The Committee has submitted its revised report to the Council after considering the fact that fee charging pattern by institutions all over India are different in different institutions and committee has suggested average fees including tuition fees and development fees for adopting by them.</p> <p>The Council deliberated the report and recommendations of the Committee and approved the same. The Council decided that the same be sent to all State Governments/ Institutions/ Fees Fixation Bodies etc. for appropriately adopting the same.</p>
18.	TO CONSIDER THE ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022-2023.
	<p>The President reported that the Executive Committee in its 252nd Meeting held on 18.08.2023 has considered the Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Council for the financial year ending on 31st March, 2023. The Executive Committee has recommended for placing the same before the Council and that the same may be accepted.</p> <p>The Audited Statement of Accounts for the year ending 31.03.2023 of the Council of Architecture, Council of Architecture (Contributory Provident Fund) Account and Council of Architecture Employees' Group Gratuity Scheme and the Annual Report for the period, as annexed with the Agenda were perused and approved by the Council and accordingly, the Council passed the following resolution:</p> <p>Resolution No.:565</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The Annual Report together with Audited Statement of Accounts as placed before the Council be approved for the period ended on 31.03.2023; (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.
19	MATTERS PENDING FOR APPROVAL OF MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
i.	Approval of Enhancement of fees to be charged from Architects.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council vide its letter no.CA/1/2020/Rules/MHRD(Fees)dated 18.11.2020, requested the Ministry for enhancement of fees being charged by the Council in view of escalation in cost of goods and services and rise in the activities and functions of the Council. The Ministry also had meeting with CoA Official, where all the relevant information as required was provided by the Council. Further, the Ministry vide letter dated 16.11.2021 has sought certain information/ clarification like service</p>

	<p>provided to registered architects, cost of services, amount of corpus fund with the Council and the manner in which the Council is planning to utilize the corpus fund and interest earned thereon. The Ministry had also sought comparison vis-à-vis fee charged by the such organizations such as Medical Council, Bar Council of India etc. and same has been provided to them.</p> <p>All the required information has been submitted to the Ministry as and when asked for and the approval of the Ministry in the matter is awaited. The Fees was last revised in the year 2014.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Central Government to accord its approval expeditiously. The Council also requested Ms. Saumya Gupta, member, COA, nominee Central Government to use her good offices in the matter so that this proposal is approved by the Central Government.</p>
ii.	<p>Issuance of notification under Rule 5 of Aadhar Authentication and Good Governance Rules on Services offered by the Council.</p>
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council has decided to introduce Aadhar based authentication as for part of its initiatives for Good Governance for following services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Registration of Architects under the Architects Act, 1972: Registration as an Architect is a statutory requirement for an individual to practice the profession of an Architect and to use the title and style of an Architect under the Architects act 1972, enacted by the Parliament of India. Aadhar authentication of individuals will help in use of their Aadhar data such as name, father/ mother/ husband/ guardian name, date of birth, etc. for use in COA database. 2. Issuance of Enrollment No. to students admitted by Architectural Institutions: Aadhar Authentication will help in verification of credentials of students and fast awarding of enrolment numbers. 3. Implementing Good Governance and digital platforms, i.e. issuance of Registration Certificate, Enrolment numbers, Training Certificates on Digi locker and other platforms by Council. 4. NATA: The council conducts national aptitude test in architecture (NATA) for admission to B.Arch. Course. Aadhar authentication of students who register for NATA will help in verification of students and posting their results on Digi locker etc. 5. Grant of Scholarship to needy students: - The Council is proposing to grant scholarship to Economically Distressed Students. Aadhar Authentication would help identifying the concerned beneficiaries and to ensure proper utilization of public funds. 6. Release of award money to winners of competitions: The Council is awarding various prizes to students and faculty members. Aadhar authentication will help in the targeted and speedy release of prizes money, etc. 7. Issuance of online directory of Architects: The Council is publishing online directory of Architects, Aadhar Authentication will help in avoiding misuse of Architects data by any person. 8. Architectural Design Competition: The Council from time to time assist various government bodies in conduct of Architectural design competition

	<p>for selection of Architect. Aadhar authentication will help in the targeted and speedy release of prizes money, etc.</p> <p>The Council has written to the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY), Govt. of India, for authentication of Aadhar services, as above, who is the competent authority, to authenticate the usage of digital platforms to ensure Good Governance.</p> <p>In response, the authorization has been conveyed by MEITY, to the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, to issue the notification under the Aadhar Rules.</p> <p>The President informed the members that Ministry vide its letter dated 24.08.2023 has approved the proposal of Council and has issued gazette notification authorizing the Council to use Adhar data appropriately.</p> <p>The Council thanked the Central Government especially Hon'ble Education Minister and Secretary Education in the matter.</p>
iii.	Approval of Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) for PG courses.
	<p>The President informed the members that the Council in its 77th Meeting held on July 15, 2022 approved the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education for Postgraduate Degree Programme) Regulations, 2022.</p> <p>These regulations have been submitted to the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, on 2nd November, 2022, for according their approval in terms of Section 45 of the Architects Act, 1972. The approval of the Ministry is awaited.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Central Government to accord its approval expeditiously. The Council also requested Ms. Saumya Gupta, member, COA, nominee Central Government to use her good offices in the matter so that this proposal is approved by the Central Government.</p>
iv.	Proposal for amendments in Council of Architecture Recruitment and Promotion Regulations, 1999.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Council has submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, for amending the Council of Architecture Employees Recruitment and Promotion Regulations, 2000, for creation of additional posts in the Council to meet the increased workload.</p> <p>The Ministry has sought the required information in 13 points format and the same is submitted to the Ministry.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Central Government to accord its approval expeditiously. The Council requested Ms. Saumya Gupta, member, COA, nominee Central Government to use her good offices in the matter so that this proposal is approved by the Central Government.</p>

v.	Proposal for recommendation to Ministry of Housing and Urban affair and DDA for allotment of land for the office Building of Council of Architecture.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council had submitted a request to L&DO and DDA for allotment of land to Council. The DDA has asked the Council to forward request through Council's nodal Ministry i.e. Ministry of Education.</p> <p>The request for allotment of land along with detailed proposal has been submitted to Ministry.</p> <p>The Ministry of Education, Govt. of India vide letter dated 26.07.2023, informed that COA may approach DDA for allotment of institutional land in Delhi directly or may bid for land in auction conducted by various authorities.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and authorized the President to take further necessary action in the matter.</p>
vi.	Amendment in the Council of Architecture Rules, 1973 in terms of directions of Hon'ble Karnataka High Court in writ petition filed by Ar. Sharan Desai regarding prescribing requirements for nomination of members of Council.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court in Writ Petition No.16114 of 2021 vide its order dated 08.01.2023 at para16 (iii) as ordered as under: -</p> <p><i>“The Union of India shall take steps to notify certain criteria for nomination of Members of the Council qua the qualification and experience under the Rules, which would become binding on every State Government as expeditiously as possible.”</i></p> <p>As sought for by the Ministry, the Council has submitted its suggestions to the Ministry in the matter and appropriate amendments in Council of Architecture Rules, 1973 are awaited from the Ministry in the matter. The Council noted the information.</p>
vii.	Proposal for grant of equivalence to Foreign PG Qualifications in Architecture.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council has been receiving numerous representations and public grievance from architects who have completed their Postgraduate Qualifications in Architecture from abroad about non-recognition/ equivalence of their qualifications with Master's Degree in Architecture in India.</p> <p>The matter was discussed with the officials of the Ministry and the Ministry desired that a scheme be prepared for grant of equivalence based on some pre-determined parameters including conduct of examination for grant of equivalence to Foreign PG qualifications in India so that the concerned architects can avail the benefits of their higher qualifications.</p>

	<p>Accordingly, a Sub-committee under the Convenorship of Dr. Vandana Sehgal and Dr. Minakshi Jain, Member, Dr. Kavita D. Rao, Special Invitee, Dr. P.S.N. Rao, Special Invitee and Dr. A. Srivatsan, Special Invitee, was constituted to prepare the scheme and mechanism for grant of equivalence to Foreign PG Qualifications in Architecture with Indian Master's Degree Course in Architecture by the Council.</p> <p>The Committee after taking note of the issue has proposed an automated process for facilitating Equivalence of Foreign Master's Degree in Architecture by providing an online mechanism for submission of applications to Council and assessment of the same on the basis of pre-determined parameters. The process would be easily accessible to the candidates, time bound, single window and fair. This would be made available on the COA website.</p> <p>The Council in its 79th Meeting held on 12th March, 2023, approved the Foreign PG qualification Scheme and the same was submitted to the Ministry of Education for according their approval for implementation.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and requested the Central Government to accord its approval expeditiously. The Council also requested Ms. Saumya Gupta, member, COA, nominee Central Government to use her good offices in the matter so that this proposal is approved by the Central Government.</p>
20	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONTRIBUTION OF OUTGOING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.
	<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. Sapna, former Vice-President ; 2. Ar. Rakesh Singh Khuswah, Member; and 3. Er. H. K. Mittal, Member. <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> <p>The Council would like to put on record its appreciation for the contribution and support extended by its former members to the Council, 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>
21	ANY OTHER ITEM WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR.
1)	TO CONSIDER THE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST ARCHITECTS FOR ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FROM THE ARCHITECTS, GENERAL PUBLIC AND GOVT. AGENCIES.
	<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</p>

	<p>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.:566</p> <p>Resolved that:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 571 1406 2058"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 571 440 1677">1.</td><td data-bbox="440 571 1406 1677"> <p>CA/DC/553 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. Kannan Krishnan & Ms. Madhuri Kannan against Ar. Mahendra Mohan P (CA/2014/66232), Kerala, the Council noted that the Respondent Architect was engaged by the Complainant to provide architectural and landscape services their house in Palakkad, Kerala. After negotiations the architect was issued letter of appointment dated 06.02.2023.</p> <p>The Respondent after collecting advance quoted massive increase in his fees without any change in the requirements of the Complainant. When the Respondent's services were terminated, he failed to return the advance amount and harassed the Complainants with emails and messages.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the letter of appointment was signed only for 4500 sqft area but based on the client requirements the area was changed to 7000 sqft. Accordingly, fee was changed.</p> <p>The client promised for payment of extra areas but after the submissions of all drawings, the client has changed his words. Due to increase in area and cost, the client asked the architect to step out of the project without payment the 2nd stage payment of 1.5 lakhs for a detailed survey and drawings. The Complainant threatened the Respondent and his associates. The Respondent elaborated subsequent events in his statement of defence.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that no fault can be attributed to the Respondent Architect and no prima facie case is made out against him. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1677 440 2058">2.</td><td data-bbox="440 1677 1406 2058"> <p>CA/DC/555 - With regard to the complaint filed by Ar. Nilesh Desai (CA/98/22473) Maharashtra against Ar. Dinesh Prabhakar Warade (CA/1995/18050) Maharashtra, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent architect was that he took up the project (Tekdi Bungalow BSUP Project) where the complainant was working as Principal Architect. The Complainant was appointed by Thane Municipal Corporation. For Tekdi Bungalow project designed by Complainant, Thane Municipal Corporation was awarded SKOCH Order-of Merit & Platinum award for qualifying amongst Top-50 Smart cities Projects in India for Green Homes Building on 9th Sept., 2017 at New Delhi. After Construction of 14th floor slab completed in late year 2016 & early year</p> </td></tr> </table>	1.	<p>CA/DC/553 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. Kannan Krishnan & Ms. Madhuri Kannan against Ar. Mahendra Mohan P (CA/2014/66232), Kerala, the Council noted that the Respondent Architect was engaged by the Complainant to provide architectural and landscape services their house in Palakkad, Kerala. After negotiations the architect was issued letter of appointment dated 06.02.2023.</p> <p>The Respondent after collecting advance quoted massive increase in his fees without any change in the requirements of the Complainant. When the Respondent's services were terminated, he failed to return the advance amount and harassed the Complainants with emails and messages.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the letter of appointment was signed only for 4500 sqft area but based on the client requirements the area was changed to 7000 sqft. Accordingly, fee was changed.</p> <p>The client promised for payment of extra areas but after the submissions of all drawings, the client has changed his words. Due to increase in area and cost, the client asked the architect to step out of the project without payment the 2nd stage payment of 1.5 lakhs for a detailed survey and drawings. The Complainant threatened the Respondent and his associates. The Respondent elaborated subsequent events in his statement of defence.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that no fault can be attributed to the Respondent Architect and no prima facie case is made out against him. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	2.	<p>CA/DC/555 - With regard to the complaint filed by Ar. Nilesh Desai (CA/98/22473) Maharashtra against Ar. Dinesh Prabhakar Warade (CA/1995/18050) Maharashtra, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent architect was that he took up the project (Tekdi Bungalow BSUP Project) where the complainant was working as Principal Architect. The Complainant was appointed by Thane Municipal Corporation. For Tekdi Bungalow project designed by Complainant, Thane Municipal Corporation was awarded SKOCH Order-of Merit & Platinum award for qualifying amongst Top-50 Smart cities Projects in India for Green Homes Building on 9th Sept., 2017 at New Delhi. After Construction of 14th floor slab completed in late year 2016 & early year</p>
1.	<p>CA/DC/553 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. Kannan Krishnan & Ms. Madhuri Kannan against Ar. Mahendra Mohan P (CA/2014/66232), Kerala, the Council noted that the Respondent Architect was engaged by the Complainant to provide architectural and landscape services their house in Palakkad, Kerala. After negotiations the architect was issued letter of appointment dated 06.02.2023.</p> <p>The Respondent after collecting advance quoted massive increase in his fees without any change in the requirements of the Complainant. When the Respondent's services were terminated, he failed to return the advance amount and harassed the Complainants with emails and messages.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that the letter of appointment was signed only for 4500 sqft area but based on the client requirements the area was changed to 7000 sqft. Accordingly, fee was changed.</p> <p>The client promised for payment of extra areas but after the submissions of all drawings, the client has changed his words. Due to increase in area and cost, the client asked the architect to step out of the project without payment the 2nd stage payment of 1.5 lakhs for a detailed survey and drawings. The Complainant threatened the Respondent and his associates. The Respondent elaborated subsequent events in his statement of defence.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that no fault can be attributed to the Respondent Architect and no prima facie case is made out against him. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>				
2.	<p>CA/DC/555 - With regard to the complaint filed by Ar. Nilesh Desai (CA/98/22473) Maharashtra against Ar. Dinesh Prabhakar Warade (CA/1995/18050) Maharashtra, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent architect was that he took up the project (Tekdi Bungalow BSUP Project) where the complainant was working as Principal Architect. The Complainant was appointed by Thane Municipal Corporation. For Tekdi Bungalow project designed by Complainant, Thane Municipal Corporation was awarded SKOCH Order-of Merit & Platinum award for qualifying amongst Top-50 Smart cities Projects in India for Green Homes Building on 9th Sept., 2017 at New Delhi. After Construction of 14th floor slab completed in late year 2016 & early year</p>				

		<p>2017. The Complainant came to know from TMC official verbally that new Architect Ar. Dinesh Warhade was appointed for further work. NO NOC was taken by TMC from Complainant.</p> <p>Ar. Dinesh Warhade tactfully used all his submitted drawings from TMC BSUP Cell & used them for obtaining OC from TMC Town Planning Department & TMC Town Planning department granted OC for above project on his name without Complainant resignation as an Architect. On site additional 4 floors were constructed illegally allegedly under the supervision of Ar. Dinesh Warhade which again proves his gross misconduct & unethical practices. Thus, Ar. Dinesh Warhade should be debarred from conducting his Architectural Professional practice by revoking his Architectural Licence.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence denied all the allegations made by the Petitioner and denied that he had never violated any provisions of Architect (Professional Conduct) Regulations 1989.</p> <p>The Respondent stated that Thane Municipal Corporation aimed to build 7000 homes under Basic services for Urban Poor (BSUP) in Thane. Under BSUP the State and Central Government were provided with grants and in some case, there were some homes that Thane Municipal Corporation constructed by spending its own money.</p> <p>The Respondent was empaneled as a Technical Consultant for the BSUP Projects under JNNURM, following proper tender procurement procedures as per Thane Municipal Corporation Resolution No. 2860 dated 11/02/2009. Respondent has been actively involved in the project since its inception in 2008.</p> <p>The Respondent's appointment included a comprehensive range of Responsibilities beyond just architectural fees and Respondent have diligently carried out the necessary tasks and stages as per agreed scope of work since the project's initiation.</p> <p>The Complainant obtained the Architectural appointment for the concerned project without prior experience or empanelment as a Technical Consultant with Thane Municipal Corporation. Their appointment was influenced by external factors and without knowledge or consent of Respondent.</p> <p>Under Pressure tactics, the Respondent had to reluctantly agree to Complainant's participation solely for the purpose of gaining experience, with their involvement limited to executing the Architectural scope.</p> <p>Respondent further stated that his firm was appointed after following due procedure. The complainant firm joined them to work for this project. The Respondent has also made payment of Rs.2,43,820/- to Complainant despite having not received any fees from Thane Municipal Corporation.</p> <p>No agreement exists between the Thane Municipal Corporation and Complainant nor between the Complainant and Respondent. The Complainant received a substantial amount of Rs.15,00,000 (15 lacs) from the Project Contractor without Respondent's Knowledge, as confirmed by the complainant in the presence of Thane Municipal Corporation authorities.</p> <p>Due to aforementioned circumstances, a gap was created, and the Occupancy Certificate for additional floors was not obtained. The</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Respondent received a letter from Thane Municipal Corporation bearing no. TMC/PWD/EE/566 dated 02.10.2022, instructing to obtain the OC. It raised a question as to why the letter was not addressed to the Complainant, if they claim him to be the Architect for the Project.</p> <p>Based on the above facts the Council noted that the Complainant was first appointed by the Thane Municipal Corporation and while his appointment was in force the Respondent Architect took up the project from Thane Municipal Corporation and continued with further work.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	
	3.	<p>CA/DC/557 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mahesh Chandwani, Mumbai against Ar. Satish Ahuja (CA/1993/16602), Mumbai the Council noted that the Complainant stated that the he was developer of plot of land having admeasuring area about 2500 Sq. Mts. Lying and situated at survey/Gut no.-242, Hissa No. -1 to 7, of village-digha, Thane-Belapur Road, Navi Mumbai by Agreement for Assignment of Development Rights executed on 28.02.2011 from Mount Mary Builders. By virtue of the said agreement the Complainant had all the right, title, interest in the aforesaid property along with benefits of sanctioned plan, FSI and TDR to plaintiff and this entire 2500 sq. mtrs land i.e "K' Wing out of the entire project land along with all rights and benefits are transferred.</p> <p>The Complainant stated that on the aforesaid property development plan was sanctioned by NMMC bearing sanctioned plan no. 10620/1525/2010 dated 23.04.2010. However, he came to know that without any consent or without being informed of the aforesaid, the plan was amended illegally at the application of M/s Akshar Development and Mount Mary builders dated 27.02.2019 on application submitted through Respondent Architect.</p> <p>The Complainant stated he was holding entire 2500 sq. mtrs land i.e "K' wing out of total 40,468 sq. mtrs and 15 shops, a project known as "Green world". It was totally illegal and improper on the part to amend the plan without written consent of the Complainant. The respondent was duty bound to insist complainants for no objection as a purchaser under provisions of section 7 of Maharashtra ownership flat Act 1963 and even under section 14 of Maharashtra Real Estate Regulatory Authority Act. The NMMC had informed and issued a notice to Ar. Satish V. Ahuja vide letter dated 14.12.2020 that signature of all owners/ consent is required for all submission of amended plan.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence submitted that he has no Professional relationship with the Complainant. He was not aware of the relationship that allegedly existed between the Complainant and the Akshar Development and that he never received any instructions in respect of the development of the Complainant's plot from the Complainant till date.</p> <p>The Complainant allegedly claimed to be owner of the K-wing plot since 2011, however he never approached Respondent with any Grievance or</p>	

		<p>complaint till 16.2.2021. Respondent further stated that the part O.C was already received on dated 27.02.2019 much prior to the Complainant's initiation of his grievances and hence, complaint was only an afterthought to harass the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent further submitted that no construction was carried out till date on the portion of land admeasuring 2500 sq mts. -K Wing, allegedly claimed by the Complainant hence there was no cause of any grievance to complain. The Respondent further stated that the complaint was nothing but an alleged misconceived attempt with vengeance to tarnish his image, reputation and goodwill.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council noted that the Respondent Architect was appointed by the Developer and not by the Complainant. However, Respondent Architect has failed in his duty to follow the procedure by not taking consent of all the Owners/ shareholders while obtaining permission on amended plans and not checking measurements on site & verifying previously sanctioned plan.</p> <p>The Council, therefore, 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.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	
	4.	<p>CA/DC/558 - With regard to the complaint filed by Ms. Prachee (Mukherjee) & Mr. Santanu (Chatterjee) Himachal Pradesh against Ar. Savneet Kaur, (CA/1995/18204) Haryana, the Council noted that the complaint against the Respondent Architect was that she was appointed as Architectural consultant by Ms. Prachee Mukharjee and Mr. Shantanu Chatterjee for the Architectural and Interior Design Consultancy of their proposed Residential Building at Palampur.</p> <p>The Complainant wanted her to use brick vernacular architecture in their construction and Respondent said she had worked on such projects. She said she had worked on Sandhya and Sarit Gupta's mud brick home in Palampur. The Complainant did not check her statement and recently learnt from Sandhya and Sarit that Savneet had not worked at all on their home construction.</p> <p>Throughout the construction period the respondent and contractor had communication problems and put the Complainant in the middle of it. The Complainant asked the respondent to find another contractor so that they could let go of the existing one. The Respondent said she knew many contractors but, in the end, came back saying nobody was willing to take on their work.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect did not have the experience in the type of work desired by them and she just lied, mislead and wasted their money and time.</p> <p>The Respondent in her defence stated that the Complainants were based out of the USA and the initial interaction with them was on the phone. However, the work for the project by the Respondent was started in July 2017 itself after discussions with the Complainants on the phone.</p>	

	<p>The designs and drawings were prepared by the Respondent after detailed discussions with the Complainants and as per their preferences and requirements.</p> <p>On the requests of the Complainants, first the designs and drawings for 2 BNBs were to be finalized followed by 2 more BNBs and then after the Petitioners returned from the U.S.A, the farmhouse was to be designed.</p> <p>The design of the BNB was single-storied using vernacular materials for the ground floor. The services (kitchen and bathroom) were to be done using burnt bricks. The room was built in burnt bricks over the service area.</p> <p>Even before the Complainants approached the Respondent, the Complainants had already selected the Contractor, Mr. Rajeev Jamwal, who was a resident of Palampur. The Complainant had also engaged the services of a retired Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO) of the Himachal Government to oversee the construction.</p> <p>The Complainants in several e-mails and WhatsApp chats have acknowledged about the site visits done by the Respondent and her associate Architects and they even appreciated the Respondent for the good work done by her and her team.</p> <p>In February 2021 when the ground floor of the Farmhouse was being constructed, a team of Architects from Respondent's team visited the project site. The Complainants were also present on the site and during discussions desired that the interiors be changed completely. This was a major change at this stage. The Complainants were informed that the whole new set of interior details required by them would mean that the interior design would have to be changed and would require substantial work.</p> <p>The Respondent and her team therefore prepared a new set of designs and drawings and even gave a detailed presentation to the Respondent to explain them about the designs. However, after the designs were ready, the Complainants suddenly changed their minds and told the Respondent they did not want to go ahead with the Project.</p> <p>The real reason for the Complainants having demolished the entire construction was that they had abandoned the project. Living far off they were not able to manage the Project and in order to sell the land, they needed to sell it without any construction.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council noted that the Complainant accepted the designs and drawings prepared by the Respondent Architect and also continued with the construction work. A site supervisor was also appointed by them. The project management services were not part of the scope of the services of the Respondent Architect hence no fault can be found with her.</p> <p>The Council opined that there is no prima facie case against the Respondent Architect. The Council, therefore, dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	
5.	<p>CA/DC/559 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. Tejubhai Isardas Lalwani, Maharashtra against Ar. Sachin Gajananrao Kanoje (CA/2000/26642) Maharashtra, the Council noted that the Complaint</p>	

	<p>against the Respondent Architect was that the Respondent Architect without obtaining the permission of the previous Architect (Ar.Viswajeet V. Mane) of M/s. Chavhan Mane and Associates, took over the supervision work of Sindhi Sanskrutik Bhavan, Sangli and has committed professional misconduct under Architects (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 1989.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence stated that the Sindhi Purashan Panchayat trust had appointed M/s. Chavan Mane & Associates, sangli through Ar. Vishvajit V. Mane for their project namely Sindhi Sanskrutik Bhavan, Sangli a multipurpose Hall in Sangli.</p> <p>The Initial Building permit was obtained by Ar. Mane in 2003. The Construction was started thereafter. However, the project construction got held up subsequently.</p> <p>In 2016, the Trust decided to engage the Respondent Ar. Sachin G. Kanoje. As per Resolution No. 4 of the meeting there was reference to "verification of the ongoing Construction internally or externally by Shri Kanoje. The Respondent was provided a no Objection Certificate by Ar. Vishvajit V. Mane dated 30.6.2016. This NOC states that Ar. Mane has had oral communication with Ar. Sachin G. Kanoje and he seized his services and gave no objection certificate to Ar. Sachin G. Kanoje to continue the work.</p> <p>The trust gave an appointment letter to Ar. Sachin G. Kanoje on 05.02.2018, stating that he was appointed as an Architect and Engineer for completing the remaining work. This appointment letter also stated that the previous Architect has expressed inability to execute the work, sometime prior to the construction work being stopped.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that he carried out due diligence in understanding of the building already constructed before undertaking the project. The Respondent obtained Revised sanction of Building plans from Sangli Miraj & Kupwad city Municipal Corporation in 2019. The Respondent also obtained Building Completion Certificate on the basis of Revised Sanctioned plan on 02.09.2022.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that no prima facie case is made out against the Respondent Architect and accordingly dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	
6.	<p>CA/DC/559 - With regard to the complaint filed by Mr. OP Kirar & Ms. Sangeeta Kirar, against Ar.Pankaj Nagalia (CA/1990/12781) Uttar Pradesh, the Council noted that the Complaint against the Respondent Architect was that the Respondent Architect was entrusted with the responsibility of preparation of Building plans, drawings and elevations of the Residential Building of the Complainant and was also entrusted with responsibility of construction of same at a cost of Rs. 32,00,000/-.</p> <p>However, the Respondent Architect did not complete the construction and was using delay-dallying tactics. The Respondent Architect misbehaved over phone with the Complainant and also threatened to stop work at the site. The respondent gave false assurance that the work started in full swing. But when the complainant visited at site no activity started. The Respondent deliberated delayed and not completed work</p>	

	<p>within the time frame allowed by the Authority. Due to which the date of completion permitted was expired.</p> <p>The Respondent Architect in his defence stated that the complainant already having an Architectural design of 51.3 Sq.M. plot, duly prepared by another Architect, which was duly approved by the Noida Authority, as per statutory requisites. Thus, there was no relation of 'Architect & Client' between the Complainant and Respondent.</p> <p>The Contract was entered into between Shri O.P. Kirar and Ms. Sangeeta Kirar with M/s. Nagalia Associates, a firm under the flagship of Respondent, wherein there are many consultants and Contractors of different fields including Construction. The Construction was done by various contractors which were chosen by Shri O.P. Kirar & Ms. Sangeeta Kirar, after referring by the Respondent.</p> <p>The respondent stated that there were no basic arrangements to work properly for want of electricity & water at site. The construction was started in December 2022 with the help of Generator, which were banned by NGT for curbing the pollution. The electricity connection was not taken prior to construction and connection was given only in the last week of May 2023. There was no water connection and same has not been connected till date.</p> <p>The Respondent also explained the detailed sequence of events and concluded that the contractors and vendors have informed him that finishing work halted due to shortage of funds. In case of availability of funds, the work can be completed within 45 days.</p> <p>Based on the above facts, the Council opined that no prima facie case is made out against the Respondent Architect and accordingly dismissed the Complaint.</p> <p>The decision of the Council be communicated to the concerned parties as per procedure.</p>	
2)	TO CONSIDER ALLOWING LATERAL ADMISSION IN 5 YEAR B. ARCH DEGREE COURSE TO STUDENTS POSSESSING 3 YEAR DIPLOMA IN ARCHITECTURE/ ARCHITECTURAL ASSISTANSHIP AND INTERIOR DESIGN.	
	<p>The President informed the members that the Executive Committee of the Council in its 252nd Meeting after considering several requests received from students and Institutions, approved for allowing lateral admission to B.Arch. Course to candidates who possessed 3 year diploma in in Architecture/ Architectural Assistanship and Interior Design.</p> <p>Further, allowing Lateral admission will provide better career oppourtunities to students to acquire a professional degree and futher upgrade their knowledge, training and skills in Degree course. Presently, these candidates are afforded limited job and professional opportunities. This would be in line with multiple entries and exit in the proposed the National Education Policy.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is proposed to amend the Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Eucation) Regulations, 2020, as under :</p> <p>After Regulation 4(2) following sub-regulation be inserted :</p> <p>(2A) Candidates possessing 10+3 Diploma in Architecture/ Architectural Assistanship and Interior Design may be admitted in Second year (Third</p>	

	<p>Semester) of B.Arch. Course by Institution(s) provided such number candidates shall not exceed 20% of the sanctioned intake of the institution(s) and subject to passing of an Aptitude Test in Architecture.</p> <p>The members held detailed discussions and deliberations in the matter and passed the following resolution :</p> <p>Resolution No.:567</p> <p>Resolved that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Regulation 4 of Council of Architecture Minimum Standards of Architecture Education Regulations, 2020 be further amended by insertion of following sub-regulation 2A as under : <p><i>Candidates possessing 10+3 Diploma in Architecture/ Architectural Assistanship and Interior Design subject to passing of Competency Test may be admitted in Second year (Third Semester) of B.Arch. Course by Institution(s) provided such number candidates shall not exceed 20% of the sanctioned intake of the institution(s) and the admission shall be subject to passing of an Aptitude Test in Architecture.</i></p> 2. The Central Government is requested to approve the above amendments in terms of Section 45 of the Architects Act, 1972.
3)	TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF INTERNAL AUDITOR OF COUNCIL FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2022-2023.
	<p>The Registrar-Secretary informed the members that M/s. Anjali Jain & Associates, Chartered Accountants have carried out the Internal Audit of the Council for the financial year 2022-2023.</p> <p>The Hon'ble Members perused Internal Audit Report and desired that appropriate action be taken on the recommendations of the Auditor.</p>
4)	TO CONSIDER STEPS TO BE TAKEN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY IN TERMS OF MULTIPLE ENTRIES/ EXITS AND PROPOSED SCHEME OF PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION.
	<p>The President informed the members that Council has constituted a Committee to prepare the Scheme of Professional Examination consisting of Ar. Lalichan Zacharias, Convenor, Ar. P.S.N. Rao, Member, Ar. Kavita D. Rao, Member and Ar. Chirayu Bhatt, Special Invitee.</p> <p>The Committee has further developed the Scheme of Professional Examination. The Executive Committee in its 252nd Meeting considered the scheme and noted that this is directly linked with the proposed amendments in the Act and can be given effect through amendments in the Act.</p> <p>The Council deliberated in the matter and approved the same and decided further details be worked before implementation.</p> <p>The President further informed the members that for implementing the recommendations of NEP the steps enumerated below would be</p>

	<p>implemented by making necessary Norms/ Standards and/or amending/ making new Regulations as per the procedure provided in the Act :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amending eligibility for admission to B.Arch. Course by removing requirement of having passed PCM subjects in 10+2. The same is already approved by the Council in it's 76th meeting held on 20th February, 2022. 2. Allowing lateral Admission in 2nd year of B.Arch. Course to 10+3 Diploma Holders. 3. Reduction of duration of B.Arch. Course to 4 years. 4. Reduction of duration of integrated general M.Arch. Course to 1 year. 5. Introduction of Professional Practice Examination. The Examination shall mean following examinations conducted by the Council at different levels : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exam - C : Candidates passed in 10+2/10+3 and having Bachelor Degree in any stream could appear for Exam-C conducted by COA in order to be entitled for Registration and Practice as "Architectural Engineer/ Licensed Surveyor" for limited practice. <p>Candidates passed in 10+2 and qualified Aptitude Test or with 10+3 and qualified in Competency Test studying B.Arch Programme shall have option to exit after three years of completing the Programme and shall be awarded with BSc in Building Science Degree and shall be entitled for Registration and Practice as "Architectural Engineer/ Licensed Surveyor" for limited practice.</p> <p>Candidate awarded with BSc in Building Science Degree shall be entitled to take admission in to 4th Year of 5 Years Integrated Masters programme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Exam – B: Candidate could appear for Exam B conducted by Council for persons subject to their passing of Exam C and shall be entitled to seek registration as an Architect (having no entitlement to Practice). <p>Candidate having completed 5 Years Integrated Masters programme shall be entitled to seek registration as an Architect (having no entitlement to Practice).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Exam -A or Professional Practice Examination: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Candidates having completed 5 Years Integrated Masters programme with 1 year Professional Apprenticeship could appear for Exam A and shall be entitled for Grant of registration as Chartered Architect with full practice rights. b. Candidates having cleared Exam B with 2 years Professional Apprenticeship could appear for Exam A and shall be entitled for Grant of registration as Chartered Architect with full practice rights. <p>The Hon'ble members noted the above initiatives to be taken by the Council.</p>
--	--

5)	TO CONSIDER POLICY FOR TAKEOVER AND MERGER OF THE ARCHITETURAL INSTITUTIONS.
	The Council deferred this matter to next meeting due to paucity of time.
6)	TO CONSIDER REVISED ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR THE ACADEMIC SESSION 2023-2024 FOR EXTENSION OF LAST DATE FOR ADMISSION TO B.ARCH./ M.ARCH. COURSE(S).
	<p>The President informed the members that as per Council of Architecture (Minimum Standards of Architectural Education) Regulations, 2020, the classes of 1st Semester of a 5-year Architecture degree course shall not commence later than the 1st working day in the month of September of a calendar year and all admissions must be completed before this date.</p> <p>The Council had received requests from the institutions and admission authorities of several states and UTs, for extension of last date for admission to 5-year B.Arch./2-year M.Arch./ Diploma programmes for the academic session 2023-2024, since the admission process, counselling as well as commencement of classes for B.Arch./ M.Arch. have been delayed.</p> <p>Upon consideration of these requests, it was decided to extend the last date for completing the process of admissions in B.Arch./ M.Arch. /Diploma Programmes in the states/UTs in the country by September 30, 2023 for the academic session 2023-2024, as a special case.</p> <p>The classes for B.Arch./ M.Arch. /Diploma Programmes may commence from October 3, 2023 onwards. In addition, inspection of a few institutions is also expected to be conducted soon.</p> <p>The Council after deliberations approved the revised academic calendar.</p>

The Vice-President thanked the President, Members of the Council for attending the meeting and making their valuable contribution. He also thanked the Registrar-Secretary, Administrative Officer and other officers and employees of the Council for organizing such a fruitful meeting. The meeting ended at 9:30 p.m.
