

REGISTRATION PANEL HEARING

**Friday 17 October 2025, at 0800 hours BST
via Microsoft Teams**

Case of

MARIA DOLORES GARCIA PEREZ (1252182)

Panel

Dr Angela Brown – Lay Chair

Eleanor Spencer – Surveyor member

Miriam Karp – Lay member

Legal Assessor

Fiona Barnett

RICS Presenting Officer

Tabrez Akhtar, RICS paralegal

Translator

Anna Galiano – RICS Frankfurt

Tribunal Executive

Maria Choudhury

1. The Panel convened to consider Mrs Garcia Perez' application for re-admission to membership of RICS. Mrs Garcia Perez attended and was not represented.
2. Ms Garcia Perez had informed RICS in advance of the hearing that she would require a translator.
3. RICS arranged for Anna Galiano to act as a translator. Ms Galiano is an employee of RICS and is not a professional independent interpreter. Mrs Garcia Perez was aware of this and agreed that she was content for Ms Galiano to translate the proceedings on her behalf.
4. Mrs Garcia Perez initially attended with a Mackenzie friend to support her at the hearing. The Panel noticed that the Mackenzie friend was the person who had provided a reference in support of Mrs Garcia Perez' application for re-admission. Given that the Panel may, in the course of the proceedings, have questions about the reference, this matter was raised with the parties in advance of the hearing.
5. Mrs Garcia Perez confirmed that in the circumstances, she was happy to continue without the Mackenzie friend in attendance.

BACKGROUND

6. Ms Garcia Perez was first registered as a member of RICS on 27 March 2008. She was expelled from RICS following the decision of a Single Member of the Regulatory Tribunal, ("the Single Member") on 16 December 2022.
7. The background to the expulsion was that Ms Garcia Perez failed to meet RICS' requirements in relation to Continuous Professional Development ("CPD") for the 2021 calendar year. This was Ms Garcia Perez' fourth breach of the CPD rules in a ten year period. The charge considered by the Single Member was as follows:

"Between 1 January 2021 and 1 February 2022, you have failed to comply with RICS' requirements in respect of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in that you have not completed or recorded, or caused to be recorded, at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal. An extension period was granted by RICS until 26 May 2022 by which date you had still failed to complete and record or caused to be

recorded at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal for the period between 1 January 2021 and 1 February 2022.”

8. At the time of the Single Member decision, Ms Garcia Perez had not engaged with RICS
9. and had not provided any documentation or written statement. The evidence before the Single Member was that Ms Garcia Perez had failed to record CPD in the years 2015, 2019 and 2020. She had received a Caution in 2015 and a Caution and Fine in 2019. The fine had not been paid. There was no evidence to demonstrate that Ms Garcia Perez had sought an exemption nor had she explained why she had not complied with her CPD obligations. She had recorded 10 hours of informal CPD which led the Single Member to state it was, “...reasonable to assume she was aware of the requirement to record CPD.” Extensive efforts had been made by RICS to contact Ms Garcia Perez to remind her of her obligation to comply.

10. The Single Member stated that,

“I note that Paragraph 22.1 of the RICS Sanctions Policy Guidance, 2020, is clear as to the sanction which is appropriate for a third – never mind a fourth - breach. In all the circumstances, expulsion from membership is both proportionate and appropriate, as Regulation is pivotal in protecting the public and in maintaining the public’s confidence in Chartered Surveyors and trust in the RICS.”

11. Ms Garcia Perez now applies for re-admission by way of her application dated 10 April 2025.
12. Mr Akhtar provided the Panel with a brief summary of the background. He reminded the Panel that the purpose of CPD requirements is to ensure that members of RICS maintain professional expertise. Compliance with the CPD requirements is mandatory, and members are required to record their CPD on the RICS portal. He confirmed that there are no other disciplinary matters involving Mrs Garcia Perez. He submitted that RICS is neutral in relation to the application.

EVIDENCE

13. In its consideration of this matter, the Panel was provided by RICS with a bundle numbering pages 1 to 160.

14. The bundle included the decision of the Single Member, and a letter of recommendation dated 17 June 2025 from Begona Feyjoo Saus, who stated:

“I have known Dolores since 1996, when we both attended the Master's Degree in Valuations at the Centro Superior de Arquitectura de la Fundación Camuñas.

.....In 1997, we started working together at TINSA, which allowed me to appreciate from the very beginning her professional rigor, her passion for the real estate sector and her firm commitment to technical excellence.....

Her leadership, integrity, analytical rigor, and excellent interpersonal skills are distinctive traits that define her as a top-level professional. In addition, her deep knowledge of the market, constant technical updating, and commitment to the highest ethical standards make her particularly well suited to join RICS. I am convinced that her admission as a member will contribute positively to the mission and values of this prestigious institution.”

15. Mrs Garcia Perez addressed the Panel during the hearing. She had made a written statement which she read into the record; this was translated by Ms Galiano.
16. Mrs Garcia Perez said she was aware of her obligations to complete CPD and her non-compliance. At the time, her personal life required all her attention.
[REDACTED]
17. Mrs Garcia Perez said she knew she should have checked the link to record the CPD. She had to give up activities such as teaching courses, but carried on working due to the understanding and support of the company she worked for. Once she gained stability in her life, she tried to access the RICS website but was unable to do so. She told the Panel she has since completed all her professional development. For example, last year she completed a 104 hour executive professional development programme and has kept up with all Spanish regulatory developments.
18. Mrs Garcia Perez said that during these years, she has not carried out valuations, although in the last two years she has collaborated with Begona [the person who provided her reference for this case] on special valuations. She said Begona encouraged her to re-apply to RICS.

19. Mrs Garcia Perez said she manages a team of 20. They often carry out property valuations of a special nature. In her firm they have RICS members and other collaborators. She told the Panel she believes her re-admission would be best for RICS and her clients.
20. Mrs Garcia Perez answered questions from the Panel.
21. She was asked why and how she felt her re-admission was in the best interests of RICS. She said that [REDACTED], she was an APC assessor for RICS in Spain and was on RICS assessor panels for candidates. She has also been a university lecturer at the European University in Madrid. These competencies would be beneficial to RICS. Mrs Garcia Perez said she is a good professional and has worked with many clients all of whom are satisfied with her services.
22. Mrs Garcia Perez said she can only re-assure the Panel with her word that she will comply in future. She hopes such difficult personal circumstances will not occur in future. She is aware she should have contacted RICS in the past, and would do so if, for example, she became ill in future.
23. In relation to a question about how Mrs Garcia Perez has remediated the matters which led to her exclusion, she reiterated that she has attended a RICS event in Madrid in June and July, and since 2023/2024, she has continued with her own training.
24. Mrs Garcia Perez was asked whether she has evidence or has kept records of the training she has done. She said she has kept records. She could provide a certificate of internal training and could ask for evidence of other training which may be available next week.
25. In relation to the testimonial provided, Mrs Garcia Perez was asked if the author of that was aware of the circumstances which led to her expulsion. She said did not know, but her opinion was that the author of the testimonial did not know of the circumstances which led to her expulsion.
26. Mrs Garcia Perez said she thought a member of the public who was aware of the circumstances of her expulsion, would think there had been a challenge, but said that “we are all human”.
27. Given Mrs Garcia Perez’ assertion that she would be able to obtain records of some of the CPD she has undertaken, the Panel decided to allow her a period

of one hour to obtain and provide this evidence before it concluded its deliberations.

28. Mrs Garcia Perez subsequently provided this evidence. She confirmed that the evidence consisted of :

- Certificate of attendance for course in business management for directors, 11 November 2023 to 24 May 2025. Credits 104 hours, (plus course objectives and curriculum).
- Details of webinar January 2025 in relation to proposed changes to Red Book.

29. Mrs Garcia Perez also provided an invitation to an RICS conference in relation to valuations.

PANEL DECISION

30. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She reminded the Panel, amongst other matters, that the burden is on Mrs Garcia Perez to persuade the Panel that her application should be granted. In order to grant the application, the Panel must be satisfied that Mrs Garcia Perez is a both a fit and proper person and that her re-admission would be in the best interests of RICS. She advised that if the Panel grants the application, it may grant it conditionally, unconditionally, or may grant re-admission to a different class of membership.

31. The Panel first considered Mrs Garcia Perez' character. In so doing, it had regard the testimonial she had provided. This testimonial spoke highly of Mrs Garcia Perez' competence, capability and commitment to standards. However, the Panel was concerned that the author of the testimonial had made no mention of the circumstances which led to the expulsion. The author was recommending that Mrs Garcia Perez be re-admitted to RICS, but Ms Garcia Perez acknowledged she had not made the author aware of the matters which gave rise to her expulsion from RICS. For this reason, the Panel decided it could attribute little weight to the testimonial, which was not written with full knowledge of the facts.

32. The Panel took into account the steps taken by Mrs Garcia Perez to address the issues which gave rise to her expulsion. It was satisfied, from the evidence of CPD provided, that she is now taking steps towards her CPD compliance. In particular, she had provided evidence of a business management course she had completed which was detailed, involved subject matter which pertained to

her role as a surveyor and had taken place over a sustained period of time. She had obtained 104 hours of credits for this.

33. However, the Panel found that although she had provided evidence that she had undertaken this CPD, she had provided no evidence of any reflections on what she had learnt from the training she had undertaken, or how her learning from that had impacted on her practice.
34. Mrs Garcia Perez acknowledged that she could have contacted RICS when she was unable to complete her CPD. She told the Panel she did not know that she could have applied for an exemption.
35. The Panel acknowledged that Mrs Garcia Perez had been facing extreme personal difficulties in her life over the period in which the CPD failures were committed, yet she said she had continued to work with the support of her employers. The Panel found that her attitude towards CPD and its significance was, and remains, somewhat cavalier. She had not persuaded the Panel that she truly understood the importance of CPD and the impact on clients and the wider public interest if professionals do not maintain their CPD obligations. When asked what members of the public would think if they knew about her past failures to comply, her response made no mention of the reputation of the profession. Her view was that members of the public would know that she had faced challenges at that time, and that she is just human. She had, in the Panel's view, adopted a narrow person-centred approach to her failures, and not considered her responsibilities as a professional in a wider sense.
36. Ms Garcia Perez had provided no evidence to the Panel today, save for the CPD evidence, which was only provided after prompting from the Panel. She had acknowledged her wrongdoing during her oral address to the Panel, but provided no convincing reflection (written or otherwise) about her misconduct, nor had she made any expression of remorse or regret for the four CPD breaches which led to her expulsion.
37. Overall the Panel found Mrs Garcia Perez to be lacking in insight into the seriousness of her breaches of the RICS rules. It was of the view, based on the evidence presented today, that she could not be relied upon to meet the high professional standards that would be expected of her if she were re-admitted as a member of RICS.
38. The Panel concluded that the public would not be properly protected if Mrs Garcia Perez was re-admitted to RICS, given the absence of evidence to show

that she understood the seriousness of her misconduct, the limited insight she has shown, and the minimal steps she has taken to remediate it. Further, allowing the application would cause serious damage to the reputation of the profession, and would not ensure that proper professional standards would be upheld.

39. The Panel concluded that Mrs Garcia Perez is not a fit and proper person to be re-admitted to membership, and that her re-admission would not be in the best interests of RICS.

40. The application is therefore refused.

COSTS

41. Mr Akhtar applied for costs in the sum of £2545. He informed the Panel that the schedule of costs had been circulated in advance. He said that Mrs Garcia Perez had not completed the statement of means.

42. Mrs Garcia Perez said she did not wish to complete the statement of means, but would pay any costs order.

43. The Panel bore in mind that it may make such order for costs against the Applicant as it considers fair and reasonable. In the absence of any submissions from Mrs Garcia Perez, the Panel found that the sum requested was fair and reasonable. It ordered that Mrs Garcia Perez pays £2545 to RICS in costs.

PUBLICATION

44. Mr Akhtar submitted that there is no justification to depart from the principles regarding publicity.

45. Mrs Garcia Perez made no submission on this issue.

46. The Panel reminded itself of the presumption in favour of publication of decisions of the Registration Panel in respect of applications for readmission following disciplinary expulsion.

47. The Panel could find no reason for departing from the normal practice in this case. Part of the role of the Panel is to uphold the reputation of the profession, and publication of its decisions is an essential part of that role.

48. The Panel therefore ordered that this decision be published on the RICS website and in Modus, in accordance with Supplement 3 to the Sanctions Policy.

APPEAL PERIOD

49. An application to appeal must be served upon the Head of Regulatory Tribunals within 28 days of service of notification of this decision.