



ROYAL INSTITUTION OF CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Case of

Andreas SERGIDES [1151641]

On

Friday 13 February 2026

At

Held remotely via Microsoft Teams

Panel

Niru Uddin (Lay Chair)
Miriam Karp (Lay Member)
Jennifer Hobart MRICS (Registered Member)

Legal Adviser

Rebecca Vanstone

RICS Representative

Christopher Geering

Tribunal Executive

Maria Choudhury-Rahman

Introduction

1. Andreas Sergides (“Mr Sergides”) appears before the RICS Disciplinary Panel in connection with the following charges:-
 1. *‘Between 1 January 2023 and 1 February 2024, you have failed to comply with RICS’ requirements in respect of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in that you have not completed and recorded, or caused to be recorded, at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal.’*

Contrary to Rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of Conduct effective from 2 February 2022

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

2. *‘Between 1 January 2024 and 1 February 2025, 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.’*

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct effective from 2 February 2022

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

Response

2. No formal response to the allegations was received. The Panel did consider an email from Mr Sergides of 07 April 2025 where he stated:

“I am writing to offer my sincere apologies for failing to meet the required Continuing Professional Development (CPD) hours and for not responding to the emails, letter, or the disciplinary bundle that were sent to me on February 20, 2024. I fully acknowledge my oversight and understand the seriousness of this matter. I deeply regret not addressing the communications promptly, and I realize the potential consequences of my failure to comply with the CPD regulations.

I assure you that it was never my intention to disregard the obligations set forth by RICS, and I take full responsibility for this lapse. I am committed to rectifying the situation immediately by updating the CPD portal with the required details and completing the necessary 20 hours of CPD. I have already taken proactive steps to meet these requirements as soon as possible...

I understand the importance of maintaining professional standards, and I am dedicated to ensuring that I meet all future requirements. I would be truly grateful for your understanding and any consideration you may give to this request; especially given the corrective actions I am taking.”

Summary

3. Mr Sergides qualified as a professional Member of RICS in November 2004.
4. The case has arisen following Mr Sergides failure to record Continuing Professional Development ('CPD') for the years 2023 and 2024.
5. All Members of RICS are required to undertake a minimum of 20 hours of CPD per calendar year. Those hours must be recorded on the online portal and must be recorded by 31 January of the following year.
6. As of 01 February 2024, Mr Sergides had failed to record any hours for the 2023 calendar year. As of 01 February 2025, Mr Sergides had failed to record any hours for the 2024 calendar year.
7. These were alleged to be the fourth and fifth breaches of the CPD requirements, with Mr Sergides receiving a caution for a breach in 2020, and a further caution and a fine being issued for a second breach in 2021. A third breach had occurred in 2022 although this had not been recorded as a caution or fine due to a data issue. Ordinarily a third breach would have resulted in referral for consideration by a Single Member of the Disciplinary Tribunal but this had not taken place.
8. Between 15 November 2023 and 13 March 2024, six email reminders were sent to Mr Sergides' preferred email address. One hard copy letter was sent to his home address in April 2024. No response was received to any of this correspondence.
9. On 25 February 2025, Mr Sergides was sent an email before disciplinary action explaining that he was in breach of Rules 1 and 2 and his case was to be referred to the Head of Regulation. He was asked to provide any documents he wished to be considered within 14 days. No response was received.
10. A further email was sent on 11 March 2025, which went unanswered.
11. Mr Sergides's case was referred to a Single Member of the Regulatory Tribunal and a sanction was imposed on 24 March 2025. Mr Sergides responded to correspondence about this on 07 April 2025 and acknowledged his oversight in not updating the CPD portal. He asked that the sanction be set aside.
12. As the 2023 charge was being prepared for a hearing, it came to light that there was a further potential breach relating to CPD not having been completed and / or recorded for 2024. An Investigation Report for that further breach was sent to Mr Sergides on 08 August 2025. Mr Sergides did not provide any response to this.

Burden and standard of proof

13. The Panel received advice from the Legal Adviser as to the burden and standard of proof. The advice highlighted that RICS is required to prove the allegations to the civil standard; that is, it is more likely than not that any event material to those allegations occurred. This is a fresh hearing, and therefore there is no requirement for the Member to prove anything. The question of whether or not any facts admitted or found proved gave rise to liability to disciplinary action was a matter for the Panel's own judgment.

Preliminary matters

14. Mr Geering, on behalf of RICS, invited the Panel to proceed in the absence of the Member. He submitted that notice of the hearing had been given in accordance with the Regulatory Tribunal Rules as this had been sent by email with more than 56 days' notice. Mr Geering highlighted an email from Mr Sergides within the bundle which he said demonstrated that the email address was active. He submitted that Mr Sergides had chosen to absent himself from the proceedings and that it would not be in the interests of justice to delay matters any further.
15. The Panel received and accepted advice from the Legal Adviser.
16. The Panel noted that the Member had been informed by email on 15 January 2026 of today's hearing and determined that service had been properly effected in accordance with the Rules. Whilst it is not necessary for RICS to show that the notice of the hearing was delivered, only served, the Panel had in mind that a delivery receipt for the email was also contained within the bundle, showing that delivery of the notice had been made.
17. The Panel next considered whether to proceed in the absence of Mr Sergides. It was cautious to exercise this discretion, given the importance of these proceedings and the potential impact upon him. It noted that Mr Sergides had engaged with RICS to reject the decision of the single member, which had resulted – at least in part – in today's hearing taking place; thereafter, he had not engaged. He had not made a request for an adjournment. The Panel had in mind that RICS had made efforts in the lead up to the hearing to contact Mr Sergides by telephone and email without success. This led the Panel to conclude that Mr Sergides had voluntarily absented himself from the proceedings. The Panel was mindful that there would be only limited inconvenience to the RICS by adjourning matters, but it was not satisfied that there would be any useful purpose in adjourning given that Mr Sergides was unlikely to attend on any future occasion. The Panel therefore considered that it was in the interests of justice to proceed in his absence.

Evidence

18. The evidence before the Panel from RICS was unchallenged. It consisted of the statements of four witnesses who produced Mr Sergides's CPD records, details of any hours completed or recorded (zero hours for the 2023 and 2024 years), and confirmation that reminders had been sent to him at the relevant time.

19. The Panel also had sight of an email from Mr Sergides sent on 07 April 2025 in response to being informed that the Single Member had issued a sanction against him for the 2023 breach, where he apologised for failing to meet the required CPD hours, acknowledged the seriousness of his conduct and said he was committed to rectifying the situation.

Findings of fact

20. The Panel received submissions from Mr Geering and advice from the Legal Adviser before retiring to consider its findings of fact.

21. The Panel considered each of the allegations separately.

Allegation 1

22. The Panel noted the evidence from Rohima Akhtar that Mr Sergides had failed to record any hours of CPD for the calendar year 1 January 2023 – 31 December 2023, by 01 January 2024 as required. It took account of the CPD record produced, and the evidence from Kieron Cathcart that six reminder emails had been sent between 15 November 2023 and 13 March 2024 to all members who had CPD outstanding and for whom there was an email address recorded. One hard copy letter was also sent to Mr Sergides in mid-April 2024. It considered the other evidence in the case which demonstrated that there was an email address held on system for Mr Sergides and that he had communicated with RICS from this address. The Panel was therefore satisfied that he had received these reminders.

23. The Panel had in mind the advice from the Legal Adviser that this allegation was to be considered afresh. However, it noted an email within the bundle sent to Mr Sergides to notify him of the decision of the single member. In response to this email, Mr Sergides apologised for not completing the CPD records and acknowledged the seriousness of his actions. The Panel considered that this was an acceptance that he was in breach of his obligations regarding CPD for the 2023 calendar year.

24. The Panel was mindful that this acceptance was not determinative of the facts and that it was required to carry out its own assessment of the evidence; however, in light of that set out above, it considered that the acceptance simply lent further weight to the evidence produced by the RICS.

25. In all the circumstances, and having regard to all of the available evidence, the Panel was satisfied that Allegation 1 was proved, in relation to the failure to complete and record the CPD. The Panel considered that it was more likely than not, that Mr Sergides had not completed the CPD, rather than simply failed to record it. Having been notified of the decision of the single member, Mr Sergides did not take any steps to evidence any CPD completed and said: *'I am committed to rectifying the situation immediately by updating the CPD portal with the required details and completing the necessary 20 hours of CPD.'* The reference to needing to complete the 20 hours of CPD was highly suggestive of the fact that these remained outstanding as out the date of his email on 07 April 2025.

1. 'Between 1 January 2023 and 1 February 2024, 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.'

Contrary to Rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of Conduct effective from 2 February 2022

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

Found proved in relation to the failure to complete and record.

Allegation 2

26. The Panel noted the evidence from Koli Khatun that Mr Sergides had failed to record any hours of CPD for the calendar year 1 January 2024 – 31 December 2025, by 01 January 2024 as required. It took account of the CPD record produced, and the evidence from Damian Mckeown that three reminder emails had been sent between 13 November 2024 and 15 January 2025 to all members who had CPD outstanding and for whom there was an email address recorded. It considered the other evidence in the case which demonstrated that there was an email address held on system for Mr Sergides and that he had communicated with RICS from this address. The Panel was therefore satisfied that he had received these reminders. There had been no response from Mr Sergides to this allegation.
27. In all the circumstances, and having regard to all of the available evidence, the Panel was satisfied that Allegation 2 was proved, in relation to the failure to complete and record the CPD. The Panel considered that it was more likely than not, that Mr Sergides had not completed the CPD, rather than simply failed to record it.

2. 'Between 1 January 2024 and 1 February 2025, 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.'

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct effective from 2 February 2022

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

Found proved in relation to the failure to complete and record.

Liability to disciplinary action

28. Based on the facts found proved, the Panel was required to determine whether or not Mr Sergides was liable to disciplinary action. The Panel received submissions from Mr

Geering, on behalf of RICS, that the conduct alleged, if found proved, would significantly damage public confidence in the profession.

29. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that the decision is one for the Panel's independent judgement, drawing upon the facts found proved; that a finding of fact does not automatically lead to liability to disciplinary action; and that account must be taken of the seriousness of the conduct and the context in which it occurred. It had in mind that the question of liability was not something that could be admitted or denied and was a question for the Panel exercising its own judgement.
30. The Panel noted that the breaches were a significant departure from what would ordinarily be expected of a professional. When considering Rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of Conduct (Global), the Panel considered that these were serious breaches. The Rules state:

Rule 1: 'Members and firms must be honest, act with integrity and comply with their professional obligations, including obligations to RICS.'

Rule 2: 'Members and firms must maintain their professional competence and ensure that services are provided by competent individuals who have the necessary expertise.'
31. The failure to complete and record CPD in 2024 occurred at a time when Mr Sergides was already under 'investigation' for similar failures in 2023. The Panel noted that his CPD record showed that he had successfully completed and recorded CPD in the years 2013 – 2019 which suggested that he was aware of his obligations and was able to comply with them.
32. The Panel considered that the behaviour had the potential to significantly undermine public confidence in the profession and in the RICS. The CPD requirements were important; they are in place to ensure that Members of the profession stay up to date with their professional obligations, which in turn, serves to protect the public. The need to record CPD was important to ensure that members can demonstrate they have addressed any development needs, and to ensure that that RICS can access these records to allow it to sample them for review. Mr Sergides had been sent multiple reminders about his outstanding CPD and yet had not taken any or any sufficient steps to address this.
33. Accordingly, the Panel concluded that the conduct found proved means Mr Sergides is liable to disciplinary action.

Submissions by RICS Presenting Officer

34. Mr Geering addressed the Panel on sanction. He invited the Panel to have regard to the aggravating and mitigating factors in this case and submitted that the primary aggravating feature was the repetitive failures.
35. Mr Geering directed the Panel to paragraph 21 which says that in the absence of extenuating circumstances, a third breach of Rule 6 of the Rules of Conduct for Members within 10 years of receipt of a caution for a breach of the same Rule, is likely to result in a Disciplinary Panel making a decision to expel a Member.

Decision as to sanction

36. The Panel accepted the legal advice and had regard to the sanctions policy. It first considered the seriousness of the breach, as per the sanctions guidance. It considered that the following factors as set out in section 7 were relevant in determining the seriousness of the breach:
- a. (h) Level of experience in practice
 - b. (k) Repeated or ongoing breach
 - c. (l) The length of time over which the breach occurred
 - d. (m) The number or frequency of the breaches
 - e. (p) Whether previous advice or warnings about risks, conduct or practice had been ignored
 - f. (u) any admission and / or regret expressed
37. The Panel then considered the aggravating and mitigating factors present in this case. It considered that the matter was significantly aggravated by the fact that this is the fourth and fifth breach of the CPD requirements, particularly because the fifth breach occurred at the time when Mr Sergides was being investigated for the fourth breach.
38. The Panel carefully considered the email from Mr Sergides in April 2025 where he had expressed regret in respect of the 2023 breach. However, the Panel had in mind that despite Mr Sergides asserting that he would take remedial action, there was no evidence that he had done. The Panel also had in mind that Mr Sergides has been in practice for many years and that there is evidence that he properly completed and recorded CPD between 2013 – 2019 and so would be aware of both the need to complete CPD, and also how to complete the record.
39. The Panel noted that the previous cautions imposed had not served to deter Mr Sergides from repeating the conduct. It was therefore concerned that there was no real insight into the seriousness of his conduct.
40. The Panel considered that all these matters aggravated the facts that it had found proved.
41. Regarding mitigating factors, Mr Sergides had expressed regret and remorse in respect of his actions leading to allegation 1 and this mitigated his conduct.
42. The Panel noted that, aside from the previous breaches of the CPD requirements, there was no other disciplinary history, and this was the first time Mr Sergides had been before a Disciplinary Panel.
43. The Panel had in mind that a finding of liability to disciplinary action does not automatically lead to sanction, but it determined that given the seriousness of the conduct it had found proved, a sanction was required to protect the public and uphold the public interest.
44. The Panel next considered the sanctions available in ascending order of seriousness. It first considered the imposition of a caution but had in mind that two cautions had been issued

previously, seemingly without any deterrent effect. The Panel was of the view that a further caution would be inappropriate considering the seriousness of a fourth and fifth breach.

45. It next considered a reprimand. It noted the reference in the sanctions policy that a reprimand may be appropriate where there was a risk of harm to the public. However, the Panel was unable to conclude that a reprimand would be a sufficient means of marking the seriousness of the breaches found proved. It also took the view that a reprimand was unlikely to have a deterrent effect, given the presence of the previous cautions.
46. The Panel considered undertakings but did not think these were appropriate or workable in the circumstances of this case. There has been extremely limited engagement by Mr Sergides and there was no indication that he would be prepared to abide by undertakings. To impose undertakings would be to formally require Mr Sergides to do something which he is already required to do under the Rules of Conduct. Undertakings would therefore be disproportionate and in any event, were insufficient to mark the seriousness of the conduct.
47. The Panel considered the imposition of a fine. It did not consider that this sanction would adequately mark the seriousness of the breaches, considering this being conduct which had been repeated on five occasions. It noted that Mr Sergides had been fined before for a breach of his CPD obligations and whilst the fine had been paid, it had not had a sufficient deterrent effect, given the conduct complained of had been repeated.
48. The Panel next considered conditions but took the view that conditions were neither workable nor appropriate, given the seriousness of the conduct found proved and the lack of engagement by Mr Sergides.
49. The Panel therefore moved to consider expulsion. It noted that the Sanctions Policy indicated that expulsion was the presumption in cases of this type. The Panel was particularly troubled by the repetitive nature of the breaches in relatively close succession, which it felt significantly increased the seriousness of the conduct. The Panel was mindful that standards of the profession must be upheld and that public confidence in the profession is severely undermined by professionals failing to meet their CPD requirements. It had determined that the CPD had neither been completed nor recorded and there was no evidence before the Panel that Mr Sergides had taken any steps to remedy this shortfall. The Panel did not have any information from Mr Sergides, absent the single email from April 2025. Whilst Mr Sergides had apologised and expressed remorse in this email, he has not engaged with the proceedings since, despite having ample opportunity to do so. Mr Sergides has not provided any response to allegation 2. The Panel could not be satisfied in the circumstances that there was any insight displayed, and it concluded that there was a high risk of repetition.
50. The Panel was unable to identify any exceptional circumstances to depart from the presumption of expulsion. In any event it had considered each lesser sanction available and concluded that none of those was appropriate given the seriousness of the facts found proved.
51. The Panel therefore determined to expel Mr Sergides from the membership.

Publication and Costs

Publication

52. The Panel considered the policy on publication of decisions contained in the Sanctions Policy Supplement 3 – Publication of Regulatory Disciplinary Matters. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Panel was unable to identify any reason to depart from the presumption that decisions will be published on the RICS website. The Panel considered that publication of decisions was necessary to uphold the reputation of the profession. There was nothing exceptional in this case which would amount to a good reason not to publish, and the Panel took the view that it was necessary to publish the findings and the sanction imposed, in the usual manner.

Costs

53. RICS applied for its costs totalling £3,405.00 supported by a schedule of costs.

54. The costs figure represented a contribution towards the costs incurred by RICS in preparation for the hearing and the hearing itself. The Panel had no reason to doubt that the costs application was a fair and reasonable one to make and the costs were proportionate. The Panel noted that the costs of the decision of the Single Member had been removed from the schedule and these were not claimed by the RICS.

55. The Panel then considered whether it was fair and reasonable for Mr Sergides to pay those costs. It did not have any information before it as to his means. The Panel was mindful that if it did not order the payment of costs, these would fall on the profession as a whole. It therefore concluded that it was appropriate for Mr Sergides to pay the costs of bringing this case.

56. The Panel therefore ordered that Mr Sergides pays costs in the sum of £3,405.00 to RICS within 28 days.

Appeal Period

57. Mr Sergides may appeal to an Appeal Panel against this decision within 28 days of notification of this decision, in accordance with Rule 152 of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules.