

Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Case of

Ka Hing WONG [6956492]

On

Wednesday 9 September 2026

At

By Video conference

Panel

Emma Moir (Chair, Lay)

Mark Griffin (RICS Member)

Nicola Hill (Lay Member)

Legal Advisor

Chris Hamlet

RICS Representative

Sanna Chaudry

Registrant Representative

Not present and not represented

Hearing Officer

Jae Berry

The formal charges are:

1. The charges against Mr Wong are as follows:

1. On or about 2 February 2024, Mr Ka Hing Wong acted dishonestly by submitting a formal Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) Submission to RICS, intending to present it as his own original work, when he knew it had been written in large part by another.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the RICS Global Rules of Conduct with effect from 2 February 2022

Mr Wong is therefore liable to disciplinary action pursuant to RICS Bye-law 5.2.2 (c)

2. On or about 2 February 2024, Mr Ka Hing Wong acted without integrity by submitting a formal Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) Submission to RICS, intending to present it as his own original work, when he knew it had been written in large part by another.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the RICS Global Rules of Conduct with effect from 2 February 2022

Mr Wong is therefore liable to disciplinary action pursuant to RICS Bye-law 5.2.2 (c)

Proceeding in absence:

3. The Panel convened to consider whether to proceed with the hearing in Mr Wong's absence. It considered a statement from Ms Jae Berry dated 19 August 2026 in

which she confirmed that on 30 June 2026, Mr Wong had been served notice of the Hearing by email in accordance with Rule 53 of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules.

4. The Panel also considered a written application by Ms Chaudry, on behalf of RICS, dated 7 September 2026, to proceed in Mr Wong's absence, together with a correspondence bundle of 28 pages.
5. The Panel noted in particular that Mr Wong provided a response to RICS on 31 August 2026 in which he acknowledged the hearing date and stated:

"Please accept this reply and the details below as my ultimate denial of the charges."

6. After setting out his response to the specific charges, Mr Wong stated:

"I respectfully request that the Disciplinary Panel review these facts and dismiss the charges. Accordingly, I will not further respond to your email or any enquiry."

7. On 1 September 2026, RICS emailed Mr Wong inviting him to confirm that he did not intend to attend the hearing and requesting he return the Listing Questionnaire and confirm whether he agreed the witness statements of Mr Amandeep Singh, RICS Lead Investigator. No response was received.
8. The Panel was directed by the Legal Advisor to Rule 53 of the Rules regarding the requirements of Notice and Rule 81 of the Rules, which provides:

"... a Panel may proceed in the absence of the Regulated Member or Applicant provided it is satisfied that relevant notification as required by these Rules has been

given and the Panel is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, having considered the public interest and the rights of the parties.”

9. The Panel was also directed to the cases of GMC v Adeogba and GMC v Visvardis [2016] EWCA Civ 162 R v Jones (Anthony) [2003] AC 1, HL and Tsolo v NMC [2025] EWHC 2324 (Admin). It was advised that a decision to proceed in the absence of the member is one to be exercised with caution, taking account of the features of the case and the reason(s) for the absence. It was reminded that there is an obligation on professional members to maintain an effective address for correspondence and to cooperate with their regulators. The Regulator is required to take reasonable efforts to ensure members are aware of the hearing – not every conceivable effort.

10. In respect of proceeding in absence, the Panel was advised that key factors to consider include:

- Any reason for the absence
- Whether the absence is voluntary or the product of an intervening factor beyond their control
- The impact of an adjournment on the case, including on any witnesses
- Whether the hearing can be heard fairly in the absence of the member
- Whether an adjournment would secure the attendance of the member at a later date
- The length and effect of a delay
- The nature of the allegations and urgency in determining the issues

11. The Panel considered the following features to be relevant to its determination:

- The Registrant has engaged with the RICS investigation since September 2024 and taken the opportunity to respond to the allegations.
- Notice of the hearing has been sent to Mr Wong's preferred email address
- Mr Wong has responded directly to that Notice.
- Mr Wong's most recent communication with RICS, on 31 August 2026, made express reference to the hearing, set out a denial of the allegations and gave a clear indication that he did not wish to engage further with the proceedings.
- The allegations are serious and require determination without delay

12. The Panel was satisfied that Mr Wong was aware of the hearing, had made a clear decision not to engage with it other than through his written submissions, and that no substantive unfairness arose as a product of proceeding in his absence. Accordingly, it directed that it was appropriate to proceed in Mr Wong's absence.

Factual Background

13. The Panel was referred to a Case Summary, produced on behalf of RICS, which set out a chronology of events and referred to relevant material within a 280-page bundle.
14. Mr Wong, who is based in Hong Kong, was enrolled as a candidate member of RICS on 12 October 2022. In order to become a chartered member, Mr Wong had to complete an assessment of professional competence ("APC") which included a written submissions and a case study.
15. Mr Wong's final submission, submitted on 2 February 2024, was subjected by RICS to plagiarism detection software "Turnitin", which identified a 42% similarity with other sources and previous submissions by other candidates. In particular, there were similarities with the papers submitted by a Mr Yip and Mr Mun.

16. On 20 August 2024, Mr Wong was asked to respond to two comparison tables that demonstrated those similarities. He responded on 29 September 2024 by stating that he did not know Mr Yip or Mr Mun and had not seen or copied their submissions. His only comment to each similarity on the comparison table was:

“Content guided and modified by consultant”.

17. When subsequently asked to clarify the comment, Mr Wong refused.

18. In January and February 2025, Mr Yip and Mr Mun confirmed to RICS that they had no connection with Mr Wong and denied sharing their submissions with him.

19. On 1 May 2025, Mr Wong was again asked to provide the name of the organisation that had assisted him with his submission and he responded that he had used an ‘online assistant’ who had not responded to him after he raised the issue of the suspected plagiarism with them.

20. In January 2026, Mr Wong was sent an allegation letter by RICS. He responded on 24 February 2026 to confirm he had no further comment to make.

21. Mr Wong’s most recent correspondence with RICS, on 31 August 2026, was in the form of written submissions on the allegations. He expressly denied them, stating that the content of his submissions in support of the APC were based on:

“My real, first hand experiences in the project management and engineering fields over the last 15 years”

“A real-world case study and project that I personally commissioned and managed at the Laguna Verde property during the Covid-19 period.”

22. He specifically addressed the apparent similarities in his submissions between those of Mr Yip and Mr Mun. He attributed those similarities, respectively, to “natural and systemic coincidence” given that the companies in question follow “the exact same...operational guidelines...” and to the fact he shared “the same engineering background....level of industry experience and a similar ranking as a Technical Manager for facilities and property management”.
23. Accordingly, he maintained that his submission was his own original work based on his own professional career.
24. It was submitted on behalf of RICS by Ms Chaudry that rather than copying the work of Mr Yip and and Mr Mun directly, Mr Wong had ‘outsourced’ his submission to an unnamed third party who had themselves plagiarised the document.
25. Ms Chaudry submitted that whether or not Mr Wong knew the final submission had been substantially plagiarised, he did now, or ought to have known that it was not his own work.

Law

26. The Legal Advisor reminded the Panel that the burden of proving disputed allegations rests with RICS. The standard of proof is the civil standard.
27. The Panel was advised that it should take account of all material produced in the case, that is, in the bundle produced by RICS, as well the recent submissions made by the Registrant in response.
28. As regards the issue of dishonesty, the Panel was directed to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67, [2018] 3WLR 1212 SC (E).

The essential test concerns the determination of a) the Registrant's actual state of knowledge and then b) whether the conduct was objectively honest or dishonest given that knowledge.

29. As regards the issue of integrity, the Panel was directed to the case of *Malins v SRA* [2018] EWCA Civ 366. It was advised that integrity is conceptually distinct from dishonesty and could include a failure to make due enquiry into matters that would be expected of a member of the profession.

Panel Determination on Facts

30. The Panel carefully considered the allegations as framed by RICS. It noted that the wording of the charges did not require proof of plagiarism, only knowledge that the APC submission had 'been written in large part by another'. However, in order to establish dishonesty and/or a lack of integrity, the Panel took the view that it should determine whether:

- a. the submission had been plagiarised; and
- b. Mr Wong knew or ought to have known that the *content* of the submission did not reflect his own work.

31. The Panel took account of the fact that Mr Wong had consistently referred to having sought assistance from a third party for the creation of the submission.

32. The Panel took further note of the clear evidence of significant similarities between the content of the submission with the prior submissions of Mr Yip and Mr Mun. The Panel rejected Mr Wong's assertions that the similarities arose from coincidence and/or shared industry experience and were satisfied instead that it was the product of plagiarism.

33. The Panel was also satisfied that Mr Wong would have read and did read the submission before it was sent to RICS. It was evident that he had edited aspects of the content, including personal details, and was accordingly more likely than not to have reviewed the entire document before submission. In that context, the Panel was satisfied that Mr Wong would have known and did know that the plagiarised content did not reflect his own experience.

34. Accordingly, the Panel determined that it was more likely than not that:

- a. Mr Wong outsourced the content of the submission in whole or part to a third party;
- b. The content was the product of significant plagiarism; and
- c. Mr Wong knew the content did not reflect his own work.

35. It concluded that in presenting this document as reflecting his own original work, Mr Wong acted:

- a. Dishonestly; and
- b. Without integrity.

Liability to Disciplinary Action

36. The Panel was advised that having found the allegations proved, it should consider whether the conduct was of a nature and seriousness that warranted formal action on registration. Account should be taken of the member's response to the allegations since they arose, including any steps taken to remedy the conduct.

37. The Panel was reminded that dishonesty and/or a lack of integrity by a member of the profession is a serious matter that strikes at the heart of public trust. The Panel was directed to Paragraph 1.1 of the Rules of Conduct, dated October 2021:

Members and firms do not mislead others by their actions or omissions, or by being complicit in the actions or omissions of others

38. The Panel took account of the further submissions by Ms Chaudry on this issue. It noted in particular her submission that Mr Wong's conduct was motivated by a desire to bypass the proper assessment process and served to undermine the integrity of the admissions process for joining RICS.

39. The Panel was satisfied that the dishonesty and lack of integrity proved in this instance had the potential to undermine public trust and confidence in the profession. It was particularly concerned that this occurred in the context of an application for professional membership and the implications that had for the integrity of the process had the plagiarism not been identified.

40. It noted that Mr Wong had denied the allegations and had not acknowledged any wrongdoing or made any attempt to reflect on or remedy it.

41. The Panel concluded that action on Mr Wong's registration was warranted in order to restore public trust and confidence and to uphold standards of conduct across the profession as a whole.

Sanction

42. The Panel was directed by the Legal Advisor to the Sanction Policy, Version 9, with effect from 2 February 2022. This provides for general considerations at the sanction stage including:

- The need to ensure any sanction is proportionate to the conduct in question
- The need to act in the public interest rather than to punish the individual member

43. The Sanctions Policy directs that the Panel must consider aggravating and mitigating features before determining the appropriate sanction.

44. The Panel considered the following features of the case aggravated the conduct proved:

- The dishonesty/lack of integrity occurred in the context of an application for chartered membership and was therefore motivated by the prospect of career advancement and personal gain
- The member had denied the allegations and failed to take any steps to acknowledge or remedy the conduct
- The member had provided no evidence of insight or remorse into the seriousness of the allegations
- The member had failed to adequately cooperate with RICS during the investigation, in terms of the timeliness and substance of his responses

45. The Panel considered the following features of the case mitigated the conduct proved:

- No previous disciplinary history

46. The Panel considered the full range of sanctions available to it as set out at Part V, paragraph 14 of the Sanctions Policy.

47. It considered a caution, a reprimand and undertakings to be inappropriate and/or wholly inadequate in view of the gravity and nature of the wrongdoing. Equally, neither a fine nor conditions were considered to reflect the serious nature of dishonesty and a lack of integrity – especially given the absence of any insight or reflection by the Member into the issues.

48. The Panel was most concerned by the nature of Mr Wong’s conduct, the implications it had for public trust and the absence of any evidence that he appreciated its seriousness. It considered expulsion to be the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances.

Costs and publication

49. The Panel was referred by the Legal Advisor to paragraph 92 of the Rules. This provides:

A Panel may make such order for costs against the Regulated Member, Applicant or RICS as it considers fair and reasonable, subject to the requirement that an estimate of costs incurred by a party will ordinarily be served on the other parties at least 24 hours before the hearing.

50. The Panel considered a Schedule of Costs submitted by RICS totalling £7,382.50 for the time spent in the investigation and disciplinary hearing. It noted that this was served on the member by email on 2 September 2026. The Panel considered those costs to be reasonably incurred and could identify no good reason to reduce the figure in view of the member’s denial of the allegations.

51. As regards publication, the Panel was referred to paragraph 94 of the Rules which itself referred to the RICS publication policy. The latter provides, at paragraph 3.2.1, as follows:

There is a presumption in favour of publication of Single Member Decisions and decisions of the Disciplinary and Appeal Panel.

52. Given that the sanction in this case was imposed primarily to restore public trust and confidence and to uphold standards in the profession, the Panel concluded that the presumption in favour of publication should not be disturbed.