

REGISTRATION PANEL HEARING

Friday 17 April 2026, at 0900 hours BST

via Microsoft Teams

Case of

Buddhika Patikiri Mudiyansele

Panel

Amit Jinabhai – Lay Chair

Hilary Lloyd – Lay member

Mark Griffin – Surveyor member

Legal Assessor

Fiona Barnett

RICS Presenting Officer

Sanna Chaudry

Hearing Officer

Maria Choudhury-Rahman

1. The Panel convened to consider Mr Patikiri Mudiyansele's application for re-admission to membership of RICS.
2. Mr Patikiri Mudiyansele [Mr Buddhika] attended and was not represented.

BACKGROUND

3. Mr Buddhika was first registered as a member of RICS in May 2012. He was expelled from RICS membership following the decision of a Single Member on 17 February 2022.
4. The background to the expulsion was that Mr Buddhika failed to meet RICS' requirements in relation to Continuous Professional Development ("CPD") for the 2020 CPD year. This was his third breach of the CPD requirements within a 10 year period. The charge considered by the Single Member was as follows:

Between 1 January 2020 and 1 February 2021, you have failed to comply with RICS requirements in regard 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 Rule 6 of the Rules of Conduct for Members 2007

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

5. The Single Member found the facts alleged proved, and decided that Mr Buddhika was liable to disciplinary action. The Single Member had not been provided with any mitigation from Mr Buddhika. In relation to aggravating factors, the Single Member stated,

"I consider that the following aggravating factors are present.....

- there has been no engagement from the member despite frequent reminders
- the second breach was dealt with by way of caution and a fine which has not been paid
- Mr Patikiri Mudiyansele has been a member since 2013 [sic] and clearly understands the process of recording CPD as hours were successfully recorded in other years

- this is his third breach of the regulation in a period of 6 years”
6. In relation to sanction, the Single Member stated,
- “Having considered all sanctions short of expulsion and determined that none would meet the wider public interest, I conclude and determine that Mr Patikiri Mudiyanseelage should be expelled from RICS membership. I recognise that expulsion is the ultimate sanction and should be reserved for those categories of cases where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. I am satisfied that a case of repeated failures to complete and record CPD hours is such a case. Mr Patikiri Mudiyanseelage has repeatedly failed to comply with the CPD requirements of the profession, and he is not again engaged at all with the process for 2020 nor has he engaged with the investigation and subsequent disciplinary process.”
7. Mr Buddhika now applies for re-admission as a member of RICS by way of his application dated 14 October 2025.
8. Ms Chaudry provided the Panel with a brief summary of the background.
9. She informed the Panel that the issues before the Panel were: whether Mr Buddhika is a fit and proper person to be a member of RICS, and, whether his re-admission is in the best interests of RICS.
10. Ms Chaudry confirmed that Mr Buddhika’s supporter, Mr Chaminda, is a current member of RICS, (MRICS). She also confirmed that Mr Buddhika has paid all necessary fees and outstanding fines.

EVIDENCE

11. In its consideration of this matter, the Panel was provided by RICS with a bundle comprising 26 pages. It also had before it a witness statement from Maria Choudhury-Rahman and exhibits, numbering 16 pages.
12. The bundle included, amongst other matters,
- The decision of the Single Member dated 17 February 2022.
 - A letter of recommendation dated 12 December 2025 from RICS member, Sujith Chaminda.
 - A written submission from Mr Buddhika dated 12 March 2026.

- Confirmation of Mr Buddhika's Master of Science (MSc) post graduate course, and academic transcript.
13. In Mr Buddhika's written submission, he explained that since November 2021, he has been enrolled in a MSc programme in Transportation at the University of Moratuwa (Sri Lanka). He said he has been fully engaged in academic studies and research activities during this period while continuing his professional employment abroad. He stated that due to the demands of balancing his postgraduate studies and professional responsibilities, he was unable to complete and record the required CPD within the stipulated timeframe. Mr Buddhika acknowledged the importance of maintaining CPD, and expressed his regret at not having complied. He asserted that his MSc has significantly contributed to his professional knowledge and competence in the field of transportation and infrastructure, and that he is committed to upholding professional standards in future
 14. Mr Buddhika addressed the Panel during the hearing. He reiterated the information contained in his written submission, and emphasised that his failure to comply with his CPD obligations was not borne out of deliberate negligence, rather, it was a result of his inability to manage his professional and academic responsibilities. Mr Buddhika also referred to many difficulties in his working life in 2020, some of which, he submitted, were related to the Covid 19 pandemic. He also confirmed that he has been working as Chief Quantity Surveyor for the Road and Transport Authority in Dubai since 2015.
 15. Mr Buddhika explained that he was keeping records of his CPD at the time of his CPD failures, but he had not been able to record these to the standards required by RICS. He has now completed his degree, and wishes to be readmitted to RICS membership. He submitted that membership of RICS is vital for him and that he will do whatever is necessary to reinstate his membership.
 16. During questions from the Panel, Mr Buddhika was asked why he did not engage with RICS in relation to his CPD breaches in 2016 and 2019. He said that these matters did not come to his attention. In relation to his 2020 breach, he admitted that he was not giving enough priority to this and that it was a mistake that he regretted.
 17. Mr Buddhika was asked about his plans to contribute to the profession in the future. He told the Panel that there is a well organised arrangement in Dubai for enhancing RICS membership, such as CPD events, and that he has been involved in assisting with mock interviews with APC (Assessment of

Professional Competence) candidates in the past and would like to continue to do so.

18. When asked why it is important to maintain CPD, Mr Buddhika told the Panel that CPD is a lifelong learning process, and that it is important to record it correctly so that it can be assessed by someone.
19. The Panel asked Mr Buddhika about the importance of reflecting on CPD. He said that learning must be reflected, and this is important because it demonstrates you are learning. He also gave the example of how surveyors will come across new methods of measurements and technologies through CPD. He recognised that if you are not learning and recording CPD, you are not maintaining standards, and clients are expecting a high level of service.
20. Mr Buddhika was asked about the risks to the reputation of the profession if members are not maintaining their CPD requirements. He said that this would lead to degraded standards if members are not learning and recording CPD. Clients expect a high level of service, and this will be impacted. He is currently working for the government of Dubai, and there is a high level of regard for RICS there. He submitted that if CPD standards were not maintained, this will have an impact on the reputation of the profession and RICS.
21. In response to being asked what measures he has in place to prevent repetition in future, Mr Buddhika said he is maintaining a schedule and is trying to record his learning every week. He could then import relevant things to the RICS records.
22. Mr Buddhika said that it had been a difficult process to get RICS membership in 2012, and that being expelled reflected a failure in himself. He said that he has taken enough measures to avoid repeating his mistakes, and has assumed a moral responsibility to encouraging newcomers to membership of RICS.

PANEL DECISION

23. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She reminded the Panel, amongst other matters, that the burden is on Mr Buddhika to persuade the Panel that his application for re-admission should be granted. In order to grant the application, the Panel must be satisfied that Mr Buddhika is a both a fit and proper person, and, that his 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.

24. The Panel first considered whether Mr Buddhika is a fit and proper person to be re-admitted to membership of RICS.
25. The Panel had received, and took into account, a letter of recommendation dated 12 December 2025 from RICS member, Sujith Chaminda. Mr Chaminda recommended Mr Buddhika for readmission to the RICS. He confirmed that he was aware of the circumstances surrounding Mr Buddhika's expulsion, however, he was of the view that Mr Buddhika was a suitable candidate for readmission and he supported the application. The Panel found this to be independent evidence of current good character and suitability.
26. The Panel also took into account that Mr Buddhika had confirmed the following in his application for re-admission:
 - There are no criminal convictions recorded against him.
 - There are no pending disciplinary proceedings or adverse findings made against him by a regulatory body in the last 3 years.
 - There is no bankruptcy order in force against him, nor has he been subject to such an order within the last three years.
 - There is no Director's Disqualification Order made against the applicant
27. The Panel also had regard to the steps Mr Buddikha has taken to address the issues for which he was expelled. He told the Panel that he had been undertaking CPD in the 2020 year, but was not recording it properly within the timeframe. He said, and the Panel accepted, that he now maintains a CPD schedule which he updates weekly, albeit this was not provided to the Panel.
28. The Panel also bore in mind that Mr Buddhika has recently completed a MSc degree in Transportation and he has provided evidence of this. The Panel was satisfied that this degree would be likely to constitute considerable CPD and learning undertaken since Mr Buddhika's expulsion.
29. During his address to the Panel, and when answering Panel questions, Mr Buddhika accepted responsibility for all of his CPD failures and said that he had not made CPD his priority. He admitted that this was a mistake, and expressed his regret for this. He recognised that completing and recording CPD was a "moral responsibility to society", and that his failures to complete and record it as required would degrade the service he was able to provide to his clients who expect a high standard of service. The Panel found his responses on these issues to be credible and it accepted them.

30. The Panel's view was that when questioned by the Panel, Mr Buddhika addressed the matters which led to his expulsion in a more expansive and thoughtful way than he had in his written submission. The Panel found Mr Buddhika's written submission to be somewhat limited in its scope, but it acknowledged that he is unrepresented in these proceedings and is likely to have had less understanding of how to approach such a submission than an applicant who has legal representation.
31. The Panel accepted that Mr Buddhika now understands the seriousness of his misconduct, has taken steps to remedy it going forwards, and understands how his conduct could impact on both his clients and the reputation of the profession. The Panel was satisfied that Mr Buddhika has insight into the wider impact of his failures.
32. Having considered the matters above, the Panel concluded that Mr Buddhika is a fit and proper person to be re-admitted to membership of RICS.
33. The Panel next considered whether re-admitting Mr Buddhika to membership would be in the best interests of RICS.
34. It had regard to the seriousness of the behaviour which led to his expulsion, and found that the misconduct which led to the expulsion was serious. Mr Buddhika had failed on three separate occasions to comply with his CPD obligations, had not paid a fine, and had not engaged with RICS in relation to these breaches. The Panel however acknowledged that there is a spectrum of seriousness of misconduct, and was satisfied that the misconduct in this case was not so serious that it must, of itself, preclude Mr Buddhika from being re-admitted to membership of RICS.
35. It is now just over 4 years since Mr Buddhika was expelled, and some 6 years since the misconduct which led to Mr Buddhika's expulsion. The Panel found that this was sufficient time for Mr Buddhika to reflect on his failures, to recognise why his actions had led to his expulsion, and to put in place meaningful measures to support future compliance with his CPD obligations.
36. The Panel considered whether Mr Buddhika had insight into his failures to maintain his CPD obligations. As set out above, Mr Buddhika acknowledged in his written submission that he understood the importance of CPD and regretted his failures in this regard. The Panel found that his insight into these matters developed during the hearing, and has expanded and improved when he was answering questions put to him by the Panel. The Panel was satisfied, as stated in its reasoning above, that he now understands the seriousness of his

misconduct, and recognises its wider implications for his clients and the reputation of the profession. The Panel accepted Mr Buddhika's assertions that he recognised that if lifelong learning and recording of CPD did not happen, then clients would not get the high level of service they expect. Overall, the Panel was satisfied that Mr Buddhika had sufficient insight into his failures.

37. The Panel next considered the risk of re-occurrence. In assessing this risk, the Panel took account of the insight shown by Mr Buddhika and his understanding of the seriousness of his failures. It also bore in mind that he has been through the process of expulsion and its consequences, which the Panel determined has been a salutary lesson for him. Mr Buddhika also told the Panel that he has been assisting APC candidates with mock interviews and that he would like to continue doing so if he was re-admitted to RICS membership. In the Panel's view, this was indicative of his commitment to RICS. He also now has a schedule of recording his CPD, which should mitigate the risk of repetition.
38. For these reasons, the Panel was satisfied that the risk of Mr Buddhika repeating his failures to comply with RICS rules was minimal, such as to be negligible.
39. The Panel also considered the reputational effect upon the profession if Mr Buddhika was re-admitted to membership. It had regard to his expressed willingness to assist APC candidates in the future, which has the potential to benefit other professionals. It also took into account his insight, good character, and the postgraduate education that he has undertaken in the intervening years since his expulsion.
40. The Panel could identify no damage to the reputation of the profession if Mr Buddhika was re-admitted. Overall, it concluded that re-admitting him to membership would uphold all aspects of the public interest.
41. In light of the above, the Panel concluded that Mr Buddhika is a fit and proper person to be re-admitted to membership, and that his re-admission would be in the best interests of RICS.
42. **Mr Buddhika's application for re-admission is therefore granted**

COSTS

43. No application for costs was made.

PUBLICATION

44. Ms Chaudry submitted that there is no justification to depart from the principles regarding publicity.
45. Mr Buddhika submitted that he had no objection to the publication of this decision and accepted that this is part of the process.
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.