



## **SINGLE MEMBER OF THE REGULATORY TRIBUNAL DECISION SHEET**

**RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2024**

**Part VI, Regulatory Tribunal Single Member Decision**

**Regulated Member: Thanmai Kalyanam**

**Single Member Decision of: Jane Bishop**

**Case Number: CON004859**

**Date of Decision: 2 March 2026**

### **CHARGE**

The formal charge against the Regulated Member (Mr Kalyanam) is:

*“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 and/or recorded, or caused to be recorded, at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal.”*

### **ALLEGED RULE/S BREACH**

Bye-Law 5.2.2 provides: “A Member may be liable to disciplinary action under these Bye-Laws, whether or not he was a Member at the time of the occurrence giving rise to that liability, by reason of:

*“... (c) a failure to adhere to these Bye-Laws or to Regulations or Rules governing Members’ conduct; ...”*

Mr Kalyanam has contravened Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct for Members 2021 requiring Members to be honest, act with integrity and comply with their professional obligations, including obligations to RICS. Appendix A to the Rules

of Conduct for Members contain Members' professional obligations to RICS. Professional obligation 1 is *"Members must comply with the CPD requirements set by RICS."*

Mr Kalyanam is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c).

## **MATERIALS CONSIDERED**

I have had regard to the RICS' bundle of documents consisting of 30 pages.

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The Rules of Conduct for Members 2021 *"...provide a structure for making ethical decisions about how to behave as a professional..."*.<sup>1</sup> Appendix A sets out the core professional obligations of Members and states *"Members must comply with the CPD requirements set by RICS."*<sup>2</sup>
2. RICS' CPD requirements are:
  - i. all Members must undertake a minimum of 20 CPD hours each calendar year (January to December);
  - ii. of the 20 CPD hours at least 10 hours must be formal CPD. The remaining hours can be informal CPD;
  - iii. all Members must maintain a relevant and current understanding of the professional and ethical standards during a rolling three-year period. Any learning undertaken to meet this requirement may count as formal CPD; and
  - iv. Members must record their CPD activity online by 31 January.
3. In some circumstances, Members can request RICS to grant them an exemption of their CPD requirements.
4. RICS' CPD requirements and obligations documentation sets out what happens if a Member fails to complete and/or record their CPD requirements. A Member's first breach will attract a Fixed Penalty caution and will remain on the Member's disciplinary record for a period of ten years. A Member's second breach (within ten years of the receipt of a

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 3 of the Introduction of the Rules of Conduct for Member 2021.

<sup>2</sup> Professional obligations to RICS number 1.

caution) attracts a Fixed Penalty caution and a fine. A Member's third breach (within ten years of the receipt of a caution) attracts the potential to be referred to a Single Member of the Regulatory Tribunal which may result in the Member being expelled from RICS Membership and costs being awarded against them.

5. Rohima Akhtar's (RICS Regulatory Support and CPD Officer) statement dated 16 January 2026, states Mr Kalyanam became a RICS Member on 29 July 2019, he was not granted a CPD concession (exemption) for 2024 and his relevant recorded CPD hours were as follows:

Year	Formal Hours	Informal Hours	Total CPD hours recorded
2019	151	0	151
2020	0	0	0
2021	37.5	2	39.5
2022	22.5	0	0 <sup>3</sup>
2023	0	0	0
2024	0	0	0

6. Rohima Akhtar's statement was consistent with the relevant RICS' records, except Mr Kalyanam's total CPD hours in 2022 was 22.5 hours. I note Mr Kalyanam recorded one (1) planned formal CPD hours in 2023.
7. Whether Mr Kalyanam did or did not complete 20 CPD hours in 2024 is unknown. However, Mr Kalyanam did not record 20 CPD hours in 2024 and I find he has contravened Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct for Members 2021.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

8. Based on the evidence before me, I find the charge against Mr Kalyanam has been proved on the balance of probabilities.

## **LIABILITY FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

9. Mr Kalyanam completed and recorded his CPD requirements in 2019, 2021 and 2022. He did not record at least 20 CPD hours in 2020 and Rohima Akhtar states he was cautioned for his first breach. He did not record at least 20 CPD hours in 2023 and Rohima Akhtar states Mr Kalyanam was cautioned and fined for his second breach. RICS' records

---

<sup>3</sup> Mr Kalyanam completed a total of 22.5 CPD hours in 2022.

indicate Mr Kalyanam's 2024/2025 RICS' membership fees and fine were paid.

10. Mr Kalyanam became a RICS Member on 29 July 2019 and he has undertaken and recorded his CPD hours in 2019, 2021 and 2022. I am satisfied Mr Kalyanam is, and was, aware of his ongoing CPD requirements. Those requirements are not onerous and should have been incorporated into his professional activities.
11. I am satisfied the RICS requirement to complete and record 20 hours of CPD each year is reasonable. The CPD policy has been approved by RICS' Standards and Regulatory Board. The Rules of Conduct for Members and Members' professional obligations require Members to meet RICS' CPD requirements and a single breach can give rise to a liability to disciplinary action. The purpose of ongoing CPD is, in part, to ensure public protection by consistent standards within the profession and RICS Members have current knowledge in their area of expertise. RICS Members demonstrate compliance with their CPD requirements by recording their CPD activities online by 31 January following the CPD year.
12. Members of RICS agree to adhere to RICS' Rules, Regulations and Bye-Laws and accept that failure to do so could give rise to disciplinary action.
13. I am satisfied Mr Kalyanam is liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c).

## **REGULATORY SANCTION**

14. The purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect. Their purpose is to uphold the standards of a profession, safeguard the reputation of the profession and, RICS as the regulator, to protect the public. Sanctions must be proportionate to the breach after considering all the circumstances of a case.
15. Damian Mckeown's (Regulation Support Team Manager) statement dated 16 January 2026 states RICS sent emails to Mr Kalyanam on 13 November 2024, 11 December 2024, 15 January 2025, 19 February 2025, 26 February 2025 and 12 March 2025 reminding him to complete and record at least 20 CPD hours. Those reminders referred to RICS' Sanctions Policy and the likelihood of expulsion for a third breach within 10 years.

16. On 19 January 2026, RICS sent Mr Kalyanam an email informing him that a report had been prepared for the Head of Regulation to decide whether the matter should be referred to a Single Member. Mr Kalyanam was provided with the bundle of evidence, schedule of costs, invited to complete and return the listing questionnaire, invited to complete and return a statement of means and invited to respond to the allegation. Microsoft Office provided a notice on 19 January 2026 that delivery to the recipient was complete, but Mr Kalyanam did not respond. On 24 February 2026, RICS sent an email to Mr Kalyanam confirming that no response had been received and that his case had now been prepared for consideration by a Single Member.<sup>4</sup> Microsoft Office provided a notice on 24 February 2026 that delivery to the recipient was complete.
17. Mr Kalyanam is responsible for ensuring his preferred contact details are up to date on the RICS' database. I do not know if Mr Kalyanam received RICS' emails, but I have found he was aware of his RICS' CDP requirements. This is Mr Kalyanam's third breach of non-compliance with RICS' CPD requirements and, as a Member of RICS, he is obligated to abide by RICS' rules. Despite being cautioned and cautioned and fined ( a fine that Mr Kalyanam has paid) he has failed to record his CPD activities in 2024.
18. The breach is serious and RICS' Sanction Policy (Version 9 with effect from 2 February 2022) states there is a presumption of expulsion in the event of a third CPD breach within 10 years of receipt of a caution for a breach of the same rule. In the circumstances, imposing no sanction, another caution, fine or a reprimand would not be appropriate given the seriousness of the breach. Nor would an undertaking be appropriate given compliance with RICS' CPD requirements is a Member's professional obligation.
19. Mr Kalyanam has not engaged with the regulatory process and was on notice of the likelihood of expulsion. He has had ample opportunities to rectify his non-compliance but did not do so. Considering all the

---

<sup>4</sup> I note the Head of Regulation letter dated 23 February 2026 incorrectly stated the referral to a Single Member was made under RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules Version 2. However, the bundle of documents and emails sent to Mr Kalyanam made it clear the matter would be determined under RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules Version 3 and he was provided links to that document. I am satisfied Mr Kalyanam was afforded procedural fairness and was not disadvantaged by this error.

circumstances of this case, I am not satisfied the presumption of expulsion for a third breach of RICS' CPD requirements has been rebutted.

## **ORDER MADE**

20. In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2024 Version 3 – Rule 107(f)(i) I make the following order:

- i. Mr Kalyanam is expelled from the Membership of RICS.**

## **TAKING EFFECT OF ORDER**

21. In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2024 Version 3, this order will take effect 14 days from service of this decision upon Mr Kalyanam, unless notification in writing is received from Mr Kalyanam or RICS stating that they consider that the findings and/or the Regulatory Sanction imposed by me is wrong.

## **COSTS**

22. RICS has applied for costs in accordance with Supplement 2 to the Sanctions Policy: Fines, Costs and Administrative Fees. Mr Kalyanam was found liable to disciplinary action and despite being invited to do so he has made no submissions regarding his financial circumstances.

23. To ensure the cost of bringing these proceedings do not burden the whole RICS Membership, it is appropriate Mr Kalyanam bear RICS' reasonable costs.

24. In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2024 Version 3, I make the following order in respect to costs:

- ii. Mr Kalyanam will pay RICS' costs of £350.**

## **PUBLICATION**

25. In accordance with Part V of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2024 Version 3, this decision will be published in accordance with the Publication Policy. That is, following the expiry of 14 days from service of this decision upon Mr Kalyanam.