BEFORE THE ARIZONA STATE

BOARD OF TECHNICAL REGISTRATION

б

IĮ

In the Matter of:

Stephen Francy, R.A. Registration No. 63522

IPS Engineers and Architects
Firm Registration No. 20164
Respondents

Case No. P18-040

CONSENT AGREEMENT and ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

In the interest of a prompt and judicious resolution of the above-captioned matter before the Arizona State Board of Technical Registration ("Board") and consistent with the public interest, statutory requirements, and the responsibilities of the Board, and pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-101 et seq., and A.A.C. R4-30-120(G), the undersigned party, Stephen Franey ("Respondent"), holder of Registration No. 63522, IPS Engineers and Architects ("Respondent Firm"), holder of Registration No. 20164, and the Board enter into the following Recitals, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement") as a final disposition of this matter.

RECITALS

- 1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and has had the opportunity to discuss this Consent Agreement with an attorney, or has waived the opportunity to discuss this Consent Agreement with an attorney.
- 2. Respondent understands that he has a right to a public administrative hearing concerning this case. He further acknowledges that at such formal hearing he could present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. By entering into this Consent Agreement, Respondent knowingly, voluntarily, and irrevocably waives his right to such an administrative hearing, as well as rights of rehearing, review, reconsideration, appeal, judicial review or any other administrative

Į į

and/or judicial action concerning the matters set forth herein.

- 3. Respondent affirmatively agrees that this Consent Agreement shall be irrevocable.
- 4. Respondent understands that this Consent Agreement or any part of the agreement may be considered in any future disciplinary action by the Board against him.
- 5. The Consent Agreement, any record prepared in this matter, all investigative materials prepared or received by the Board and all related exhibits and materials, are public records (as defined in A.R.S. § 41-158.18) upon acceptance by the Board of this Consent Agreement and may be retained in the Board's files pertaining to this matter.
- 6. Respondent understands this Consent Agreement deals with Board case number P18-040 involving allegations that Respondent engaged in conduct that would subject him to discipline under the Board's statutes and rules. The investigation into these allegations against Respondent shall be concluded upon the Board's adoption of this Consent Agreement.
- 7. Respondent understands that this Consent Agreement does not constitute a dismissal or resolution of any other matters currently pending before the Board, if any, and does not constitute any waiver, express or implied, of the Board's statutory authority or jurisdiction regarding any other pending or future investigation, action or proceeding.
- 8. Respondent also understands that acceptance of this Consent Agreement does not preclude any other agency, subdivision, or officer of this State from instituting any other civil or criminal proceedings with respect to the conduct that is the subject of this Consent Agreement.
- 9. Respondent acknowledges and agrees that, upon signing this Consent Agreement and returning this document to the Board's Executive Director, he may not revoke his acceptance of the Consent Agreement or make any modifications to the document regardless of whether the Consent Agreement has been signed on behalf of the Board. Any modification to this original document is ineffective and void unless mutually agreed by the parties in writing.
- 10. This Consent Agreement is subject to the approval of the Board and is effective only when accepted by the Board and signed on behalf of the Board. If the Board does not accept this Consent Agreement, the Board retains its authority to hold a formal administrative hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-128(E). In the event that the Board does not approve this Consent

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

77

24

25

26

27

28

Agreement, it is withdrawn and shall be of no evidentiary value and shall not be relied upon nor introduced in any action by any party, except that the parties agree that should the Board reject this Consent Agreement and this case proceeds to hearing, Respondent shall assert no claim that the Board was prejudiced by its review and discussion of this document or any records relating

- If a court of competent jurisdiction rules that any part of this Consent Agreement is void or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of the Consent Agreement shall remain in full
- Respondent understands that any violation of this Consent Agreement may result in disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of the registration under A.R.S. § 32-150.
- Respondent agrees that the Board will adopt the following Findings of Fact,

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the 1. practice of Architecture in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Respondent is the holder of Arizona Registered Architect, Registration No. 63522. Respondent was not registered with the Board at the time of project engagement for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade in Phoenix, AZ. Respondent subsequently obtained his Arizona registration on January 6, 2017.
- 3. Respondent Firm is the holder of Registration No. 20164. Respondent Firm was not registered with the Board at the time of project engagement for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade in Phoenix, AZ. Respondent Firm was subsequently registered on January 19, 2017.
- 4. On June 28, 2016, Respondent Firm offered to practice Architecture without being registered with the Board through a Purchase Order that was issued for design services for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project in Phoenix, AZ.
- 5. On October 25, 2016, Respondent and Respondent firm engaged in the practice of Architecture by producing professional documents for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project in Phoenix, AZ.

4

8

6

Q 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 6. On March 10, 2017, Respondent and Respondent Firm submitted professional documents, that were not signed or sealed, for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project which were marked "Issued for Construction".
- 7. On December 14, 2017, the Board received a complaint alleging that Respondent, who is the principal and responsible registered Architect for Respondent Firm, and Respondent Firm acting as the prime professionals failed to sign and seal professional architectural and engineering documents that were issued for construction on the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project located at 620 N. 51st Ave., in Phoenix, Arizona. It was further alleged that professional engineering documents prepared by Respondent and Respondent Firm failed to provide pertinent information and details related to masonry construction and structural modifications on the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project.
- 8. On December 4, 2018, an Enforcement Advisory Committee convened to review the complaint against the Respondent. During the meeting, the Committee found that Respondents failed to sign and seal professional documents that were marked "Issued for Construction".
- 9. The Committee concluded that Respondent Firm offered architectural services while not being registered with the Board by accepting a purchase order in June 2016 for design services for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project located at 620 N. 51st Ave., in Phoenix, Arizona. The Committee also concluded that Respondent Firm engaged in the practice of Architecture by producing professional documents for owner review in October 2016 for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade project located at 620 N. 51st Ave., in Phoenix, Arizona.
- 10. The Committee concluded that Respondent held himself out to be an Architect while not registered as an Architect in Arizona that extended for a period from before June 28, 2016, until gaining his Arizona Registration as an Architect on January 16, 2017. During the interview Respondent admitted that he and Respondent Firm had engaged with the Celgene project prior to being registered with the Board.
- 11. The Committee found that the Respondent advertised in some manner, word of mouth or otherwise, to be an Architect while not registered as an Architect in Arizona that

G

extended for a period from before June 28, 2016, until gaining his Arizona Registration as an Architect on January 16, 2017. Respondent admitted that both he and Respondent Firm were not registered with the Board prior to project engagement. The Committee also found that it was obvious that there was an offering to practice, there was advertising and there was practice prior to registration based on the purchase order document. The Committee opined that execution of judgement constitutes practice of the profession; practice of the profession requires sealing unles it falls into exemption status and none of this project fits within the exemptions and that the date alone are indicting of violation.

12. The Committee did not find that Respondent was responsible for the engineering documents produced for the Celegene project.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Board has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-101, et seq.
- 2. The conduct alleged in the Findings of Fact constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-128(C)(4) as it relates to A.A.C. R4-30-304(D), in that Respondent failed to sign and seal professional documents marked "Issue for Construction" for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade in Phoenix, AZ.
- 3. The conduct alleged in the Findings of Fact constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-141(A)(C), in that Respondent Firm offered to practice and engaged in the practice of Architecture, without Board registration, by the issuance of a purchase order for services and the production of professional documents for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade in Phoenix, AZ.
- 4. The conduct alleged in the Findings of Fact constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-145(1), in that Respondent practiced or offered to practice the profession of Architecture without registration with the Board for the Celgene Aseptic Facility Upgrade in Phoenix, AZ.
- 5. The conduct alleged in the Findings of Fact constitutes grounds for discipline pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-145(2), in that Respondent advertised that a person is registered or qualified to practice architecture, a Board regulated profession, while not registered with the

Ĩ

<u>ORDER</u>

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Board issues the following Order:

- 1. LETTER OF REPRIMAND. Respondent is hereby issued a Letter of Reprimand.
- 2. ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY. Within six (6) months from the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall pay an administrative penalty of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2000.00) by certified check or money order made payable to the State of Arizona Board of Technical Registration.
- 3. COST OF INVESTIGATION. Within ninety (90) days from the effective date of this Consent Agreement, Respondent shall pay the cost of investigation of this case to the Board in the amount of Seven Hundred Eighty-Five Dollars (\$785.00) by certified check or money order made payable to the State of Arizona Board of Technical Registration, according to the provisions of A.R.S. § 32-128(H).
- 4. OBEY ALL LAWS. Respondents shall obey all federal, state and local laws, as well as, all rules governing the practice of Architecture in the State of Arizona. The Board shall consider any violation of this paragraph to be a separate violation of the rules and statutes governing the Arizona Board of Technical Registration. The Board may also consider Respondents' non-compliance with this Order as a separate violation of A.R.S. § 32-150.
- 5. RENEWAL OF REGISTRATION. Respondent and Respondent Firm shall timely renew their Arizona registration as an Architect and an Engineering and Architecture Firm, and timely pay all required registration fees.
- 6. EFFECTIVE DATE. The effective date of this Consent Agreement is the date the Respondent and Board sign the Consent Agreement. If the dates are different, the effective date is the later of the two dates.
- 7. COSTS OF COMPLIANCE. Respondent shall pay all costs associated with complying with this Consent Agreement.
 - 8. NONCOMPLIANCE. If Respondent violates this Order in any way or fails to

*	fulfill the requirements of this Order, the Board, after giving notice and the opportunity to be
2	heard, may revoke, suspend or take other disciplinary actions against the registration. The issue
3	at such a hearing will be limited solely to whether this Order has been violated.
4	
5	ACCEPTED and ORDERED this 22ND day of JONUANY, 2019.
6	
7	452
8	Iason Foose, R.L.S., Vice
9	Chairman, Arizona State Board of
10	Technical Registration
POLICE CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	
12	Consent Agreement and Order, No. P148-040 accepted this 7th day of 2019.
13	Took of Jan 1
14	Stephen Francy, and on behalf of IPS
15	Engineers and Architects, Respondents
16	ORIGINAL filed this 25th day of
7	<u> Дичач</u> , 2019, with:
18	
19	Arizona State Board of Technical Registration 1110 W. Washington, Suite 240
20	Phoenix, AZ 85007
21	COPY of the foregoing mailed via Certified Mail
22	No. 9214 8901 9434 4600 0493 04 and
23	First Class mail this 25 th day of, 2019, to:
24	Stephen Francy
25	IPS Engineers and Architects 721 Arbor Way, Suite 100
26	Blue Bell, PA 19422
27	
28	Sign War
	Dav./

į