

**IN THE MATTER OF
THE PROFESSIONAL GOVERNANCE ACT, S.B.C. 2018, c. 47**

and

IN THE MATTER OF ARYO FALAKROU, ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGIST

**DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
of THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (“AIBC”)**

Date and Place of Hearing:	July 7 and 9, 2025, at AIBC Offices, 100 – 440 Cambie Street Vancouver, British Columbia
Panel of the Discipline Committee: (the “Panel”)	D. Brent North, Architect AIBC, Chair Brian Hart, Architect AIBC Andrea Ritchie
Counsel for AIBC:	Elizabeth Janzen
For the Registrant:	Aryo Falakrou, self-represented
Counsel to the Panel:	Andrew D. Gay, K.C.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The AIBC issued a citation against the respondent, Aryo Falakrou, on October 2, 2024. The citation was amended on December 12, 2024, and further amended on June 12, 2025 (the “Citation”).
2. In brief, the Citation alleges that Mr. Falakrou, who is not an architect, has held himself out as an architect on multiple occasions and has condoned or encouraged third parties to describe him as an architect, or to imply that he is registered as an architect.
 - a. The AIBC alleges that this conduct violated various statutory and bylaw provisions and constitutes professional misconduct and/or conduct unbecoming a registrant;

- b. The full text of the allegations in the Citation is set out in Appendix “A” to this decision; and
 - c. The Citation and the related exhibits presented in this hearing contain references to MyHomeDesigner, Myhomedesigner, MyHomeDesigner.com, myhomedesigner.com, MyHomeDesigner.com Ltd. The Panel treats all of these as references to Mr. Falakrou’s business, through which his services and the representation of his services are provided, and makes no distinction between them.
3. The Panel has decided that twelve (12) of the fourteen (14) allegations in the Citation have been proved, one (1) allegation is partially proved, and one (1) allegation is not proved. This decision sets out our reasons for these conclusions.

B. APPLICABLE LEGAL PRINCIPLES

The Panel’s Jurisdiction

4. Section 75 of the *Professional Governance Act*, S.B.C. 2018, c. 47 (the “PGA”) sets out the Panel’s jurisdiction to hold a hearing and make determinations. For the reasons set out below, the Panel can also make findings under the repealed *Architects Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c.17 (the “*Architects Act*”).

The Repeal and Replacement of the Architects Act with the PGA

5. The *Architects Act* was repealed and replaced by the PGA on February 10, 2023. Mr. Falakrou is alleged to have engaged in the impugned conduct both before and after the *Architects Act* was repealed.
6. The law provides that despite an enactment’s repeal and replacement, the *substantive* provisions of that enactment, and of any bylaws made thereunder, are presumed to apply to proceedings addressing conduct which occurred when the repealed enactment was still in force.¹
7. This is significant because under the *Architects Act* a registrant could be penalized for:
- (a) unprofessional conduct;
 - (b) a contravention of the *Architects Act* or a bylaw;
 - (c) negligence;
 - (d) misconduct in the execution of a duty of office; and

¹ *Interpretation Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 238, s. 35 and 36; *R. v. Dineley*, 2012 SCC 58 at para. 10 (per the majority) and at para. 45 (per the dissent); and *Re Mahmoud*, Discipline Committee of Engineers and Geoscientists BC, July 18, 2024, at para. 5.

(e) incompetence, unfitness or incapacity to practice architecture;²

whereas under the PGA a registrant can be penalized for:

- (f) professional misconduct;³
- (g) conduct unbecoming a registrant; and
- (h) incompetent performance of duties undertaken while engaged in the registrant's regulated practice.⁴

8. The AIBC must establish that the impugned conduct which occurred prior to the repeal of the *Architects Act* fits within categories (a) to (e), and the impugned conduct after the *Architect Act's* repeal must fit within categories (f) to (h).
9. The *procedure* established under the new enactment (in this case the PGA) must be followed notwithstanding the repeal of the previous enactment.⁵

Burden and Standard of Proof

10. The AIBC has the burden of proving each of the allegations in the Citation. The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.⁶ The Panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that Mr. Falakrou engaged in the acts alleged in the Citation, and that such conduct falls within one or more of the categories of conduct which can lead to a penalty under either or both of the *Architects Act* and the PGA.

The Statutory and Bylaw Provisions Mr. Falakrou is Alleged to have Breached

11. The allegations made by the AIBC are that Mr. Falakrou contravened provisions of the *Architects Act* and the PGA, as follows:
 - a. Before the *Architects Act* was repealed:
 - i. Section 63(1) of the *Architects Act*, and
 - ii. AIBC Bylaw 33.3.

² *Architects Act*, s. 50(1)

³ Which is defined in the PGA to include a failure to comply with the PGA, the regulations or the bylaws.

⁴ PGA, s. 75(5)

⁵ *Interpretation Act*, s. 36(1)(b) and (c). The exception is where procedural provisions affect substantive rights: *R. v. Dineley*, above at para. 11, a matter not alleged in this case.

⁶ *Kaminski v. Assn. of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia*, 2010 BCSC 468 at para. 52; *F.H. v. McDougall*, 2008 SCC 53 at paras. 40-46.

- b. After the *Architects Act* was repealed:
 - i. Sections 52(1) and 52(3) of the PGA, and,
 - ii. Sections 4.92 and 4.94 of the current AIBC Bylaws.
- 12. These provisions are addressed later in this decision. AIBC alleges that Mr. Falakrou breached these by:
 - a. Directly and/or indirectly holding himself out under the title "Architect" and using descriptions which implied, or likely led the public to infer, that he was registered as an architect, and/or that he had attained that title and was able to provide architectural services; and/or
 - b. Condoning or encouraging others to use, or acquiescing in the use by others, of descriptions which implied that he was registered as an architect or was able to provide architectural services.
- 13. In Citation paragraphs 1 to 14 , reproduced in the Appendix, the AIBC sets out particulars of these allegations, each of which references websites, YouTube channels, or Google search results which describe Mr. Falakrou or his services.

Professional Misconduct and Conduct Unbecoming a Registrant

- 14. Additionally, the Citation alleges that Mr. Falakrou's conduct amounts to professional misconduct and/or conduct unbecoming a registrant.
- 15. Those terms are used only in the PGA, not in the *Architects Act*.
- 16. Under s. 1(1) of the PGA, "Professional Misconduct" is defined to mean *misconduct by a registrant as a professional, relating to the performance of duties while engaged in a regulated practice, including a failure to comply with, or a breach of, this Act, the regulations or the bylaws.*
- 17. Under s. 1(1) of the PGA, "conduct unbecoming a registrant" means *conduct of a registrant that:*
 - a. *brings the regulatory body or its registrants into disrepute,*
 - b. *undermines the standards, methods or principles that are the foundation of the profession, or*
 - c. *undermines the principle of holding paramount the safety, health and welfare of the public, including the protection of the environment and the promotion of health and safety in the workplace in the manner that reflects the stewardship of a given profession by each regulatory body.*

18. The Panel questioned the AIBC's counsel about the fact that these terms were not used in the *Architects Act*, and asked whether the AIBC can seek findings in relation to these allegations for the period before the *Architects Act* was repealed. Counsel argued that giving notice to Mr. Falakrou that he is alleged to have engaged in professional misconduct is sufficient notice that he is alleged to have engaged in unprofessional conduct (the term used in the *Architects Act*). Mr. Falakrou did not make submissions on this point.
19. The Panel finds that it is unnecessary to resolve this issue. If Mr. Falakrou is found to have violated the *Architects Act* or bylaws, an additional finding that the very same conduct also amounts to "unprofessional conduct" would have no bearing on penalty. If Mr. Falakrou is not found to have violated the *Architects Act* or bylaws, there would be no finding of unprofessional conduct on the facts of this case. Therefore, the Panel declines to decide whether findings of "unprofessional conduct" are available in this case, and it will decide the case solely on the basis of whether Mr. Falakrou violated the *Architects Act* (or the bylaws made under that Act) before it was repealed.

C. THE EVIDENCE

AIBC's case

20. The AIBC led evidence to establish that Mr. Falakrou has described himself and his work on various websites using the terms "architect" and "architectural", even though he is not an architect and has never been registered in British Columbia as an architect. The AIBC also led evidence that various third-party websites have identified Mr. Falakrou and described his work using the words "architect" and "architectural". The AIBC further led evidence to prove that it asked Mr. Falakrou to correct the allegedly offending online statements, but that he did not do so. A summary of the evidence relied upon by AIBC is as follows:
 - a. Jenelyn Torres, Director, Registration and Licensing and AIBC Deputy Registrar, testified that:
 - i. Mr. Falakrou has been an architectural technologist under the auspices of the AIBC since 2014 and that his status has not changed in the period since then to the present. Prior to 2014 he was listed as a 'building designer', which category no longer exists;
 - ii. MyHomeDesigner.com is the only business associated with Mr. Falakrou's practice;
 - iii. MyHomeDesigner.com is not registered with the AIBC, nor has it ever been, nor is Mr. Falakrou registered as an architect; and

- iv. The AIBC has never issued a Certificate of Practice to either Mr. Falakrou or MyHomeDesigner.com.
- b. Tatiana Perez-Velez, AIBC Discipline and Conduct Officer, testified that:
- i. She held the position of Professional Conduct Officer from May 2021 until August 2024, at which point she transitioned to her current position of Discipline and Conduct Officer;
 - ii. She attended AIBC Investigation Committee meetings in both positions, under the *Architects Act* and the PGA respectively, but was not a member of the Investigations Committee and held no voting privilege;
 - iii. That in reference to Exhibits 2 and 3, she received a number of complaints about Mr. Falakrou prior to the August 10, 2022 complaint that is the subject event of this hearing and that these prior complaints were either handled by the AIBC's Investigations Committee, or by staff, and that these complaints were considered resolved to the AIBC's satisfaction;
 - iv. AIBC received a complaint about Mr. Falakrou on August 10, 2022, marked as Exhibit 4. Ms. Perez-Velez testified that the documents at Exhibit 4 represent the complaint's entire contents as received by the AIBC. (For clarity, the Panel observes that Exhibit 4 contains multiple screen shots of the alleged violations);
 - v. Ms. Perez-Velez reviewed all of the web links referenced in the complaint, in preparation for the AIBC issuing its September 16, 2022 letter to Mr. Falakrou, marked as Exhibit 5, where AIBC notified Mr. Falakrou of the complaint and invited his response;

- vi. The Investigations Committee reviewed the file and directed the issuance of the December 1, 2022 letter, marked as Exhibit 6, in which Ms. Sabinder Sheina, AIBC Legal Counsel and Director, Professional Conduct and Illegal Practice, asked Mr. Falakrou to remove / amend all references to “architect”, “architecture” and “architectural” on the websites referenced in the letter. (For clarity, the Panel observes that this letter identifies the same list of web pages as per Appendix “A” to Exhibit 5). The December 1 letter further states:

“In the event that you are unable to make the necessary changes yourself, as stated above, we ask that you contact the websites accordingly and request that they correct the content above by removing or amending the reference to “architect”, “architecture”, and “architectural” which describes you. Please provide us with supporting documentation of your attempts to contact the websites.”

- vii. Prior to the December 1 letter, Ms. Perez-Velez re-checked the web links in question and found the alleged misrepresentations continued in the same form as she had seen when she reviewed the websites in September of 2022;
- viii. The AIBC issued a further letter, dated May 17, 2023, marked as Exhibit 7, where the AIBC advised Mr. Falakrou that the matter was being sent to “discipline”, with recommended charges described therein. Ms. Perez-Velez testified that she re-checked the web links prior to the issuance of this letter and found the alleged misrepresentations continued without material difference;
- ix. Ms. Perez-Velez took screen shots of the web pages containing the alleged misconduct in September 2024 for purposes of the discipline proceeding, found at Exhibits 8 and 9. (For clarity, the Panel observes the screenshots are from September 16th and 18th, 2024, respectively and that the screenshots are taken from Mr. Falakrou’s company website, his YouTube channel, Google search pages, certain podcast links, [Bark.com](https://www.bark.com), and a Yellow Pages search page);
- x. Exhibit 8, page 6 shows a screen shot from a YouTube recording of the “Deborah Peters Show”, where Ms. Peters is recorded, by way of subtitle, as asking Mr. Falakrou: “you’re an architect, is that correct”, to which Mr. Falakrou is recorded as responding, “yes, by trade”. Ms. Perez-Velez testified to having personally watched the YouTube video and confirmed the subtitles as “accurate”;

- xi. Exhibit 10 is from the MyHomedesigner YouTube channel, which Ms. Perez-Velez visited initially after receipt of the complaint, and again the week prior to this hearing. The “About” link on the site opens a page which says that “MyHomedesigner.com provides custom home design and architectural design consultation for home renovations, office or restaurants”. The same page contains a link to “west vancouver architect” which, according to Ms. Perez-Velez, is a link to Mr. Falakrou’s website; and
 - c. Page 4 of Exhibit 8 is a screenshot of the introductory page to a video that promotes Mr. Falakrou’s services. On that page, Mr. Falakrou is described as a “Vancouver Architect”. During the hearing, AIBC’s counsel took the Panel to the same page online, to demonstrate that the reference to “Vancouver Architect” was still present as of the hearing date. A screenshot of the web page in question was marked as Exhibit 11.
- 21. As indicated above, Ms. Perez-Velez gave evidence of prior complaints relating to Mr. Falakrou. Reference to prior complaints is found in Exhibits 2 and 3. Those complaints are not before us. In the Panel’s view, the evidence of prior complaints is not relevant to the question of whether Mr. Falakrou has committed the violations alleged in the Citation and we have put no weight on this evidence.
- 22. The AIBC also relies on some of the testimony from Mr. Falakrou’s cross examination. This includes testimony and/or admissions as follows:
 - a. Mr. Falakrou understood that:
 - i. Prior to its repeal he was governed by the *Architects Act* and the AIBC’s associated Bylaws and the Code of Ethics;
 - ii. Following the repeal of the *Architects Act*, he was governed by the PGA and the AIBC’s associated Bylaws and the Code of Ethics; and
 - iii. The purpose of both acts is the protection of the public.
 - b. He had read and understood the applicable acts, bylaws and codes of ethics;
 - c. He is currently an AIBC registrant holding the designation of “architectural technologist” and has held that designation for over a decade;
 - d. He was never registered as an architect, nor did he ever hold a Certificate of Practice;

- e. He understood he could not call himself an architect, nor hold himself out to be an architect, or provide services as an architect, and that he understood that the term “architect” is a protected title under both the *Architects Act* and the PGA;
- f. He provides his services through his solely owned company, MyHomeDesigner, which has never been registered as an architectural firm, nor held a Certificate of Practice;
- g. He has a website for his business, MyHomeDesigner.com, for which he is generally responsible, even though other people have worked on it for him, and that the website contains various pages titled “Home”, “About”, “Portfolio”, “Blog Posts” and “Contact”;
- h. He has a YouTube channel “@myhomedesignervancouver”, the content for which he is responsible;
- i. He paid for a listing on the website Bark.com under the listing category “Architectural Services” because, according to Mr. Falakrou, “...that’s all they have that’s related to job that I do”. Further, Mr. Falakrou still has the Bark.com account;
- j. He testified: “I provide architectural drawings for homes, for Part 9 [of the BC Building Code]. You can’t stop me from saying that. The law is that I can provide architectural drawings for Part 9”;
- k. He acknowledged that, after he published his book titled “Beyond Ages”, he was asked to participate in multiple interviews for articles or podcasts, including for the “Deborah Peters Show”, “Medium.com”, and “Run With It” (although Mr. Falakrou did not recall “Pursuing Profit With Principles”);
- l. In respect of the interviews noted in paragraph (k) above, Mr. Falakrou testified that after giving those interviews he received a number of links to the articles, podcasts and/or videos resulting from the interviews, but did not recall the degree to which he reviewed, read or viewed any of them;
- m. He understood that evidence of attempts to remove the alleged misrepresentations from third party websites were important for this case. He said that he had contacted a number of the interviewers, podcasters, and website owners in question, by email, phone or social media, to ask them to change how they described Mr. Falakrou, but that he had no corroborating evidence of these efforts;
- n. He did not respond to the AIBC Investigation Committee’s request that he provide the evidence noted in (m), above; and

- o. He did not make any of the changes requested by the AIBC Investigation Committee in December 2022 to any of his company website, his company YouTube channel, and certain third-party websites. And further, in specific reference to MyHomeDesigner.com, he testified that he does not, “believe it’s the AIBC’s right to ask him to change it... [I’m] never going to change it”.

The Respondent’s case

- 23. Mr. Falakrou testified in support of his own case. He did not tender any documents in evidence. He did not call any other witnesses.
- 24. It was evident to the Panel that English is not Mr. Falakrou’s first language. However, the Panel observes that Mr. Falakrou is fluent in English, appears to conduct his online affairs in English, published a book in English, communicated with the AIBC in writing in English, and appeared comfortable testifying in English. Mr. Falakrou did not express any concerns with comprehension.
- 25. Mr. Falakrou called himself as a witness and testified that:
 - a. He studied architecture 37 years ago, outside of Canada, and that on coming to Canada “everything changed”. The regulations pertaining to becoming an architect in Canada caused him to decide not to register as an architect;
 - b. As he could not call himself an architect he planned to work on Part 9 buildings under the BC Building Code, which Mr. Falakrou said is permissible for non-architects. To this end he created a website and set up an office;
 - c. He wrote a book during COVID, when “people had nothing to do”, and the book made him a best-selling author, leading to a lot of interviews, podcasts, and YouTube videos, and that “people from everywhere in the world would listen to him except Canadians”;
 - d. The book did not say that Mr. Falakrou was an architect; it was written about home design;

- e. The people interviewing him, as reflected in some of the exhibits, characterized him as an architect in their online publications. Mr. Falakrou said: "Folks outside Canada don't follow the rules in Canada, so for them they didn't care about what I mentioned. They referred to me as being an architect, but they weren't in Canada. I've answered that I've studied architecture, but I'm not an architect." As an example, Mr. Falakrou noted that one interviewer, Deborah Peters, while talking very quickly asked Mr. Falakrou if he was an architect, to which he responded: "as a trade' like I studied it, I'm not an architect". Mr. Falakrou said: "I didn't have time to explain it"; and
 - f. He is following the AIBC's bylaws.
26. In the manner of a rhetorical question, Mr. Falakrou asked why the bylaws were not revised so that registrants providing architectural drawings could present themselves as doing architectural work. He also stated that municipalities generally refer to design drawings required at the building permit application stage as "architectural drawings", regardless of whether they were prepared by an architect. On this basis, Mr. Falakrou stated that he should be free to describe his work as "architectural".
27. The Panel notes that Mr. Falakrou made other statements during the hearing when not on the witness stand. Notably he stated that:
- a. "If the bylaw [is] a regulation, how we interpret the bylaw depends on the person reading it, we have an issue with the interpretation of words";
 - b. "Providing architectural drawings for Part 9 [buildings] is allowed by AIBC and [under the] Building Code";
 - c. In relation to Exhibit 11, having a photo of himself with the associated caption, "Vancouver Architect", does not necessarily mean that he is an architect; as this conclusion is up to the viewer's imagination or interpretation;
 - d. "If I call a rose, [the] picture that comes to mind is a flower, a rose. But it could be a colour, a person's name, a restaurant, anything with that name. It's up to us and how our brain is programmed to interpret that word.";
 - e. In relation to Exhibits 4 and 8, his purpose in including the word "architect" is that he needs to satisfy the at least 50% of the public that believes they need an architect to obtain a design.

D. THE PANEL'S FINDINGS

The Panel's Basis of Adjudication

28. The AIBC alleges that Mr. Falakrou breached the statutory and bylaw provisions identified above in paragraph 11 on each of the online platforms detailed in paragraphs 1 to 14 of the Citation, as reproduced in Appendix "A" to this decision. We provide findings in relation to each of the Citation's 14 paragraphs below. In each case, we determine whether a violation has been proved under the *Architects Act*, the PGA, or both.
29. Section 33.3 of the former Bylaws provided that an architect shall comply with the *Architects Act*, the Bylaws and Council rulings, in the latter of which "architect" is interpreted to include associates. It follows that any proven breach of section 63(1) of the *Architects Act* is a breach of section 33.3. We do not find it necessary to address this because a finding that Mr. Falakrou breached section 33.3 adds nothing to a finding that Mr. Falakrou breached the *Architects Act*.
30. The Panel agrees with paragraphs 12 and 13 of the AIBC's closing submissions. An Architectural Technologist was an "associate" under the *Architects Act*, not a "member". Mr. Falakrou did not argue otherwise. The Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou was entitled to use the title "Architectural Technologist AIBC" after, or in association with, his name or the services of his firm, but not the title "Architect" or any similar title or description respecting the services offered.
31. Subsection 63(1) of the *Architects Act* provides:

"Subject to this Act, a person not registered as a member or as an architectural firm must not use or be held out under the title "architect" or any similar title or description or use, and must not advertise or be held out under any name, title, addition, or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer, that registration under this Act applies."
32. One of the questions in this case is whether this provision imposes any obligation on a non-architect who is aware that another person is holding them out as an architect. For example, the AIBC proved that when one uses Google to search "aryo falakrou", a search page displays a link to the MyHomeDesigner.com website with the words "Vancouver architect" underneath, and "Architectural designer in British Columbia" appearing on a separate location on the search page (see Exhibit 4, page 14).

33. The AIBC did not lead evidence of how Google works. The AIBC argued that the Google search results are “pulled from” the MyHomeDesigner website. That may be so, but this was not proved. It was specifically not proved how or why the words “Vancouver architect” or “Architectural designer” are displayed in the manner in question.
34. However, the Panel must give meaning to the words “must not be held out” in section 63(1) of the *Architects Act*. The Act does not say that a person “must not hold themselves out”. It is broader and appears to contemplate that a person could be “held out” by a third party. Neither party identified any past decision where this matter was considered, and the Panel is not aware of one.
35. Viewed from the perspective of public protection, and in light of the words used in the provision, the Panel’s view is that the words “must not be held out” logically impose a burden on a person to take reasonable steps, upon being made aware that they are being “held out” improperly, to correct the problem. In the Panel’s view, what constitutes reasonable steps is informed, in part, by the question of whether the person appears to have contributed to the problem.
36. Absent such an obligation, the public protection goals of the Act could be undermined by persons content to allow third parties to promote their credentials incorrectly or falsely.
37. In Mr. Falakrou’s case, there is no question that he has contributed to the problem because, as is documented below, he has promoted himself as an “architect” and “architectural designer”. There is a strong likelihood that the words “Vancouver architect” and “Architectural designer” appear on the Google search page mentioned above because Mr. Falakrou describes himself and his services online with these words. Accordingly, when the AIBC brought these words to Mr. Falakrou’s attention and asked him to take steps to correct them (Exhibit 6), it is the Panel’s view that Mr. Falakrou was obligated to take reasonable steps to ensure he was not “held out” on the said Google search page as an “architect” or “architectural designer”.
38. The Panel follows this approach in the section below addressing the fourteen particulars set out in the Citation.
39. Following the *Architects Act*’s repeal, the *Architects Regulation* has governed the titles which are reserved for the exclusive use of registrants, as follows:
 - a. “architect”
 - b. “intern architect”
 - c. “architectural technologist”

40. Section 52 of the PGA provides that a person other than a registrant must not use a reserved title (or an abbreviation of the title or an equivalent of the title) and must not use other names, titles or descriptions in any manner that expresses or implies that the person is a registrant or is authorized to practice a profession that is subject to a reserved title. More fully, subsections 52(1) and (3) provide as follows:

52(1) If a regulation under section 51(1)(a) or 89(2) (b) [*designation of profession*] prescribes a title to be used exclusively by registrants of a regulatory body listed in Schedule 2 to this Act, a person other than a registrant of the regulatory body must not use the title, an abbreviation of the title or an equivalent of the title or abbreviation in another language

- (a) to describe the person's work,
- (b) in association with or as part of another title describing the person's work, or
- (c) in association with a description of the person's work.

(3) A person other than a registrant of a regulatory body must not use a reserved title or other name, title, description or abbreviation of a name or title, or an equivalent of a reserved title or other name or title in another language, in any manner that expresses or implies that the person is a registrant or associated with the regulatory body or is authorized to practice in a profession that is subject to a reserved title.

41. Mr. Falakrou is a “registrant” under the PGA which superficially might suggest he is entitled to use the reserved titles referenced in the *Architects Regulation*. The Panel agrees with the AIBC, however, that the proper interpretation of section 52 of the PGA is that a registrant in one category (e.g. an architectural technologist) is not entitled to use a title reserved for another category of registrant (e.g. an architect). Any other interpretation would create an absurdity. The AIBC’s interpretation is consistent with Bylaws 4.93 and 4.95.

42. The current bylaws further address registrants’ use of reserved titles as follows:

4.92 Only Architects may be held out or hold themselves out to be an Architect and use the titles Architect and Architect AIBC.

4.93 Individual Registrants are entitled to be held out under the reserved title prescribed to them in the Architects Regulation, and to use that title in accordance with these Bylaws.

4.94 Individual Registrants must not be held out as or use a reserved title to which they are not entitled, nor any variations or abbreviations of reserved titles that imply entitlement to such title.

4.95 The following titles may be used by non-Architect Registrants registered in the respective categories:

...

4.95.4 Architectural Technologist and Architectural Technologist
AIBC

43. Further to our comments above on being “held out” under the *Architects Act*, similarly a person must not be “held out” as an architect, or “held out” as being entitled to use a reserved title, under Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94. Bylaw 4.92 expressly distinguishes a person holding themselves out from a person being “held out”, the latter implying that they are “held out” by a third party. Our comments above in paragraphs 32-38 apply equally to these provisions.
44. Based on Ms. Torres’ evidence, which Mr. Falakrou generally agreed with, the Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou has never been registered as an architect in British Columbia and has been an architectural technologist at all times during the period covered by the Citation.
45. As a result, both before and after the repeal of the *Architects Act*, Mr. Falakrou was not entitled to refer to himself as an “architect”. Under the *Architects Act*, he was further prohibited from using any “similar title or description or use” and could not “advertise or be held out under any name, title, addition or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer, that a registration under [that] Act applies”. Under the PGA and its regulations, Mr. Falakrou was prohibited from using any other name, title or description in any manner that expressed or implied that he was a registrant or authorized to practice architecture, and was prohibited from holding himself out as an architect.

The Panel’s Findings

46. Unless stated otherwise, in relation to each of the findings below, the Panel finds that the evidence of Ms. Perez-Velez allows for a reasonable inference that the web pages in question were publicly viewable on the internet at all times from the date of the complaint in August 2022 to the date of the Citation (June 12, 2025). Mr. Falakrou did not suggest otherwise. Even if any of the web pages were, for some period, taken down and not publicly visible, violations will still have been established in relation to the occasions on which it has been proved that the web pages were live and publicly visible.
47. The Panel further agrees with the AIBC that, on the basis of Ms. Perez-Velez’s evidence, we can infer that in August 2022, the web pages were as they appeared in the screenshots attached to the complaint (Exhibit 4) and except where stated otherwise did not change in any material way between the complaint date and when Ms. Perez-Velez took additional screenshots in

September 2024 (found at Exhibits 8 and 9). Mr. Falakrou did not suggest otherwise.

48. The Panel finds that Ms. Perez-Velez checked the various online websites, YouTube recordings, and Google search results as per her testimony stated in paragraphs 20(b) v, vii viii and ix, above, and that these checks confirmed the content of the Exhibits had not changed in any material way since the date of the complaint. Mr. Falakrou did not dispute the evidence.
49. The Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou was responsible for his own MyHomeDesigner.com website content and YouTube channel as per his testimony under cross examination set out above in paragraphs 22(g) and (h). Further, he admittedly did not make any of the changes to the various web pages as requested by the AIBC Investigations Committee in December 2022.

Paragraph 1 of the Citation

50. Regarding: A YouTube video (<https://www.youtube.com/shorts/Q5P-KBBWEmk>) which promotes Mr. Falakrou's services with the title "Vancouver Architect, custom homes, extravagant homes, office spaces, creative designs" (Exhibits 4, 8 and 11):
 - a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using or being held out under the title "architect" and from using titles that imply, or are likely to lead the public to infer, that he is registered as an architect. Mr. Falakrou was not a member as defined by the *Architects Act* at any time;
 - ii. Exhibit 4 shows a photo of Mr. Falakrou, his name, a listing of his website Myhomedesigner.com and the accompanying description, "Vancouver Architect";
 - iii. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, is responsible for the YouTube content; and
 - iv. Using the term "Vancouver Architect" implies that Mr. Falakrou is registered as an architect and is likely to lead the public to infer this. Mr. Falakrou's assertions to the contrary are not credible.

- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of sections 52(1) and 52(3), AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. These provisions prohibit Mr. Falakrou from using the title “architect” and holding himself out as an architect. Mr. Falakrou was not an architect at any time. He was and is an architectural technologist;
 - ii. Exhibits 8 (from September of 2024) and 11 (from the time of the hearing) continue to show a photo of Mr. Falakrou, his name, a listing of his website Myhomedesigner.com and the accompanying description “Vancouver Architect”;
 - iii. As above, Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, is responsible for the YouTube content; and
 - iv. Describing oneself as a “Vancouver Architect” is using the title “architect” and is holding oneself out as an architect.

Paragraph 2 of the Citation

51. Regarding: The My Home Designer YouTube channel, (<https://www.youtube.com/c/Myhomedesignervancouver/videos>) included the following video titles with the word “architect” used as a descriptor:
- Sechelt and Gibsons Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TH2IdshSzss>
 - Victoria, Nanaimo Architect, Home Designer, Interior designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hJLC2VAsfJ8>
 - Kelowna Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gFele-3-tUk>
 - Osoyoos Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2fEMd0uUVqI>
 - Chilliwack, Abbotsford, Maple Ridge Architect, Interior Designer, Home Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPpmobBq4Xs>
 - Surrey, White Rock Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0nf9pSRg8Y8>
 - Burnaby Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XegooLpHzCc>
 - Richmond Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u3ghltqn2jQ>
 - North Vancouver's Architect, Home designer, Interior designer: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EPeQpGHLKa8>

- Coquitlam Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPLqUUeKna0>
 - West Vancouver Architect, Home Designer, Interior designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tz0wDRMJb4>;
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
- i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using or being held out under the title “architect” and from using titles that imply, or are likely to lead the public to infer, that he is registered as an architect. Mr. Falakrou was not a member as defined by the *Architects Act* at any time;
 - ii. Exhibit 4 shows that all of the listed videos are subtitled with, or use, the reserved title “architect” in association with a particular city, implying that Mr. Falakrou is an architect who works in the identified cities;
 - iii. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, is responsible for the YouTube content;
 - iv. Use of the term “Architect” in this manner implies that Mr. Falakrou is registered as an architect and is likely to lead the public to infer this.
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of sections 52(1) and 52(3), AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. These provisions prohibit Mr. Falakrou from using the title “architect” and holding himself out as an architect. Mr. Falakrou was not an “architect” at any time. He was and is, an architectural technologist;
 - ii. Exhibits 8 and 9 show that Mr. Falakrou was still using the word “Architect” in the same manner as of September, 2024; and
 - iii. Describing oneself as an “architect”, including in conjunction with the name of a city (such as “Sechelt and Gibsons Architect”) is using the title “architect” and is holding oneself out as an architect.

Paragraph 3 of the Citation

52. Regarding: The My Home Designer YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/@Myhomedesignervancouver>) “About” description states that MyHomeDesigner.com provides “architectural design consultation”:
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using or holding themselves out as an architect or any similar title or description or use, and must not advertise or be held out under any description implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - ii. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, is responsible for the YouTube content;
 - iii. The words “architectural design consultation”, in the manner they are used in Exhibit 10, involve a use of a “similar description” (i.e. “architectural”) to describe Mr. Falakrou’s work, and this web page holds Mr. Falakrou out under a description that implies, and is likely to lead the public to infer, that Mr. Falakrou is registered as an architect; and
 - iv. The Panel’s view on this matter is consistent with the AIBC’s Bulletin 32 in which the AIBC notified the profession that using the phrase “Architectural Design” or “Architectural Designer” by non-architects is not acceptable.
 - b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of section 52(3) and AIBC Bylaw 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
 - i. Section 52(3) provides that a person must not use an “other name, title, [or] description” in any manner that expresses or implies that the person is a registrant or is authorized to practice in a profession that is subject to a reserved title. AIBC bylaw 4.94 provides that registrants must not be held out as having a reserved title to which they are not entitled, nor use any variations of reserved titles that imply entitlement to such a title;

- ii. The words “architectural design consultation”, in the manner they are used in Exhibit 10, involve a use of an “other name or description” (i.e. “architectural”) to describe Mr. Falakrou’s work which implies that he is registered as an architect or is authorized to practice architecture. The words also amount to a “variation” of a reserved title that imply entitlement to the title “architect”;
- iii. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, is responsible for the YouTube content; and
- iv. The Panel’s view on this matter is consistent with the AIBC’s guideline titled “Regulatory Guidance: Right to Title”, which replaced Bulletin 32, and in which AIBC notified the profession that using the phrase “Architectural Design” or “Architectural Designer” by non-architects is not considered acceptable.

Paragraph 4 of the Citation

53. Regarding: a Google search for “Aryo Falakrou”.
(https://www.google.com/search?q=aryo+falakrou&rlz=1C1GCEA_enCA899CA899&oq=aryo+fala&aqs=chrome.1.69i57j0i22i30j0i13i30j0i8i13i30l2j69i60j69i61.5124j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8) resulted in the My Home Designer website identifying you as "architect":
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from being held out under the title “architect”;
 - ii. On the Google search page (Exhibit 4, p. 14) Mr. Falakrou is held out as a “Vancouver architect”. This term is used in immediate conjunction with both his website address and his name;
 - iii. As set out above, the Panel interprets section 63(1) as imposing a duty on Mr. Falakrou to take reasonable steps to attempt to correct this problem, particularly as the Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou contributed to the problem by promoting himself as an “architect” and “architectural designer”;
 - iv. The AIBC brought the Google search page’s content to Mr. Falakrou’s attention and asked him to take corrective action (Exhibit 6); and

- v. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, made no attempt to contact Google, or take any other step to correct the problem such as altering the content of his own website and YouTube channel.
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. A person must not be “held out” as an architect, or “held out” as being entitled to use a reserved title, under Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94. Mr. Falakrou was not an “architect” at any time; he was and is, an architectural technologist;
 - ii. By September 2024, the Google search page no longer referred to Mr. Falakrou as a “Vancouver architect” (Exhibit 8, p. 7) but under a search result on the same page Mr. Falakrou is described as a “Coquitlam architect”;
 - iii. The reference to “Coquitlam architect” on this page was not brought to Mr. Falakrou’s attention by the AIBC. However, the Google search page was previously brought to his attention. In these circumstances the Panel finds that it does not matter what city to which the “architect” is connected. The violation of Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 is established as a result of Mr. Falakrou being held out as an architect;
 - iv. For the reasons given above, the Panel interprets Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 as creating the duty to take reasonable steps to correct this problem, particularly as the Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou contributed to the problem by promoting himself as an “architect” and “architectural designer”; and
 - v. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, took no steps to correct the reference to “architect”.

Paragraph 5 of the Citation

54. Regarding: the “Blog” tab of My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/category/architect-blog/>) repeatedly used the heading “Architect Blog”:
- a. Under the Architects Act: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using or being held out under the title “architect”;

- ii. Exhibit 4 establishes that on his website, Mr. Falakrou repeatedly titled blog postings with the words “Architect Blog”. This amounts to using the title “architect” or being held out under the title “architect”; and
 - iii. By Mr. Falakrou’s own admission, established in paragraph 22 (g), this content represents his own work, and the website pages are under his control.
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of PGA sections 52(1) and 52(3), and AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. These provisions establish that a non-registrant may not use a reserved title to describe the person’s work, or in a manner that implies that the person is a registrant or is authorized to practice the profession subject to the reserved title;
 - ii. Exhibit 8 establishes that on his website, Mr. Falakrou continued to use the phrase “Architect Blog”. This amounts to using a reserved title (“architect”) to describe his work or to imply that Mr. Falakrou is authorized to practice architecture; and
 - iii. Same as for the *Architects Act*, above.

Paragraph 6 of the Citation

55. Regarding: the YouTube video titled “Aryo Falakrou – Does Your Work Environment Inspire Productivity or Drain Your Energy?” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8OTwhf6qLs>), in which you identified yourself as an “architect”:
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
- i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using or being held out under the title “architect”; and
 - ii. Referencing paragraphs 20(b)(vii) and (x), Ms. Perez-Velez testified that she observed the video as containing the alleged misrepresentation on more than one occasion in 2022 leading up to the AIBC’s December 1 letter. Mr. Falakrou did not dispute this assertion.

- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of PGA sections 52(1) and 52(3) and AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. These provisions establish that a non-registrant may not use a reserved title to describe the person's work, or in a manner that implies that the person is a registrant or is authorized to practice the profession subject to the reserved title;
 - ii. Exhibit 8, page 6, shows that during the interview, which is the subject of the video, Mr. Falakrou was asked if he was an architect and he responded, "by trade yes". The Panel finds that this response implies that Mr. Falakrou is authorized to practice architecture which is not true; and
 - iii. Referencing paragraphs 20(b)(x), Ms. Perez-Velez testified that she observed the video as containing the alleged misrepresentation, and;
 - iv. The applicable segment of the video in question was played during the hearing and the closed captioning remained unchanged. Mr. Falakrou confirmed the words of the closed captioning in cross examination per paragraph 25(e).

Paragraph 7 of the Citation

56. Regarding: the Yellow Pages website listed "MyHomeDesigner.com Ltd", under the "architect" category:
<https://www.yellowpages.ca/search/si/3/architect/West+Vancouver+BC>
- a. Under the Architects Act: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
- i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from being held out under the title "architect";
 - ii. Exhibit 4, p. 16, shows that the Yellow Pages website lists MyHomeDesigner.com Ltd. under the search category "Architects". The Panel finds that this constituted holding out Mr. Falakrou as an architect;
 - iii. As set out above, the Panel interprets section 63(1) as imposing a duty on Mr. Falakrou to take reasonable steps to attempt to correct cases where third party websites advertise his work by referring to him as an architect, particularly where this is brought to his attention by AIBC as occurred in this case (Exhibit 6); and

- iv. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, made no attempt to contact Yellow Pages. The Panel notes that the Yellow Pages website depicted in Exhibit 4 has a “contact us” button at the bottom right of the page, suggesting that it would not have been difficult for Mr. Falakrou to bring the matter to the attention of Yellow Pages.
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of AIBC Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
 - i. A person must not be “held out” as an architect, or “held out” as being entitled to use a reserved title, under sections 4.92 and 4.94 of the current Bylaws;
 - ii. Exhibit 8, p. 17 shows that the Yellow Pages web page remained substantively the same in September of 2024; and
 - iii. The remainder of the analysis is the same as for the *Architects Act*, above.

Paragraph 8 of the Citation

57. Regarding: a Google search for “MyHomeDesigner”, (https://www.google.com/search?q=myhomedesigner&rlz=1C1GCEA_enCA899CA899&ei=VT0WY5KbHruG0PEP2OJgAY&ved=0ahUKEwjSmYfLof75AhU7AzQIHdh3AmAQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=myhomedesigner&gs_lcp=Cgdn3Mtd2l6EAMyBAgAEAAoyBAgAEAAoyBAgAEB46CggAEEcQ1gQQsAM6BQgAEIAEOg4lLhCABBDHARDRAxDUAjoFCC4QgAQ6CwguEIAEEMcBENEDoGoILhDHARDRAxAKOgclABCABBAKOgQIABATogYIABAKEBM6BggAEB4QDToECC4QCkoECEEYAEoECEYYAFcFxQFY3vYBYKv6AWgFcAF4AIAbDYgBrQiSAQQxNy4xmAEAoAEBByAEHwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz) resulted in the My Home Designer website identifying you as “architect” and “architectural designer in British Columbia”:

- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. The analysis on this issue is identical to the analysis above on paragraph 4 of the Citation. The only difference is that in addition to referencing the title “architect” the Google search page in this case references Mr. Falakrou’s company as offering an “architectural experience” (Exhibit 4, p. 15), a difference which the Panel finds simply compounds the violation of the *Architects Act*.

- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of section AIBC Bylaw 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. AIBC Bylaw 4.94 provides that a person must not be held out as an architect, or held out as being entitled to use a reserved title. The Panel further interprets the phrasing of Bylaw 4.94 to mean that a person cannot be held out as being entitled to use a reserved title through the use of words that are variations of the reserved title. The Panel's view on this matter is consistent with the AIBC's guideline titled "Regulatory Guidance: Right to Title", in which AIBC notified the profession that use of the phrase "Architectural Design" or "Architectural Designer" by non-architects is not considered acceptable;
 - ii. By September 2024, the Google search page no longer referred to Mr. Falakrou as an "architect" and did not refer to an "architectural experience" (Exhibit 8, p.8). It does, however, refer to MyHomeDesigner.com Ltd with the descriptor "Architectural designer in British Columbia". The Panel finds that this amounts to using an "other name or description" (i.e. "architectural") to describe Mr. Falakrou's work which implies that he is registered as an architect or is authorized to practice architecture. The Panel also finds that Mr. Falakrou is being held out as being entitled to use a reserved title through using words that are variations of the reserved title.
 - iii. As set out above, the Panel interprets Bylaw 4.94 as imposing a duty on Mr. Falakrou to take reasonable steps to attempt to correct this problem.
 - iv. Mr. Falakrou, by his own admission, made no attempt to contact Google, or take any other step to correct the problem such as altering the content of his own website and YouTube channel so that he was no longer referring to himself as an architectural designer.

Paragraph 9 of the Citation

58. Regarding: the “Medium” website, (<https://dmcenter.medium.com/home-design-mindset-28ebfe194485>) contained the article titled “Aryo Falakrou, Architectural Designs Homes for Mindset Too” and identified you in several instances as “architectural designer”;
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follow:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from being held out under the title “architect” or a similar title or description and must not be held out under any name, title, or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - ii. The Medium web page refers to Mr. Falakrou as providing “architectural designs” and refers to him as an “architectural home designer” and an “architectural designer” (Exhibit 4, p 17). The Panel finds that this amounts to being held out under a description similar to “architect” and which implies or is likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - iii. As set out above, the Panel interprets section 63(1) as imposing a duty on Mr. Falakrou to take reasonable steps to attempt to correct this problem;
 - iv. Mr. Falakrou testified that he made efforts to contact the article’s author, but he provided no supporting evidence when requested to do so by the investigations committee, nor in the hearing; and
 - v. If Mr. Falakrou had contacted the author, the evidence would reasonably be available and, since it is not, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that no attempt was made.

- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of section AIBC Bylaw 4.94, and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
 - i. The effect of Bylaw 4.94 is set out above in the section addressing Paragraph 8 of the Citation;
 - ii. As of September 2024, the Medium web page was unchanged and contained the same descriptors as set out above (Exhibit 8, pp. 9-10). The panel finds that this amounts to the use of an “other name or description” (i.e. “architectural”) to describe Mr. Falakrou’s work which implies that he is registered as an architect or is authorized to practice architecture. The Panel also finds that Mr. Falakrou is being held out as being entitled to use a reserved title through using words that are variations of the reserved title; and
 - iii. The remainder of the analysis is the same under the *Architects Act*, as set out above.

Paragraph 10 of the Citation

- 59. Regarding: the “Pursuing Profit with Principles” website, (<https://www.pursuingprofitwithprinciples.com/episode/aryo-falakrou>) identified you as an “architectural designer” with over 34 years of experience in “architectural and interior designs” using a “holistic-architectural” methodology:
 - a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from being held out under the title “architect” or a similar title or description and must not be held out under any name, title, or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - ii. On the Pursuing Profit with Principles web page (Exhibit 4, p. 18) Mr. Falakrou is described as an “architectural designer” with experience in “architectural and interior designs” whose methodology is a “new holistic-architectural approach”. The Panel finds that that this amounts to being held out under a description similar to “architect” and which implies or is likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;

- iii. Mr. Falakrou testified that he made efforts to contact the website's owner, but he provided no supporting evidence when requested to do so by the Investigations Committee, nor in the hearing; and
 - iv. If Mr. Falakrou had contacted the website's owner, the evidence would reasonably be available and, since it is not, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that no attempt was made.
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of AIBC Bylaw 4.94, and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
- i. The effect of Bylaw 4.94 is set out above in the section addressing Paragraph 8 of the Citation;
 - i. As of September 2024, the Pursuing Profit with Principles website continued to describe Mr. Falakrou the same way as set out above. The Panel finds that this amounts to the use of an "other name or description" (i.e. "architectural") to describe Mr. Falakrou's work which implies that he is registered as an architect or is authorized to practice architecture. The Panel also finds that Mr. Falakrou is being held out as being entitled to use a reserved title through the use of words that are variations of the reserved title; and
 - ii. The remainder of the analysis is the same as under the *Architects Act*, as set out above.

Paragraph 11 of the Citation

60. Regarding: My Home Designer Bark Profile (<https://www.bark.com/en/ca/company/my-home-designer/X0v3E/>) promoted itself as providing "architectural services":
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from using descriptions similar to the title "architect" and provides that persons must not advertise or be held out under any name, title or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the Act applies;

- ii. Mr. Falakrou's company is profiled on the Bark.com website (Exhibit 4, p. 19). The company is described as being within the category "Architectural Services". The profile says that MyHomeDesigner provides "architectural and interior design consultation and drawings"; and
 - iii. Mr. Falakrou admitted during cross-examination that he selected "Architectural Services", as the listing category for his work. The Panel finds that Mr. Falakrou was engaging in advertising for the purposes of section 63(1). The Panel finds that he advertised using names and descriptions implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the Act applies. Alternatively, he was held out under a description similar to "architect".
- b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of PGA section 52(3) and AIBC Bylaw 4.94 and that it constitutes professional misconduct;
- i. The effect of section 52(3) and Bylaw 4.94 is set out above in the section addressing Paragraph 8 of the Citation;
 - ii. As of September 2024, the Bark.com profile continued to describe MyHomeDesigner under the category "Architectural Services". The profile no longer stated that MyHomeDesigner provides "architectural and interior design consultation and drawings"; and
 - iii. In relation to the continued use of the category "Architectural Services", which Mr. Falakrou testified was his choice, the Panel finds that this constitutes using a description that implies that Mr. Falakrou, through his company, is a registrant or is authorized to practice architecture. Alternatively, the Panel finds this constitutes the use of a variation of a reserved title that implies entitlement to such a title.

Paragraph 12 of the Citation

61. Regarding: Christine Blanchette’s “Run with it” podcast on Apple Podcasts, (<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/aryo-falakrou-architectural-designer-talks-abouthis/id1539089402?i=1000515089739>) identified you as an “architectural designer”:
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is a breach of the *Architects Act* as follows:
 - i. Section 63(1) prohibits a non-member from being held out under the title “architect” or a similar title or description and must not be held out under any name, title, or description implying or likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - ii. The Apple Podcast webpage describes Mr. Falakrou as an “Architectural Designer” and directs readers to his company website for more information (Exhibit 4, p. 20). The Panel finds that that this amounts to being held out under a description similar to “architect” and which implies or is likely to lead the public to infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies;
 - iii. Mr. Falakrou testified that he made efforts to contact the website’s owner, but he provided no supporting evidence when requested to do so by the investigations committee, nor in the hearing; and
 - iv. If Mr. Falakrou had contacted the website’s owner, the evidence would reasonably be available and, since it is not, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that no attempt was made.
 - b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is a breach of AIBC Bylaw 4.94, and that it constitutes professional misconduct as follows:
 - i. The effect of Bylaw 4.94 is set out above in the section addressing Paragraph 8 of the Citation;
 - ii. As of September 2024, the Apple Podcast webpage continued to describe Mr. Falakrou as an “Architectural Designer”. The Panel finds that this amounts to being held out as being entitled to use a reserved title through the use of words that are variations of the reserved title;
 - iii. The remainder of the analysis is the same as for the *Architects Act*, above.

Paragraph 13 of the Citation

62. Regarding: My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/>) stated you create “architectural extravagant” and that your business offers “an architectural experience” under the “New Custom Homes” heading:
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is not a breach of the *Architects Act* for the following reasons:
 - i. The webpage in question starts by describing Mr. Falakrou as a “Home Designer” which is permissible (Exhibit 4, p. 7). The manner in which the term “creating architectural extravagant” is used does not detract from the statement that Mr. Falakrou is a Home Designer and appears to be more in the nature of a design concept than a statement of professional qualification or an attempt to imply registration under the *Architects Act*. The Panel does not find that the public would likely infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies as a result of this statement; and
 - ii. The AIBC did not prove that the phrase “will offer you an architectural experience” was used on the webpage before the *Architects Act* was repealed.
 - b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds that using the phrase “architectural extravagant” is not a breach of the PGA for the same reasons. However:
 - i. The AIBC proved that the phrase “My Home Designer will offer you an architectural experience” was used on the webpage in September 2024 when the PGA was in force (Exhibit 8, p. 14);
 - ii. As indicated above, Bylaws 4.92 and 4.94 prohibit non-architects from holding themselves out as architects and prohibits registrants from using any variation of a reserved title that implies entitlement to such a title. The Panel finds that offering an “architectural experience” is holding oneself out as an architect and using a variation of the title “architect” to imply entitlement to such a title.

Paragraph 14 of the Citation

63. Regarding: the “About Us” tab of My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/aboutus>) promoted a video titled, “Vancouver home designer, interior designer offering you joy of an “architectural extravagant”:
- a. Under the *Architects Act*: The Panel finds this is not a breach of the *Architects Act* for the following reasons:
 - i. The video description at Exhibit 4, page 8 starts by describing Mr. Falakrou as a “Home Designer, Interior Designer” which is permissible. The manner in which the term “architectural extravagant” is used does not detract from the statement that Mr. Falakrou is a Home Designer or Interior Designer and appears to be more in the nature of a design concept than a statement of professional qualification or an attempt to imply registration under the *Architects Act*. The Panel does not find that the public would likely infer that registration under the *Architects Act* applies as a result of this statement;
 - b. Under the PGA: The Panel finds this is not a breach of the PGA for the same reasons.
 - c. Panel Observation: Exhibits 4 and 8 also include the phrase, “If you are looking for sophisticated design that bring the best architecture in town to your home or workplace, you’ve found the right place”. Exhibit 4 also includes the phrase “we do our best to create a better architecture in Vancouver”. Further, Exhibit 8 refers to Mr. Falakrou as being experienced in “architectural and interior designs”. Although these statements are not referenced in the Citation and accordingly attract no penalty, the Panel observes that these statements would also likely be a contravention of the *Architects Act* and the PGA.

E. SUMMARY OF DETERMINATIONS

64. The Panel finds that the AIBC has proved the allegations in paragraphs 1-12 of the Citation in the manner set out above.
65. The Panel finds that paragraph 13 of the Citation is proved only in part, and that paragraph 14 of the Citation has not been proved.

66. At a more general level, in reference to paragraphs A and B of the Citation, the Panel finds that AIBC has proved that on multiple occasions, and continuing over a period of several years:
- a. Mr. Falakrou has held himself out as an architect, and used descriptions of himself and his work which imply, or are likely to lead the public to infer, that he was registered as an architect, was entitled to use the title “architect” or was entitled to provide architectural services; and
 - b. Mr. Falakrou condoned or acquiesced in the use by others of descriptions which implied that Mr. Falakrou was registered as an architect or was entitled to provide architectural services.
67. In specific response to several of Mr. Falakrou’s arguments, the Panel finds:
- a. Per paragraphs 22(j), 25(b) and 27(b), Mr. Falakrou asserted that he is permitted to produce architectural drawings for Part 9 buildings in accordance with certain municipal requirements for the submission of “architectural drawings”, and/or the AIBC and/or “the law”.
 - b. Even if some municipal officials refer to design drawings by non-architects as “architectural drawings” that does not mean that a non-architect is permitted to violate the applicable legislation and bylaws by describing themselves as an architect, or their work as “architectural”;
 - c. The term “architectural drawings”, as used in certain municipal building permit submittal requirements is not a defined term and refers generically to particular documentation content requested by the municipality;
 - d. Contrary to Mr. Falakrou’s assertion, a non-architect is not permitted to design all Part 9 buildings, the restrictions being set out in the [Architects Regulation](#), of which Mr. Falakrou should be aware as a *registrant*;
 - e. The fact that a non-architect can design some Part 9 buildings does not mean that the non-architect can hold themselves out as an architect or as providing architectural services; and
 - f. The fact that third party websites, or the content thereon, may be created or controlled by persons outside of Canada is irrelevant. As a regulated architectural technologist, if Mr. Falakrou becomes aware that another person is holding him out as an architect, he has an obligation to take reasonable steps to correct that problem.

F. PENALTY AND COSTS

- 68 The Panel must next determine the sanctions which should be imposed on Mr. Falakrou and what order, if any, should be made in relation to costs.
- 69 The Panel's preference is to hear submissions on the issue of penalty and costs through a video conference. The Panel directs that by September 2, 2025, the parties mutually propose three (3) possible video conference dates between October 1 and 31, 2025.
- 70 If this schedule cannot be met due to holidays or other scheduling impediments, the parties may seek a revision to this schedule.

Dated: August 15, 2025



D. Brent North, Architect AIBC, Chair



Brian Hart, Architect AIBC



Andrea Ritchie

**APPENDIX "A" TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE of
THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ("AIBC")**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *PROFESSIONAL GOVERNANCE ACT*
S.B.C. 2018, CHAPTER 47**

- and -

IN THE MATTER OF ARYO FALAKROU ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGIST AIBC

FURTHER AMENDED CITATION

TO: Aryo Falakrou Architectural Technologist AIBC

CARE OF: My Home Designer
200 – 100 Park Royal
West Vancouver, BC V7T 1A2

TAKE NOTICE that the Investigation Committee of the Architectural Institute of British Columbia (the "AIBC") has ordered a Discipline Hearing into a Complaint against you, a Registrant of the AIBC, to be held at **100 – 440 Cambie Street, in the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia**, on ~~February 24, 25, and 26~~ **July 7, 8, and 9, 2025**, at the hour of **9:30 a.m.**

The *Architects Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, Chapter 17 (the "*Architects Act*") was repealed and replaced by the *Professional Governance Act* (the "*PGA*") on February 10, 2023. While the allegations herein are made in part under the repealed *Architects Act*, the former AIBC Bylaws (the "Bylaws"), and/or the former AIBC's Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (the "Code of Ethics"), by authority of the transition provisions in the *Architects Regulation*, B.C. Reg. 33/2023 and current AIBC Bylaws, the procedures established by the *PGA* and the current AIBC Bylaws will be followed for this proceeding.

AND TAKE NOTICE that the allegations against you are that you have contravened section 63(1) of the *Architects Act* and AIBC Bylaw 33.3 in the Code of Ethics, sections 52(1) and 52(3) of the *PGA*, and sections 4.92 and 4.94 of the current AIBC Bylaws, and that this conduct amounts to Professional Misconduct and/or Conduct Unbecoming a Registrant, in that, at all material times including from the date the Complaint was received, at one or more times during the investigation, and/or to the date of this Further Amended Citation, you

- A) Directly and/or indirectly held yourself out under the title "Architect" and used descriptions which implied, or likely led the public to infer, that you were registered as an architect, and/or that you had attained that title and were able to provide architectural services; and/or
- B) Condoned or encouraged others to use, or acquiesced in the use by others, of descriptions which, in contravention of the *Architects Act* and Bylaws, implied that you were registered as an architect or were able to provide architectural services.

on various online platforms, namely:

**APPENDIX "A" TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE of
THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ("AIBC")**

1. a YouTube video (<https://www.youtube.com/shorts/Q5P-KBBWEmk>) which promoted your services with the title “Vancouver Architect, custom homes, extravagant homes, office spaces, creative designs”;
2. the My Home Designer YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/c/Myhomedesignervancouver/videos>) included the following video titles with the word “architect” used as a descriptor:
 - Sechelt and Gibsons Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TH2IdshSzss>
 - Victoria, Nanaimo Architect, Home Designer, Interior designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hJLC2VAsfj8>
 - Kelowna Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gFeIe-3-tUk>
 - Osoyoos Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2fEMd0uUVqI>
 - Chilliwack, Abbotsford, Maple Ridge Architect, Interior Designer, Home Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPpmobBq4Xs>
 - Surrey, White Rock Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0nf9pSRg8Y8>
 - Burnaby Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XegooLpHzCc>
 - Richmond Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u3ghItqn2jQ>
 - North Vancouver's Architect, Home designer, Interior designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EPeQpGHLKa8>
 - Coquitlam Architect, Home Designer, Interior Designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPLqUUeKna0>
 - West Vancouver Architect, Home Designer, Interior designer:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tz0wDRMJBb4>;
3. The My Home Designer YouTube channel
(<https://www.youtube.com/@Myhomedesignervancouver>) “About” description states that MyHomeDesigner.com provides “architectural design consultation”;
- ~~3.~~ 4. a Google search for "Aryo Falakrou"
(https://www.google.com/search?q=aryo+falakrou&rlz=1C1GCEA_enCA899CA899&oq=aryo+fala&aqs=chrome.1.69i57j0i22i30j0i13i30j0i8i13i30l2j69i60j69i61.5124j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8) resulted in the My Home Designer website identifying you as "architect";

**APPENDIX "A" TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
of THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ("AIBC")**

4. ~~5.~~ the "Blog" tab of My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/category/architect-blog/>) repeatedly used the heading "Architect Blog";
5. ~~6.~~ the YouTube video titled "Aryo Falakrou - Does Your Work Environment Inspire Productivity or Drain Your Energy?" (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8OTwhef6qLs>), in which you identified yourself as an "architect";
6. ~~7.~~ the Yellow Pages website listed "MyHomeDesigner.com Ltd" under the "architect" category <https://www.yellowpages.ca/search/si/3/architect/West+Vancouver+BC>.
7. ~~8.~~ a Google search for "MyHomeDesigner" (https://www.google.com/search?q=myhomedesigner&rlz=1C1GCEA_enCA899CA899&ei=VT0WY5KbHruG0PEP2O-lgAY&ved=0ahUKEwjSmYfLof75AhU7AzQIHdh3AmAQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oeq=myhomedesigner&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyBAGAEAAoyBAGAEAAoyBAGAEAB46CggAEEcQ1gQQsAM6BQgAEIAEOg4ILhCABBDHARDRAxDUAjoFCC4QgAQ6CwguEIAEEMcBENEDOgoILhDHARDRAxAKOgcIABCABBAKOgQIABATOGYIABAKEBM6BggAEB4QDTtoECC4QCkoECEEYAEoECEYYAFcfXQFY3vYBYKv6AWgFcAF4AIABdYgBrQiSAQQxNy4xmAEAAoAEBYAEHwAEB&scient=gws-wiz) resulted in the My Home Designer website identifying you as "architect" and "Architectural designer in British Columbia";
8. ~~9.~~ the Medium website (<https://dmcenter.medium.com/home-design-mindset-28ebfe194485>) contained the article titled "Aryo Falakrou, Architectural Designs Homes for Mindset Too" and identified you in several instances as "architectural designer";
9. ~~10.~~ the Pursuing Profit with Principles website (<https://www.pursuingprofitwithprinciples.com/episode/aryo-falakrou>) identified you as an "architectural designer" with over 34 years of experience in "architectural and interior designs" using a "holistic-architectural" methodology;
40. ~~11.~~ My Home Designer Bark Profile (<https://www.bark.com/en/ca/company/my-home-designer/X0v3E/>) promoted itself as providing "architectural services";
44. ~~12.~~ Christine Blanchette's "Run with it" podcast on Apple Podcasts (<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/aryo-falakrou-architectural-designer-talks-about-his/id1539089402?i=1000515089739>) identified you as an "architectural designer";
42. ~~13.~~ My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/>) stated you create "architectural extravagant" and that your business offers "an architectural experience" under the "New Custom Homes" heading; and
43. ~~14.~~ the "About Us" tab of My Home Designer website (<https://myhomedesigner.com/about-us/>) promoted a video titled "Vancouver home designer, interior designer offering you joy of an architectural extravagant!".

**APPENDIX "A" TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
of THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ("AIBC")**

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that you, **Aryo Falakrou Architectural Technologist AIBC**, have the right, at your own expense, to be represented by legal counsel at the Discipline Hearing by the Discipline Hearing Panel pursuant to section 79 of the *PGA* and that you or your legal counsel shall have the full right to cross-examine all witnesses called and to call evidence in defence and reply in answer to the allegation.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that in the event of your non-attendance or failure to remain in attendance at the Discipline Hearing, the Discipline Hearing Panel pursuant to section 78 of the *PGA* may, on proof of service of this Citation upon you, proceed with the taking of evidence or otherwise ascertaining the facts concerning the allegation, your absence notwithstanding, and may make its findings on the facts and its decision without further notice to you.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that at the conclusion of the Discipline Hearing, if the Discipline Hearing Panel determines pursuant to section 75(5)(b) of the *PGA* that you have committed one or more of the following:

- i. Professional Misconduct;
- ii. Conduct Unbecoming a Registrant;
- iii. Incompetent performance of duties undertaken while engaged in the Registrant's Regulated Practice,

THEN, the Discipline Hearing Panel pursuant to section 75(6) of the *PGA* may make one or more of the following orders:

- i. a reprimand;
- ii. impose a penalty on the individual of not more than \$100,000;
- iii. impose conditions on the individual's registration;
- iv. suspend the individual from practice:
 - a. for a specified period of time;
 - b. until the individual complies with requirement (vi) below
 - c. for a specified minimum period of time and until the individual complies with requirement (vi) below
- v. cancel the individual's registration from the AIBC; and
- vi. require the individual to:
 - a. complete a remedial program; or
 - b. appear before a committee to satisfy the committee that the individual is competent to practise the registrant's regulated practice.

The Discipline Hearing Panel may also direct that certain Costs of the Discipline Hearing are payable to the AIBC by you, in the amount and within the time specified by the Discipline Hearing Panel.

Enclosed with this Citation are section 63(1) of the repealed *Architects Act*, and Bylaw 33.3 of the former Code of Ethics.

Capitalized terms in this Citation have the same meaning as defined in the [AIBC Bylaws](#).

**APPENDIX "A" TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
of THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ("AIBC")**

DATED at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 02 day of October, 2024.

CITATION AMENDED December 12, 2024 pursuant to s. 7.25.1 of the AIBC Bylaws.

CITATION FURTHER AMENDED June 12, 2025, pursuant to s. 7.25.1 of the AIBC Bylaws.

ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Per:

Chief Executive Officer & Registrar