

BEFORE THE
BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, AND GEOLOGISTS
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation)	
against:)	
)	
KOLADI MUTHERI KRIPANARAYANAN)	Case No. 1233-A
P.O. Box 223)	
2710 Alpine Blvd)	
Alpine, CA 91901)	
)	
Civil Engineer License, No. C 34055,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

DECISION

The attached Stipulated Surrender and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on December 9, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED November 9, 2021.

Original Signed

BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS,
LAND SURVEYORS, AND GEOLOGISTS
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 RITA M. LANE
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 171352
600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
5 San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
6 San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 738-9421
7 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061
Attorneys for Complainant

8
9 **BEFORE THE**
10 **BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, AND**
11 **GEOLOGISTS**
12 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
13 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

15 **KOLADI MUTHERI**
16 **KRIPANARAYANAN**
17 **2710 Alpine Blvd, PMB #223**
18 **Alpine, CA 91901**

19 **Civil Engineer License No. C 34055**

20 Respondent.

Case No. 1233-A

OAH No. 2021020170

**STIPULATED SURRENDER OF
LICENSE AND ORDER**

21 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-
22 entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:

23 **PARTIES**

24 1. Richard B. Moore, PLS (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board for
25 Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists (Board). He brought this action solely in
26 his official capacity and is represented in this matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State
27 of California, by Rita M. Lane, Deputy Attorney General.

28 ///

///

1 2. Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by
2 attorney Gregg Carlucci, whose address is: 3505 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 337, San Diego,
3 CA 92108.

4 3. On or about March 17, 1982, the Board issued Civil Engineer License No. C 34055 to
5 Respondent. The Civil Engineer License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the
6 charges brought in Accusation No. 1233-A and expired on June 30, 2021, and has not been
7 renewed.

8 4. On or about February 17, 1984, the Board issued Structural Engineer License No. S
9 2654 to Respondent.

10 5. In a disciplinary action titled "In the Matter of the Accusation Against Kolandi
11 Mutheri Kripanarayanan," Case No. Case No. 1143-A, the Board issued a Decision and Order
12 effective October 12, 2018, in which Respondent's Civil Engineer License was revoked.
13 However, the revocation was stayed, and Respondent's Civil Engineer License was placed on
14 probation for four (4) years with certain terms and conditions. In addition, Respondent voluntarily
15 surrendered his Structural Engineer License.

16 **JURISDICTION**

17 6. First Amended Accusation No. 1233-A was filed before the Board, and is currently
18 pending against Respondent. The First Amended Accusation and all other statutorily required
19 documents were properly served on Respondent on July 12, 2021. Respondent timely filed his
20 Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of First Amended Accusation No. 1233-A
21 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

22 **ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS**

23 7. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the
24 charges and allegations in First Amended Accusation No. 1233-A. Respondent also has carefully
25 read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of
26 License and Order.

27 8. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a
28 hearing on the charges and allegations in the First Amended Accusation; the right to confront and

1 cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own
2 behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the
3 production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision;
4 and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable
5 laws.

6 9. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and
7 every right set forth above.

8 **CULPABILITY**

9 10. Respondent understands that the charges and allegations in First Amended
10 Accusation No. 1233-A, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his
11 Civil Engineer License.

12 11. For the purpose of resolving the First Amended Accusation without the expense and
13 uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could
14 establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause
15 for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest that cause for discipline exists
16 based on those charges.

17 12. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to issue
18 an order accepting the voluntary surrender of his Civil Engineer License without further process.

19 **CONTINGENCY**

20 13. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board. Respondent understands
21 and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board may communicate directly
22 with the Board regarding this stipulation and surrender, without notice to or participation by
23 Respondent or his counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he
24 may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board
25 considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order,
26 the Stipulated Surrender and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this
27 paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not
28 be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.

1 14. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile
2 copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including PDF and facsimile signatures
3 thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

4 15. This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is intended by the parties to be an
5 integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement.
6 It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions,
7 negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Surrender of License and Order
8 may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing
9 executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.

10 16. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that
11 the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

12 **ORDER**

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Civil Engineer License No. C 34055 issued to Respondent
14 Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan, is surrendered and accepted by the Board.

15 1. The surrender of Respondent's Civil Engineer License and the acceptance of the
16 surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent.
17 This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's
18 license history with the Board.

19 2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a licensed civil engineer in
20 California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.

21 3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was
22 issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.

23 4. Respondent agrees not to petition for reinstatement of the surrendered license.
24 Respondent agrees not to apply for any license issued by the Board for three years from the
25 effective date of this surrender. Respondent understands and agrees that if he ever applies for any
26 license issued by the Board, the Board shall treat it as a new application for licensure.
27 Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations, and procedures for licensure in effect at
28 the time the application is filed, including but not limited, to submitting a completed application

1 and the requisite fee and taking and passing the required examination(s), and all of the charges
2 and allegations contained in the Accusation shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by
3 Respondent when the licensing agency determines whether to grant or deny the application.

4 5. In exchange for these agreements, the Board will waive reimbursement of its costs of
5 investigation and prosecution in this matter.

6 **ACCEPTANCE**

7 I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully
8 discussed it with my attorney Gregg Carlucci. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will
9 have on my Civil Engineer License. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order
10 voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the
11 Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists.

12
13 DATED: 10/4/21

Original Signed

KOLADI MUTHERI KRIPANARAYANAN
Respondent

14
15
16 I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan the terms
17 and conditions and other matters contained in this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I
18 approve its form and content.

19
20 DATED: 10/4/21

Original Signed

GREGG CARLUCCI
Attorney for Respondent

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

DATED: October 22, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

Original Signed

RITA M. LANE
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

SD2020301067
83057781.docx

Exhibit A

First Amended Accusation No. 1233-A

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 RITA M. LANE
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 171352
600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
5 San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
6 San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 738-9421
7 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061
Attorneys for Complainant

9 **BEFORE THE**
10 **BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, AND**
11 **GEOLOGISTS**
12 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
13 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 1233-A

15 **KOLADI MUTHERI KRIPANARAYANAN**
16 **P.O. Box 223**
17 **2710 Alpine Blvd**
18 **Alpine, CA 91901**

FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION

Civil Engineer License No. C 34055

Respondent.

20 **PARTIES**

21 1. Richard B. Moore, PLS (Complainant) brings this First Amended Accusation solely
22 in his official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board for Professional Engineers, Land
23 Surveyors, and Geologists (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.

24 2. On or about March 17, 1982, the Board issued Civil Engineer License Number C
25 34055 to Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan (Respondent). The Civil Engineer License was in full
26 force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and expired on June 30,
27 2021, and has not been renewed.

28 ///

1 3. On or about February 17, 1984, the Board issued Structural Engineer License Number
2 S 2654 to Respondent.

3 4. In a disciplinary action titled "In the Matter of the Accusation Against Kolandi
4 Mutheri Kripanarayanan," Case No. Case No. 1143-A, the Board issued a Decision and Order
5 effective October 12, 2018, in which Respondent's Civil Engineer License was revoked.
6 However, the revocation was stayed, and Respondent's Civil Engineer License was placed on
7 probation for four (4) years with certain terms and conditions. In addition, Respondent
8 voluntarily surrendered his Structural Engineer License.

9 **JURISDICTION**

10 5. This First Amended Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the
11 following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless
12 otherwise indicated.

13 6. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration,
14 surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a
15 disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued
16 or reinstated.

17 **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

18 7. Section 6775 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that:

19 [T]he board may publicly reprove, suspend for a period not to exceed two
20 years, or revoke the certificate of any professional engineer licensed under this
chapter on any of the following grounds:

21 . . .

(b) Any deceit, misrepresentation, or fraud in his or her practice.

22 (c) Any negligence or incompetence in his or her practice.

23 . . .

(f) Aiding or abetting any person in the violation of any provision of this

24
25

26 **COST RECOVERY**

27 8. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the
28 administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of

1 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
2 enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being
3 renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be
4 included in a stipulated settlement.

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 9. On or about February 1, 2018, the Board opened an investigation into Respondent’s
7 civil engineering work on a number of projects with Concorde Consulting Group, LLC. The
8 investigation was later expanded to include Respondent’s work on projects with Concorde
9 Enterprises. According to documents filed with the California Secretary of State, Respondent
10 was the manager of Concorde Consulting Group, LLC, and an officer of Concorde Consulting
11 Group, Inc. doing business in California as N.K. Concorde Consulting Group.

12 10. As described more fully below, Respondent performed civil engineering work on
13 each of the following projects undertaken by Concorde Consulting Group, LLC, or Concorde
14 Enterprises, and demonstrated negligence or incompetence in the practice of civil engineering.

15 **3817 BEN STREET, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

16 11. On or about July 20, 2017, Respondent stamped and signed final architectural and
17 structural drawings for the property at 3817 Ben Street. The project at 3817 Ben Street involved
18 a new enclosed space created for a single-family residence, requiring a new wall and other
19 structural elements over an existing patio slab. The plans were submitted to the City of San
20 Diego and approved on or about January 25, 2018.

21 12. On or about August 28, 2018, Respondent prepared, stamped, and signed structural
22 calculations titled “DESIGN CALCULATIONS FOR Plan Check Corrections at 3817 Ben Street
23 Remodel” that were submitted to the City of San Diego.

24 13. On or about November 8, 2018, Respondent stamped and signed final project
25 drawings indicating field changes – Delta 1 (a new beam) and Delta 2 (change of wall openings)
26 – to the City of San Diego for the property at 3817 Ben Street.

27 ///

28 ///

1 14. In his “Response to Board Letter Dated 11-9-2019,” Respondent claimed that the
2 original calculations for roof framing were done by others on November 30, 2016. Respondent
3 stated he reviewed the plan check comments and drawings around January 19, 2017, and that he
4 provided structural calculations to support the use of Ram Jack piles because the owner wanted to
5 repair the foundation.

6 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

7 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 3817 Ben Street)**

8 15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
9 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 3817 Ben Street, as
10 set forth in paragraphs 11 through 14 above, which are incorporated herein by reference, and as
11 follows:

12 16. Drawing A-4 of the original construction documents states “concrete stem wall to
13 match (E),” but there was nothing related to the foundation required to support the stem wall.
14 Although field change documents were later issued to identify a new foundation system, the
15 original documents lacked sufficient information to identify whether the support system met code
16 requirements, demonstrating a lack of care in assessing the existing structure.

17 17. Structural calculations done to determine the effect of wind on weak-axis bending of
18 wood beams used nominal dimensions (4 inches) instead of actual dimensions (3.5 inches). This
19 demonstrates a lack of care in structural analysis procedures.

20 **3833 BEN STREET, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

21 18. On or about April 12, 2017, Respondent prepared, signed, and stamped drawings that
22 were submitted to the City of San Diego for the addition of two new roof-support beams as part
23 of a residential remodel at 3833 Ben Street.

24 19. In his “Response to Board Letter Dated 11-9-2019,” Respondent claimed that
25 calculations for the roof framing were completed by others. Respondent stated he reviewed the
26 calculations and drawings.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 3833 Ben Street)**

3 20. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
4 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 3833 Ben Street, as
5 set forth in paragraphs 18 and 19 above, which are incorporated herein by reference, and as
6 follows:

7 21. Drawing S-2 indicates that the inner Beam “RB-1”¹ carries roof loads as a
8 concentrated force (Detail 5), whereas this force is missing from Respondent’s beam design
9 calculations.

10 22. Beam supports impose concentrated forces that require some type of evaluation to
11 assure adequate transfer to supporting soils. The calculations do not include a review of the
12 existing slab or footing, demonstrating a lack of care in assessing the existing structure.

13 **3653 PRINCETON AVENUE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

14 23. On or about May 24, 2010, Respondent signed and stamped structural design
15 calculations submitted to the City of San Diego for the remodel of an existing single-family
16 residence at 3653 Princeton Avenue, including construction of a new deck and replacement of
17 part of the roof.

18 24. On July 12, 2010, Respondent stamped and signed final (punched) drawings for the
19 project that were submitted to the City of San Diego and approved on July 14, 2010.

20 25. In his “Response to Board Letter Dated 11-9-2019,” Respondent claimed he did no
21 work for the project.

22 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

23 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 3653 Princeton Avenue)**

24 26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
25 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 3653 Princeton

26 ///

27 _____
28 ¹Both engineered beams were given the same designation, even though they are different sizes and carry different loads.

1 Avenue, as set forth in paragraphs 23 through 25 above, which are incorporated herein by
2 reference, and as follows:

3 27. Guardrail post anchorage details were not properly designed to resist Code-required
4 forces. Calculations were not completed, although the plans examiner requested them.

5 **7973 PURPLE SAGE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

6 28. On or about July 23, 2015, the City of San Diego approved final (punched) drawings
7 signed and stamped by Respondent for the renovation of an existing patio at the single-family
8 residence at 7973 Purple Sage.

9 29. In his “Response to Board Letter Dated 11-9-2019,” Respondent claimed he had no
10 record of having done any calculations, drawings, or review work for the project.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

12 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 7973 Purple Sage)**

13 30. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
14 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 7973 Purple Sage,
15 as set forth in paragraphs 28 and 29 above, which are incorporated herein by reference, and as
16 follows:

17 31. The following errors collectively demonstrate a lack of sufficient care by Respondent:

- 18 a) Drawing S-1 includes a tremendous quantity of notes that do not apply to the
19 work.
 - 20 b) Drawing S-2 contains a prescriptive table, “Allowable Spans for Girders
21 Supporting One Floor Only,” but the project does not include a floor.
 - 22 c) Detail 1/S-2 calls for “Simpson SWTXP,” but no such product exists.
 - 23 d) Detail 1/S-2 calls for “Simpson ETX,” but no such product exists.
 - 24 e) The patio section calls for #4 reinforcement in the footings, but Detail 1/S-2 call
25 for #5 bars.
 - 26 f) The patio section calls for 4x4 rafters, but Detail 2/S-2 calls for 2x rafters.
 - 27 g) Detail 3/S-2 calls for steel columns, but the project uses wood columns.
- 28

1 32. A four-foot tall free-standing wall for pool equipment is called out in the drawings,
2 but no details are included to indicate the means of construction or foundation support
3 requirements.

4 **7220 TRADE STREET, SUITE 120, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

5 33. On or about March 24, 2016, the City of San Diego issued a building permit to
6 Concorde Enterprises for tenant improvement work at 7220 Trade Street, Suite 120. “K.M
7 Kripa” was identified on the permit application as the design professional for the project,
8 although he was described as an architect and no license number was provided. Respondent
9 prepared and stamped final (punched) drawings for the project, which were submitted to the City
10 of San Diego. The undated drawings included tenant improvements for a commercial building,
11 including the removal and addition of partition walls, flooring, and other work.

12 34. In his “Response to Board Letter Dated 11-9-2019,” Respondent claimed he did no
13 work on the project and did not sign any drawings.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

15 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 7220 Trade Street)**

16 35. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
17 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 7220 Trade Street,
18 Suite 120, as set forth in paragraphs 33 and 34 above, which are incorporated herein by reference,
19 and as follows:

20 36. Drawing A-4 includes a suspended ceiling support and bracing detail that is far out of
21 date. It makes reference to the “U.B.C.” (Uniform Building Code), which was discontinued in
22 January 2000.

23 **1032 SYLARK DRIVE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

24 37. On or about January 19, 2017, Respondent stamped resubmittal (plan check)
25 calculations for 1032 Skylark Drive. The original project, which was designed by others,
26 included a general remodel, a new deck, and foundation repair.

27 38. On July 10, 2017, Respondent signed and stamped foundation repair calculations for
28 the project that were submitted to the City of San Diego.

1 **SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Incompetence in the Practice of Engineering – 1032 Skylark Drive)**

3 39. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
4 that Respondent demonstrated incompetence in the practice of engineering for the project at 1032
5 Skylark Drive, as set forth in paragraphs 37 and 38 above, which are incorporated herein by
6 reference, and as follows:

7 40. Structural plan check response calculations identify anchorage of a guardrail for 50
8 PLF applied to the top rail. The correct moment is calculated at the base of the system, but the
9 specification of fasteners is inadequate. Horizontal parallel-to-grain resisting shear values for lag
10 screws are noted (an incorrect application), and the moment arm is not resolved in such a way
11 that the base moment is adequately transferred into the supporting floor system. Proper resolution
12 of applied forces is a necessary part of the structural design process, and Respondent
13 demonstrated a lack of knowledge in this regard.

14 **500 & 506 SMILAX AVENUE, WEST SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

15 41. Concorde Enterprises was hired by a contractor to provide structural plans and
16 building department review documents for two (2) single family homes with the same floor and
17 front roof elevation located at 500 and 506 Smilax Avenue in West Sacramento (Smilax Avenue
18 project). The scope of services offered included two (2) sets of stamped structural drawings and
19 calculations, to oversee plan corrections, RFIs during construction, stamped inspection letters as
20 needed, and truss compliance letter.

21 42. Concorde Enterprises hired a drafting consultant, G.A., to work on the project
22 drawings.

23 43. On or about May 15, 2020, project drawings and calculations were provided from
24 Concorde Enterprises to the contractor for submission to the city building department. The
25 drawings were stamped and signed by Respondent and are dated May 1, 2020. The calculations
26 were stamped and signed by Respondent and are dated May 5, 2020.

27 44. The drawings and calculations were submitted to the city building department.

28 ///

1 45. On or about June 15, 2020, the contractor received the city’s plan check corrections
2 of 16 items specifically addressed to the structural drawings and requiring correction by an
3 engineer. Concorde Enterprises failed to make the corrections.

4 46. On or about September 11, 2020, when contacted by the Board regarding his
5 involvement in the Smilax Avenue project, Respondent emailed the Board and insisted that
6 he had not worked on the project in any capacity.

7 47. Later in the day on September 11, 2020, the Board emailed Respondent and
8 informed Respondent that the Smilax Avenue plans and calculations included his stamp and
9 signature. Respondent responded by email to the Board and stated that “I am 100% sure that
10 I never worked on this project.”

11 48. By email dated September 18, 2020, Respondent informed the Board that he
12 looked in his files and spoke with Concorde Enterprises and stated that he had nothing to do
13 with the Smilax Avenue project

14 49. By email dated September 21, 2020, Respondent informed the Board that the
15 Smilax Avenue project was Concorde Enterprises project, not his project, and he did not
16 know who had placed his stamp and signature on the Smilax Avenue documents.

17 50. On or about October 20, 2020, Respondent met with a Board investigator and
18 reviewed the Smilax Avenue project documents. Respondent again denied that he did any work
19 on the Smilax Avenue project and denied that he stamped or signed the project documents, and
20 that he did not know who did. Respondent stated that Rajesh Narayanan is the president and
21 owner of Concorde Enterprises and is not a licensed engineer. Respondent admitted that
22 Rajesh Narayanan is his son. Respondent refused to sign a statement that he did not work on the
23 Smilax Avenue project.

24 51. By letter to the Board dated October 21, 2020, Respondent stated that his scope of
25 work on the Smilax Avenue project was to only review the calculations and drawings, and that he
26 did not prepare the calculations. Respondent stated that he gave Concorde Enterprises
27 authorization to use his electronic stamp on the Smilax Avenue documents.

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 500 Smilax Avenue Project)**

3 52. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
4 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 500 Smilax
5 Avenue, as set forth in paragraphs 41 through 51, above, which are incorporated herein by
6 reference, and as follows:

7 53. In the calculations, Respondent appears to provide an engineering analysis and design
8 for the prefabricated wood trusses. The analysis lacks consideration of required connection plates
9 and includes a snow load that is not identified elsewhere in the calculations.

10 54. In the calculations, two allowable foundation pressures are assumed (3500 PSF and
11 5000 PSF), both of which are too high to assume without the assistance of a geotechnical report.
12 No justification was provided as to why there would be two applicable design values for the same
13 lot.

14 55. The calculations include two different footing conditions that do not appear on the
15 drawings: (1) Footing depth = 20" with 24" of soil over the top; (2) footing depth = 12" with 18"
16 of soil over the top.

17 56. The structural calculations assume a roof dead load of 10 PSF, but the drawings
18 identify a roof dead load of 15 PSF, which means the supporting elements are under-designed and
19 the seismic demand load is too low.

20 57. The drawings indicate shorter shear wall segments than were used in the calculations
21 for design, therefore holdown forces will be higher, potentially requiring a larger holdown device
22 or foundation.

23 58. Drag trusses appear to be required, but these are not identified on the roof framing
24 plans. Drag truss notes are included on Drawing S-1.

25 59. Construction notes include masonry and structural steel, but neither of these materials
26 are evident in the plans or details.

27 ///

28 ///

1 60. The foundation plans (S-2) and roof framing plans (S-3) make reference to Steel
2 Strong Walls and identify additional drawings, but these do not appear to be used and the
3 referenced drawings are not included in the set.

4 61. Detail 10/S-4 shows splice lengths for concrete reinforcement, but the minimum
5 length shown does not meet the requirements of ACI 318-14, Section 25.4.2.2.

6 **EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

7 **(Negligence in the Practice of Engineering – 506 Smilax Avenue Project)**

8 62. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(c) in
9 that Respondent was negligent in his practice of engineering for the project at 506 Smilax
10 Avenue, as set forth in paragraphs 41 through 51, above, which are incorporated herein by
11 reference, and as follows:

12 63. The structural calculations assume a roof dead load of 10 PSF, but the drawings
13 identify a roof dead load of 15 PSF, which means the supporting elements are under-designed and
14 the seismic demand load is too low.

15 64. The drawings indicate shorter shear wall segments than were used in the calculations
16 for design, therefore holdown forces will be higher, potentially requiring a larger holdown device
17 or foundation.

18 65. Drag trusses appear to be required, but these are not identified on the roof framing
19 plans. Drag truss notes are included on Drawing S-1.

20 66. Construction notes include masonry and structural steel, but neither of these materials
21 are evident in the plans or details.

22 67. The foundation plans (S-2) and roof framing plans (S-3) make reference to Steel
23 Strong Walls and identify additional drawings, but these do not appear to be used and the
24 referenced drawings are not included in the set.

25 68. Detail 10/S-4 shows splice lengths for concrete reinforcement, but the minimum
26 length shown does not meet the requirements of ACI 318-14, Section 25.4.2.2.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Aiding and Abetting the Unlicensed Practice of Engineering)**

3 69. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(f) in that
4 Respondent aided and abetted Rajesh Narayanan in the unlicensed practice of engineering when
5 he gave Rajesh Narayanan and Concorde Enterprises authorization to use his electronic stamp
6 bearing his license information on the Smilex Avenue project documents, and as more
7 specifically set forth in paragraphs 41 through 51, above, which are incorporated herein by
8 reference.

9 **TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

10 **(Deceit and Misrepresentation)**

11 70. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section Code section 6775(b) in
12 that on several occasions Respondent was deceitful and misrepresented to the Board his
13 involvement in the Smilex Avenue project as more specifically set forth in paragraphs 41 through
14 51, above, which are incorporated herein by reference.

15 **DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS**

16 71. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent,
17 Complainant alleges that:

18 72. On or about November 25, 2009, in a prior disciplinary action entitled *In the Matter*
19 *of the Accusation Against Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan* before the Board, in Case Number
20 850-A, Respondent stipulated to revocation of his Civil Engineer License and Structural Engineer
21 License, with the revocation stayed, and Respondent's licenses placed on three years probation
22 with various terms and conditions for multiple violations of Code section 6775. That decision is
23 now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.

24 73. On or about October 12, 2018, in a prior disciplinary action entitled *In the Matter of*
25 *the Accusation Against Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan* before the Board, in Case Number 1143-
26 A, Respondent stipulated to revocation of his Civil Engineer License, with the revocation stayed,
27 and Respondent's licenses placed on four years probation with various terms and conditions for
28 multiple violations of Code section 6775. In addition, Respondent voluntarily surrendered his

1 Structural Engineer License. That decision is now final and is incorporated by reference as if
2 fully set forth.

3 **PRAYER**

4 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters alleged in this
5 First Amended Accusation, and that following the hearing, the Board for Professional Engineers,
6 Land Surveyors, and Geologists issue a decision:

7 1. Revoking or suspending Civil Engineer License No. C 34055, issued to Koladi
8 Mutheri Kripanarayanan;

9 2. Ordering Koladi Mutheri Kripanarayanan to pay the Board for Professional
10 Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists the reasonable costs of the investigation and
11 enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; and

12 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

13
14 DATED: 7/9/2021

Original Signed

15 _____
16 RICHARD B. MOORE, PLS
17 Executive Officer
18 Board for Professional Engineers, Land
19 Surveyors, and Geologists
20 Department of Consumer Affairs
21 State of California
22 *Complainant*

23
24
25
26
27
28
SD2020301067
82943318.docx