PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Australian Property Institute Ltd.
ABN 49 007 505 866
ACN 608 309 128

23 July 2026

Professional Conduct Committee | Panel Report

PR0526 Muskett v Sarenas

Produced by the Professional Conduct Committee
pursuant to Section 13.13 of the API Professional Conduct Policy

Details

Complainant	Justin Muskett	**Member**	Rizabelle Sarenas
	Level 27, 101 Collins Street		49 Ormonde Road
	MELBOURNE VIC 3000		FERNTREE GULLY VIC 3156
	justin.muskett@ana.net.au		admin@rcspropertyconsulting.com

Professional Conduct Committee

[redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]

Date of Complaint

18 March 2026

Date of Professional Conduct Committee Meetings

3 June 2026

15 July 2026

Property Address

78 Bathurst Street, Launceston Tas 7250

Property Category

- ☐ Residential
- X Commercial
- ☐ Rural

Timeline of Events

30.12.2025	Complainant enquired about valuation for insurance purposes.
5.1.2026	Member response with pricing.
19.1.2026	Authority to proceed provided.
3.3.2026	Report provided.

Complainant Position

How has this event Affected you?

I have lost all trust in the Valuation process and I will be requesting insurance companies which we use as loss adjusters review this process moving forward. I felt violated and scammed by the Member's company.

What Outcome are you Seeking?

We are hoping Valuation Tas are unable to advertise they are local and are restricted to operating out of the area they are actually present. We are hoping the Member is unable to scam others.

Member Position

I received instructions from Valuation Australia on 6 February 2026 to complete a Desktop Valuation for the purpose of Building Insurance. At the time, I was in Launceston. Although a desktop valuation does not require an external inspection, I still attended the property and took my own photographs. I have attached the photos that I personally captured.

Regarding the photos included in the report, these were provided to me as part of the desktop valuation instructions. Based on my experience and previous desktop valuations I have completed, we are required to include all photos supplied to us. I did not claim ownership of those provided images, nor did I state that they were taken by me. I am unsure whether Mr. Muskett is familiar with the desktop valuation process, how it works, and the fact that valuers must rely on the documents and information provided by the instructing party. I also made this clear in my report on page 2 and in accordance to API Rules of Conduct Section 12. Regarding Desktop Process.

“The instructing party is aware that the valuer signing this report has not carried out a physical inspection and has received desktop instructions from Valuations TAS. The signing valuer, under the API Code of Conduct, details the risks associated with not inspecting the subject property. Refer to comments in the body of this report. For clarity, the valuer brings to the instructing party’s attention that the Australian Property Institute (API) recommends a physical inspection as industry best practice.”

“Should the instructing party decide that a full inspection by the signing valuer is more appropriate to ensure accuracy of the building insurance valuation, please contact our office for a quotation.”

I am not aware of how Valuation Australia delivered the report to Mr Muskett or how they managed their payment-chasing process. I was not involved in any of those administrative steps. However, I did attempt to contact Mr Muskett directly, and I also phoned the office to advise them that I had tried to reach out. Mr Justin Muskett declined to speak with me, which I found surprising as I had done nothing wrong. It appears his frustration may have been directed at the administrative team regarding payment follow- up, but that matter is outside my control and not my responsibility.

Finally, I further would like to add that this has nothing to do with RCS Property Management & Valuation Pty Ltd.

Allegations and Considerations

The Complainant alleges the following categories of the Rules of Professional Conduct have been breached by the Member:

Service Provided

Relevant Rules: Rule 1.7, 1.11, 2.1 and 2.2

Complainant stated: We enquired to the Member the process to provide a valuation report. We requested a quote dated 30 December 2025. They responded with an email dated 5 January 2026, stating the cost of $3,150 plus GST and the turnaround time is 7 business days from inspection. We engaged their services dated 19 January, providing them with an authority to proceed from Insurance Company direction. We have attached the email and authority to proceed document. We were then advised they could not attend site, to which we provided images, floor dimensions and title information dated 3 February 2026. We were then provided with an invoice dated 6 February 2026, with a follow up email 10 February chasing payment, and then advising 11 February if we cancel the request we would be charged 50% of the fee. We advised our Purchase Order ensured they would be paid once the report is received. They advised they would not release the report until payment was received. We arranged full payment of the invoice 17 February 2026, followed by a request for a reduced fee due to not attending site. We were then offered $150.00 reduction. We requested to meet at their Tasmanian office, to which we were advised they do not operate from, indicating they have no one in the state, hence why they could not attend to the property. We then received the report on 3 March 2026, well after the invoice payment. The Member advertises being operating in Tasmania, does not act in an ethical way of producing documents in a timely manner, and would not meet to discuss.

Member stated: I received instructions from Valuation Australia on 6 February 2026 to complete a Desktop Valuation for the purpose of Building Insurance…

I am not aware of how Valuation Australia delivered the report to Mr Muskett or how they managed their payment-chasing process. I was not involved in any of those administrative steps. However, I did attempt to contact Mr Muskett directly, and I also phoned the office to advise them that I had tried to reach out. Mr Justin Muskett declined to speak with me, which I found surprising as I had done nothing wrong. It appears his frustration may have been directed at the administrative team regarding payment follow-up, but that matter is outside my control and not my responsibility.

Relevant Rules:

Rule 1.7 – *A Member must obtain or confirm in writing and maintain a record of all instructions and variations of instruction of the client or the client's representatives.*

Rule 1.11 – *A Member must complete the professional services required by the agreed instructions to the Member, unless:*

(a) the Member and the client, have otherwise agreed in writing that the professional services are not to be completed;

(b) the Member is discharged from completing the professional services in writing by the client; or

(c) the Member terminates the instructions for just cause, with reasonable written notice to the client expressing the reasons why the Member is terminating the instructions.

Rule 2.1 – *A Member must attempt to meet the service timeline within the agreed instructions.*

Rule 2.2 – *A Member must inform the client within a reasonable time frame if there is, or is likely to be, a delay in providing/completing professional services.*

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The Member relied on the business model of the company to confirm instructions rather than take personal responsibility as required under the Ethics and Rules;
- The report was not completed in accordance with the agreed instructions;
- There was no reasonable attempt by the Member to meet the agreed timelines;
- There was no communication with the client to advise on delays.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rules 1.7, 1.11, 2.1 and 2.2 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Ethical duties

Relevant Rules: Rule 1.1

Complainant stated: Failing to perform work the Member was engaged to do breaches ethical duties by violating core professional principles such as integrity, honesty, and diligence. The Member advertised they were in Tasmania, which they were and are not. They have no local presence. Further to this they charged for a service they did not complete, with no site inspection. They also did not complete this in the timeframe they advised.

Member stated: I received instructions from Valuation Australia… to complete a Desktop Valuation for the purpose of Building Insurance. At the time, I was in Launceston. Although a desktop valuation does not require an external inspection, I still attended the property and took my own photographs. I have attached the photos that I personally captured.

Regarding the photos included in the report, these were provided to me as part of the desktop valuation instructions.

Relevant Rules:

Rule 1.1 – *A Member must undertake their professional services ethically, with honesty, and in good faith, without personal bias, an in a manner which upholds the values and reputation of the API.*

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- the Member participated in a misrepresentation to the client and did not inform the client about the sub-contractor situation. However, this is not sufficient for a breach of Rule 1.1.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does not establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Plagiarism

Relevant Rules: Rule 6.1

Complainant stated: The Member was provided with the images of the property and identified these as their own. It was not changed until after we advised.

Member stated: Regarding the photos included in the report, these were provided to me as part of the desktop valuation instructions. Based on my experience and previous desktop valuations I have completed, we are required to include all photos supplied to us. I did not claim ownership of those provided images, nor did I state that they were taken by me.

Relevant Rules:

Rule 6.1 *– A Member must not use, rely on, reproduce, paraphrase, or summarise any work, words, ideas, processes, results and/or intellectual property that is not their own without explicitly and expressly identifying and acknowledging the source and, if appropriate, seek prior approval for such use, reliance and reproduction.*

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The Member should have acknowledged the source of the photos.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rule 6.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Valuation process

Relevant Rules: Rule 12.3, 12.4, 12.5

Complainant stated: The timeframe taken to provide the report was outside of the timeframe they proposed.

Member stated: I am unsure whether Mr. Muskett is familiar with the desktop valuation process, how it works, and the fact that valuers must rely on the documents and information provided by the instructing party. I also made this clear in my report on page 2 and in accordance to API Rules of Conduct Section 12. Regarding Desktop Process.

“The instructing party is aware that the valuer signing this report has not carried out a physical inspection and has received desktop instructions from Valuations TAS. The signing valuer, under the API Code of Conduct, details the risks associated with not inspecting the subject property. Refer to comments in the body of this report. For clarity, the valuer brings to the instructing party’s attention that the Australian Property Institute (API) recommends a physical inspection as industry best practice.”

“Should the instructing party decide that a full inspection by the signing valuer is more appropriate to ensure accuracy of the building insurance valuation, please contact our office for a quotation.”

Relevant Rules:

Rule 12.3 *– Prior to completing a desktop, a Valuer should have sufficient knowledge and experience gained from undertaking valuations on the same or similar asset class in the relevant market.*

Rule 12.4 *– When completing a desktop, a Valuer must perform the necessary investigations and processes to permit the Valuer to:*

(a) satisfy themselves that the requirements of the desktop process have been performed, and

(b) complete the desktop in accordance with practice accepted as proper for a desktop process as set out in the Rules.

Rule 12.5 *– When completing a desktop report in accordance with the written instructions from the client, or the client's representative, the Valuer must take reasonable steps to:*

(a) ascertain and verify the information as a Valuer should when performing a desktop.

(b) obtain, compile and appropriately verify sufficient relevant facts and data to ensure the Valuer can conclude all reasoning and analysis to allow the Valuer to form their qualified opinion; and

(c) in the absence or deficiency of relevant facts and data, explain in the desktop report the basis on which the qualified opinion is formed and any limitations in the desktop process which could affect reliance upon the desktop report.

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The Member appears to do a lot of work in Tasmania and there is no evidence of a lack of experience;
- The Member prepared an insurance valuation with reference to Rawlinson's and no market knowledge was required;
- The Member included an acknowledgement of the risks in relying on a desktop assessment in the report;
- The Member complied with the requirements of Rule 12.5.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does not establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rules 12.3,12.4 or 12.5 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Fraudulent and dishonest behaviour

Relevant Rules: Rule 1.5 and 1.6(a)

Complainant stated: As stated above the Member is not operating in Tasmania, although they advertise this.

Member stated: I received instructions from Valuation Australia on 6 February 2026 to complete a Desktop Valuation for the purpose of Building Insurance. At the time, I was in Launceston.

Relevant Rules:

Rule 1.5 *– A Member must not include false or misleading claims in any advertisement for their services.*

Rule 1.6(a) *– A Member must operate within the limits of their skill and must not:*

(a) accept instructions in a field of practice nor in a market in which they possess insufficient skill to provide professional services to the client, unless the Member obtains fully informed written consent from the client to undertake the professional services in conjunction with a person, including another Member having the required skill…

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The false advertising on the Valuations Tasmania website is not the responsibility of the Member.
- There is no evidence that the Member was operating outside her field of expertise.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does not establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rules 1.5 or 1.6(a) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Professional Conduct Panel Meeting – 3 June 2026

The Chair of the Committee formed a Panel to consider the complaint. The Panel was provided with Annexures 001 to 006.

On 3 June 2026, the Chair of the API's Professional Conduct Committee [redacted] together with [redacted] and [redacted] ("Panel") considered this complaint pursuant to clause 11.1(a) of the API Professional Conduct Policy. The Committee together with API representatives, acting as observers, convened by videoconference.

The Professional Conduct Panel gave due consideration to the alleged breaches of the API Rules of Professional Conduct based on their extensive knowledge and understanding of the API valuation and property standards. No conflict of interest was identified amongst the committee from the material provided.

Professional Conduct Panel Determination

In accordance with section 11.1(b)(i) of the API Professional Conduct Policy, the Professional Conduct Panel determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does establish a prima facie finding of professional misconduct in relation to **Rules 1.7, 1.11, 2.1, 2.2 and 6.1** of the API's Rules of Professional Conduct.

Notice of Prima Facie Findings

The Member was charged with Professional Misconduct pursuant to a breach of **Rules 1.7, 1.11, 2.1, 2.2 and 6.1** of the API's Rules of Professional Conduct. A Notice of Prima Facie Findings was forwarded to the Member on 4 June 2026.

The Member elected to provide written representations on 4 June 2026.

The Member provided written representations with attachments (Annexure 007) on 26 June 2026.

Consideration of Written Representations

The same Panel met to consider the Member's written representations (Annexure 007) on 26 June 2026.

At the end of the meeting, the Panel confirmed the findings of Professional Misconduct pursuant to a breach of **Rules 1.7, 1.11, 2.1, 2.2 and 6.1** of the API's Rules of Professional Misconduct.

The Panel also noted:

- The Member's employer told her to do a desktop but the original instructions were not for a desktop. The change was not confirmed in writing.
- Instructions were for an inspection and report within 7 days – the Member blamed her employer but the valuer is responsible for compliance.
- A member of the public would think the photographs were her own.

Sanctions

Prior to determining the penalty to be imposed on the Member pursuant to clause 14.1 of the Professional Conduct Policy, the considerations set out in clause 14.3 of the Policy have been considered by the Complaints Committee.

Specifically, the Professional Conduct Committee has considered the following factors:

a. the breaches are medium range in seriousness
b. the Member claims she is no longer working for Valuations Tasmania
c. this is the fourth complaint against the Member
d. repeated conduct suggests a degree of reckless intention
e. the breach has the potential to harm the reputation of the API and APIV
f. a punitive approach is appropriate as the educative approach has not worked.
g. formal enforcement action is required.

Taking the above matters into consideration, it is determined that the following sanctions are appropriate:

a. Member is censured;
b. Member is counselled to study and learn the Rules of Professional Conduct and the impact of those Rules;
c. Findings of the Professional Review to be published on the API website redacting the names of the Panel Members;
d. Member is placed on a formal warning and the warning recorded on the Member's membership file – one more breach and the matter will be referred to the Board recommending a suspension of membership for 5 years;
e. Member to pay a fine of $5000.

Member Rights

The Member is informed that a right of appeal exists pursuant to clause 16.1 of the Professional Conduct Policy for a review of the sanctions imposed or should they believe a lack of procedural fairness has been afforded and followed. Any such appeal must be commenced within 15 business days of receipt of this decision.

Pursuant to Section 16.3 of the Professional Conduct Policy, the Complainant is not entitled to appeal a decision of the Complaints Committee.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Annexures

Number	Name	Dates
001	Correspondence	18.3.2026 – 3.5.2026
002	Complainant Supporting Evidence	19.1.2026 – 18.3.2026
003	Member Supporting Evidence	30.12.2025 – 3.5.2026
004	Professional Review Form	18.3.2026
005	Member Response Submission	3.5.2026
006	Valuation Report	6.2.2026
007	Member's Written Representations	26.6.2026

I, [redacted], as Chair of the Professional Conduct Committee and Panel Member confirm that this is an accurate account of the decision of the Panel formed from the Professional Conduct Committee in relation to this Complaint.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Chair | API Professional Conduct Committee
Australian Property Institute Ltd
ProfessionalConduct@api.org.au