

23 July 2026

Professional Conduct Committee | Panel Report
PR0484 [REDACTED] v Delorenzo

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

Details

Complainant	[REDACTED]	Member	John Delorenzo (75366 – Former Member)
			Delorenzo Property Group Pty Ltd
			[REDACTED]

Professional Conduct Committee

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Date of Complaint

11 February 2025

Date of Professional Conduct Committee Meetings

14 May 2026

15 July 2026

Property Address

[REDACTED]

Property Category

- ☒ Residential
- ☐ Commercial
- ☐ Rural

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Timeline of Events

This is a summary of a timeline of events alleged by the Complainant in their submitted evidence:

Oct. 2024	Engagement and payment of fees. Property visited by John. Information asked for Rental Schedule, Past details, contact with real estate agent details requested and given.
24 October 2024	Inspection completed
Nov 2024	First promise of report delivery 18.11.2024
	Draft received which contained very sketchy details.
Nov to Present	Constant requests for an update. Constant promises via text and email that the report is coming. Still have not received a report.
	Now becoming time critical as the family I am working with need to make a decision regarding strata or not to strata their property.

Complainant Position

How has this event Affected you?

Stress.
Mistrust.
Concern re quality of report.
Timing frame – Decision on Strata needs to be completed by June 2025. Family meetings need to take place.
Disrespect for process and client.
Constantly advised that the report is coming.

What Outcome are you Seeking?

We were looking for the report to be completed. But due to the constant promises of delivery we are now concerned about the quality of the report. We would like a total refund of the engagement fee.

Member Position

I am not a member of the API, you probably have heard of our new technology and ESG reporting patents and trying to cut the poppy down. Tall poppy syndrome is common within Australia and the API.

Please be advised I am not at liberty to discuss any of my operations and business to irrelevant third parties. All alleged complaints will be dealt with in due course, this is not avoidance of the alleged incident but clarification that our company is undergoing changes and it is now larger than just myself. I need some time to ensure my transition goes smoothly, upon completion of the transition I may or may not be back in contact.

I did not have to respond to you as I have been an inactive member for just over a year now. I hope you can appreciate that I have taken time out of my busy schedule to provide with this courtesy.

All the best moving forward, I am sure your legal counsel and my legal department will be in contact in due course.

End of discussion.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

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 2.1 and 2.2

Complainant stated: In regards to a valuation, this has not been received. It was advised that the report would be received within approximately 2 weeks after a visit to the property. Property visit was in Oct.

Member stated: As today is my last day to provide you with a response, here it is:
\$89,000 amount of dollars of unpaid invoices to me.
\$350,000 amount of work my firm one from 2020 to 2024 for mortgage purposes but my firm was advised that it can only be done through HTW, or PRP ect.

Relevant Rules:

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 failed to attempt to meet the service timeline.
- The Member failed to inform the client about the delay and the client had to keep chasing him.

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

Competency

Relevant Rules: Rule 1.6

Complainant stated: Due to the delay in the report. We are concerned about the quality of the report.

Member stated: N/A

Relevant Rules:

Rule 1.6 – 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 another person, including another Member having the required skill; or
- (b) give instructions to another Member who does not have the required skill to undertake the professional services without appropriate supervision from another Member having the required skill.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- There is insufficient evidence as there is no report to consider the Member's skill level.

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

Ethical duties

Relevant Rules: Rule 1.1

Complainant stated: Rule 1. Relationship with clients.

Member stated: N/A

Relevant Rules:

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

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The Member was dishonest – he made statements he had no intention of carrying out.
- The Member did not undertake the instructions or the task in good faith. He did not attain the level expected of a Member of the API.

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Non-compliance with Professional Member Obligations

Relevant Rules: Rule 10.2

Complainant stated: N/A

Member stated: N/A

Relevant Rules:

***Rule 10.2** – Valuers must also comply with all applicable legal, legislative requirements and any Member obligations published or adopted by the API and applicable at the valuation date.*

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- As the Member is in breach of Rule 1.1, he is in breach of 10.2

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rule 10.2 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Other

Relevant Rules: Rule 5.4

Complainant stated: Just plain unprofessional.

Member stated:

Relevant Rules:

Rule 5.4 – *A Member must fully cooperate with any request for information or any directive from the API in relation to a complaint or disciplinary matter that has been raised with the API.*

Professional Conduct Committee considered:

- The (now former) Member is no longer a Member of the API and was not a Member when asked for a response to the Complaint so no breach (but noted that if he had been a Member he would have been in breach of this Rule).

The Professional Conduct Committee determined the evidence submitted by the Complainant does not establish a prima facie finding of a breach of Rule 5.4 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Professional Conduct Panel Meeting – 14 May 2026

The Deputy Chair of the Committee formed a Panel to consider the complaint. The Panel was provided with Annexures 001 to 005.

On 14 May 2026, the Deputy 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 2.1, 2.2, 1.1, 10.2 and 1.11** 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 2.1, 2.2, 1.1, 10.2 and 1.11** of the API's Rules of Professional Conduct. A Notice of Prima Facie Findings was

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

forwarded to the Member on 2 June 2026 by registered post. Delivery of the Notice was acknowledged on 5 June 2026.

The Member failed to make an election so was sent a Notice of Hearing on 30 June 2026 by email.

The Member did not attend the Hearing on 15 July 2026 but provided for AI recording of the Hearing. The AI recording mechanism was removed from the meeting.

At the end of the meeting, the Panel confirmed the findings of Professional Misconduct pursuant to a breach of **Rules 2.1, 2.2, 1.1, 10.2 and 1.11** of the API's Rules of Professional Misconduct.

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 breach was serious as money was taken from a client and a report was not provided.
- b. the Member has not shown contrition.
- c. there was a fairly high degree of negligence.
- d. the breach has a very high potential to harm the reputation of the API and APIV.
- e. a punitive approach was appropriate.
- f. enforcement action is appropriate.

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

- a. Member is censured.
 - b. Findings of the Panel will be published without the names of the Panel Members.
 - c. 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	11.2.2025 – 10.2.2026
002	Complainant Supporting Evidence	10.10.2024 – 24.2.2026
003	Member Supporting Evidence	2.2.2026 – 25.2.2026
004	Professional Review Form	11.2.2025
005	Member Response Submission	25.2.2026

I, [REDACTED] as Deputy 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]

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