BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **LUIS ANTONIO ROBLES** **PO Box 1006** **Pacifica, CA 94044** **Architect License No. C-21700** Respondent.	Case Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 **DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER** [Gov. Code, §11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On or about June 30, 2026, Complainant Laura Zuniga, in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Architects Board, Department of Consumer Affairs, filed Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 against Luis Antonio Robles (Respondent) before the California Architects Board. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)

2. On or about July 18, 1990, the California Architects Board (Board) issued Architect License No. C-21700 to Respondent. The Architect License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 and will expire on December 31, 2027, unless renewed.

3. On or about July 1, 2026, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 558 and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 104, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is: PO Box 1006, Pacifica, CA 94044.

4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505(c) and/or Business and Professions Code section 124.

5. Government Code section 11506, subdivision (c) states, in pertinent part:

> (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense . . . and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation . . . not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense . . . shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

6. The Board takes official notice of its records and the fact that Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005.

7. California Government Code section 11520(a) states, in pertinent part:

> (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense . . . or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent . . . .

8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this matter, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

9. The Board finds that the actual costs for Investigation and Enforcement are $5,523.00 as of August 6, 2026.

///

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Luis Antonio Robles has subjected his Architect License No. C-21700 to discipline.

2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

3. The California Architects Board is authorized to revoke Respondent's Architect License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this case:

Palm Avenue Project

a. Business and Professions Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8) [Written Contract Requirements];

b. Business and Professions Code section 5582; California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151 [Aiding Unlawful Practice];

c. Business and Professions Code section 5582.1; California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151 [Permitting Misuse of Name];

d. Business and Professions Code sections 5578 and 5584; California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 160, subdivision (b)(1) [Negligence];

Duarte Court Project

e. Business and Professions Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8) [Written Contract Requirements];

f. Business and Professions Code section 5582; California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151 [Aiding Unlawful Practice]; and

g. Business and Professions Code section 5582.1; California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151 [Permitting Misuse of Name].

///

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Architect License No. C-21700, issued to Respondent Luis Antonio Robles, is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on October 16, 2026. It is so ORDERED September 16, 2026.

Ron Jones

FOR THE CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

45160866
DOJ Matter ID:SF2026900192

Attachment:
Exhibit A: Accusation

Exhibit A

Accusation

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
CHAR SACHSON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 244774
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Telephone: (415) 510-3876
Facsimile: (415) 703-1107
E-mail: Joshua.Johnson@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against**:** **LUIS ANTONIO ROBLES** **PO Box 1006** **Pacifica, CA 94044** **Architect License No. C-21700** Respondent.	Case Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 **ACCUSATION**

PARTIES

1. Laura Zuniga (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Architects Board (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.

2. On or about July 18, 1990, the Board issued Architect License Number C-21700 to Luis Antonio Robles (Respondent). The Architect License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2027, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

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

5. Section 5555 of the Code states:

> Licenses to practice architecture remain in full force until revoked or suspended for cause, or until they expire, as provided in this chapter [Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 5500)].

6. Section 5560 of the Code states:

> The board may upon its own motion, and shall upon the verified complaint in writing of any person, investigate the actions of any architect and may temporarily suspend or permanently revoke, the license of any architect who is guilty of, or commits one or more of, the acts or omissions constituting grounds for disciplinary action under this chapter [Chapter 3 (commencing with section 5500)].

7. Section 5526 of the Code directs the Board to adopt rules and regulations governing the practice of architecture. Subdivision (b) requires that "[e]very person who holds a license issued by the board shall be governed and controlled by these rules."

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

8. Section 5536.22, subdivision (a), of the Code states:

> An architect shall use a written contract when contracting to provide professional services to a client pursuant to this chapter. That written contract shall be executed by the architect and the client, or the client's representative, prior to the architect commencing work, unless the client knowingly states in writing that work may be commenced before the contract is executed. The written contract shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following items:
>
> (1) A description of the project for which the client is seeking services.
>
> (2) A description of the services to be provided by the architect to the client.
>
> (3) A description of any basis of compensation applicable to the contract and the method of payment agreed upon by both parties.
>
> (4) The name, address, and license number of the architect, the name and address of the client, and the project address.
>
> (5) A description of the procedure that the architect and the client will use to accommodate additional services and contract changes, including, but not limited to, changes in the description of the project, in the description of the services, or in the description of the compensation and method of payment.
>
> (6) A description of the procedure to be used by either party to terminate the

contract.

(7) A statement identifying the ownership and use of instruments of service prepared by the architect.

(8) A statement in at least 12-point type that reads: "Architects are licensed and regulated by the California Architects Board located at 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834."

9. Section 5578 states:

The fact that the holder of a license is practicing in violation of the provisions of this chapter constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

10. Section 5582 of the Code states:

The fact that the holder of a license has aided or abetted in the practice of architecture any person not authorized to practice architecture under the provisions of this chapter, constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

11. Section 5582.1 of the Code states:

(a)The fact that the holder of a license has affixed their signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which have not been prepared by them, or under their responsible control, constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

(b)The fact that the holder of a license has permitted their name to be used for the purpose of assisting any person to evade the provisions of this chapter constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

12. Section 5584 of the Code states:

The fact that, in the practice of architecture, the holder of a license has been guilty of negligence or willful misconduct constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

13. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, states:

(a) For purposes of Sections 5582 and 5582.1 of the code, aiding and abetting takes place when a California licensed architect signs any instrument of service which has been prepared by any person who is not:

(1) a California licensed architect or civil engineer or structural engineer, or

(2) a subordinate employee under his/her immediate and responsible direction, or

(3) an individual, who is associated by written agreement with the architect and who is under the architect's immediate and responsible direction as described in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The requirements of "immediate and responsible direction" as used in this section shall be deemed to be satisfied when the architect:

(1) instructs the person described in subsection (a) of this section, in the preparation of instruments of service, and

(2) the architect has exercised the same judgment and responsibility in reviewing all stages of the design documents and other phases of the work as required by law, and which would normally be exercised if he/she personally performed the required tasks.

14. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 160, subdivision (b)(1), states:

(b) Standard of Care:

(1) When practicing architecture, an architect shall act with reasonable care and competence, and shall apply the technical knowledge and skill which is ordinarily applied by architects of good standing, practicing in this state under similar circumstances and conditions.

COST RECOVERY

15. Section 125.3, subdivision (a), of the Code states:

Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

PALM AVENUE PROJECT

16. In or around October 2023, Respondent provided architectural services for EY for a home remodeling project on Palm Avenue in San Mateo, California (Palm Avenue Project).

17. On or about January 27, 2024, EY entered into a written contract with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints, an unlicensed individual, to provide architectural plans, "all sign[ed] and stamped by a licensed engineer," for a change of window sizes for $2,200.

18. All Blueprint prepared the window plans per the contract, signed and stamped by Respondent. EY received and submitted the drawings to San Mateo for permit approval, but the plans were rejected for lacking necessary structural details. After rejection of the plans, EY learned for the first time that Respondent was not a licensed engineer.

19. On or about March 7, 2024, EY entered into a second contract with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints to provide architectural plans, for new framing layout and new lateral calculations for $5,800. Respondent did not directly enter into any written agreements with EY for work on the Palm Avenue Project. Respondent did not have a written contract with All

Blueprints.

20. EY was provided with additional calculations and drawings that were signed and stamped by Respondent. EY again submitted the plans to the city, but they were again rejected for being incomplete, lacking several critical elements, including the agreed-upon window size calculations.

21. Following rejection of the permit application, EY asked Respondent to fix the issues, with only minimal and ineffective communication from Respondent. Throughout the Palm Avenue Project, EY's communications were entirely with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints despite the fact that Respondent was the licensed professional signing and stamping the drawings.

22. EY paid All Blueprints a total of $7,200. No payments were made to Respondent directly on the Palm Avenue Project.

23. EY remains without the full services paid for, and without city permit approval due to incomplete and incorrect submissions by Respondent.

24. Throughout the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent's role was limited to endorsing the plans officially without responsible control in the project management. At the same time, Respondent aided and abetted Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints to manage the project operations, using Respondent's stamp and signature in a manner inconsistent with the California Architects Practice Act.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Written Contract Requirements)

25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8), in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent stamped and signed drawings prepared by All Blueprints, though Respondent failed to enter into a written contract with All Blueprints, as set forth above.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Aiding Unlawful Practice)

26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Palm Avenue Project,

Respondent aided or abetted in the practice of architecture a person not authorized to practice architecture in California, as set forth above.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Permitting Misuse of Name)

27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582.1, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent affixed his signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which had not been prepared by him, or under his responsible control, and/or permitted his name to be used for the purpose of assisting another person to evade the provisions of the California Architects Practice Act, as set forth above.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence)

28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5584, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 160, subdivision (b)(1), in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent failed to act with reasonable care and competence and apply the technical knowledge and skill ordinarily applied by architects of good standing practicing in California under similar circumstances and conditions, as set forth above.

DUARTE COURT PROJECT

29. On or around January 7, 2025, the Board received a complaint from a Plan Check Engineer with the City of Milpitas regarding Respondent's actions related to a home remodel project on Duarte Court in Milpitas, California (Duarte Court Project). While on the Duarte Court Project, the Project's designer, Alberto Orozco with All Blueprints (unlicensed), did not keep Respondent informed of dealings and decisions in the plan review process and was not working under Respondent's supervision.

30. While on Duarte Court Project, Respondent's stamp and signature were included on the drawings but Respondent was not included in email communications between the City of Milpitas and All Blueprints despite the City of Milpitas's repeated requests to obtain Respondent's email address to include Respondent in the email communications.

31. In a letter to the Board dated May 22, 2025, Respondent stated that the "contract to do the drawings was not with me, but with All Blueprints. My job was to stamp the plans for securing the building permit." Respondent admitted that he did not have a written contract with All Blueprints.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Written Contract Requirements)

32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8), in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent stamped and signed drawings prepared by All Blueprints, though Respondent failed to enter into a written contract with All Blueprints, as set forth above.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Aiding Unlawful Practice)

33. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent aided or abetted in the practice of architecture a person not authorized to practice architecture in California, as set forth above.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Permitting Misuse of Name)

34. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582.1, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent affixed his signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which had not been prepared by him, or under his responsible control, and/or permitted his name to be used for the purpose of assisting another person to evade the provisions of the California Architects Practice Act, as set forth above.

///

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the California Architects Board issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Architect License Number C-21700, issued to Luis Antonio Robles;

2. Ordering Luis Antonio Robles to pay the California Architects Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3 and if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;

and,

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

DATED: 6/30/2026

Laura Zuniga

LAURA ZUNIGA
Executive Officer
California Architects Board
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

SF2026900192
45088792

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **LUIS ANTONIO ROBLES** **PO Box 1006** **Pacifica, CA 94044** **Architect License No. C-21700** Respondent.	Case Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 **DEFAULT DECISION INVESTIGATORY EVIDENCE PACKET** [Gov. Code §11520]

The Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in support of the Default Decision and Order in the above matter consists of the following.

Exhibit 1: Pleadings offered for jurisdictional purposes: Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense (two blank copies), Request for Discovery, Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6 and 11507.7), Proofs of Service;

Exhibit 2: License Certification for Luis Antonio Robles Architect License No. C-21700;

Exhibit 3: Certification of Costs;

Exhibit 4: Investigative Report 24-04-068 (without attachments);

Exhibit 5. Investigative Report 25-01-005 (without attachments).

Dated: August 6, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
JOSHUA A. ROOM
Supervising Deputy Attorney General



JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

Exhibit 1

Accusation Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005
Statement to Respondent
Notice of Defense
Request for Discovery
Discovery Statutes, Proofs of Service

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
CHAR SACHSON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 244774
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Telephone: (415) 510-3876
Facsimile: (415) 703-1107
E-mail: Joshua.Johnson@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against**:** **LUIS ANTONIO ROBLES** **PO Box 1006** **Pacifica, CA 94044** **Architect License No. C-21700** Respondent.	Case Nos. 24-04-068 & 25-01-005 **ACCUSATION**

PARTIES

1. Laura Zuniga (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the California Architects Board (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs.

2. On or about July 18, 1990, the Board issued Architect License Number C-21700 to Luis Antonio Robles (Respondent). The Architect License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2027, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

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

5. Section 5555 of the Code states:

> Licenses to practice architecture remain in full force until revoked or suspended for cause, or until they expire, as provided in this chapter [Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 5500)].

6. Section 5560 of the Code states:

> The board may upon its own motion, and shall upon the verified complaint in writing of any person, investigate the actions of any architect and may temporarily suspend or permanently revoke, the license of any architect who is guilty of, or commits one or more of, the acts or omissions constituting grounds for disciplinary action under this chapter [Chapter 3 (commencing with section 5500)].

7. Section 5526 of the Code directs the Board to adopt rules and regulations governing the practice of architecture. Subdivision (b) requires that "[e]very person who holds a license issued by the board shall be governed and controlled by these rules."

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

8. Section 5536.22, subdivision (a), of the Code states:

> An architect shall use a written contract when contracting to provide professional services to a client pursuant to this chapter. That written contract shall be executed by the architect and the client, or the client's representative, prior to the architect commencing work, unless the client knowingly states in writing that work may be commenced before the contract is executed. The written contract shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following items:
>
> (1) A description of the project for which the client is seeking services.
>
> (2) A description of the services to be provided by the architect to the client.
>
> (3) A description of any basis of compensation applicable to the contract and the method of payment agreed upon by both parties.
>
> (4) The name, address, and license number of the architect, the name and address of the client, and the project address.
>
> (5) A description of the procedure that the architect and the client will use to accommodate additional services and contract changes, including, but not limited to, changes in the description of the project, in the description of the services, or in the description of the compensation and method of payment.
>
> (6) A description of the procedure to be used by either party to terminate the

contract.

(7) A statement identifying the ownership and use of instruments of service prepared by the architect.

(8) A statement in at least 12-point type that reads: "Architects are licensed and regulated by the California Architects Board located at 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834."

9. Section 5578 states:

The fact that the holder of a license is practicing in violation of the provisions of this chapter constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

10. Section 5582 of the Code states:

The fact that the holder of a license has aided or abetted in the practice of architecture any person not authorized to practice architecture under the provisions of this chapter, constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

11. Section 5582.1 of the Code states:

(a)The fact that the holder of a license has affixed their signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which have not been prepared by them, or under their responsible control, constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

(b)The fact that the holder of a license has permitted their name to be used for the purpose of assisting any person to evade the provisions of this chapter constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

12. Section 5584 of the Code states:

The fact that, in the practice of architecture, the holder of a license has been guilty of negligence or willful misconduct constitutes a ground for disciplinary action.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

13. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, states:

(a) For purposes of Sections 5582 and 5582.1 of the code, aiding and abetting takes place when a California licensed architect signs any instrument of service which has been prepared by any person who is not:

(1) a California licensed architect or civil engineer or structural engineer, or

(2) a subordinate employee under his/her immediate and responsible direction, or

(3) an individual, who is associated by written agreement with the architect and who is under the architect's immediate and responsible direction as described in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The requirements of "immediate and responsible direction" as used in this section shall be deemed to be satisfied when the architect:

(1) instructs the person described in subsection (a) of this section, in the preparation of instruments of service, and

(2) the architect has exercised the same judgment and responsibility in reviewing all stages of the design documents and other phases of the work as required by law, and which would normally be exercised if he/she personally performed the required tasks.

14. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 160, subdivision (b)(1), states:

(b) Standard of Care:

(1) When practicing architecture, an architect shall act with reasonable care and competence, and shall apply the technical knowledge and skill which is ordinarily applied by architects of good standing, practicing in this state under similar circumstances and conditions.

COST RECOVERY

15. Section 125.3, subdivision (a), of the Code states:

Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

PALM AVENUE PROJECT

16. In or around October 2023, Respondent provided architectural services for EY for a home remodeling project on Palm Avenue in San Mateo, California (Palm Avenue Project).

17. On or about January 27, 2024, EY entered into a written contract with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints, an unlicensed individual, to provide architectural plans, "all sign[ed] and stamped by a licensed engineer," for a change of window sizes for $2,200.

18. All Blueprint prepared the window plans per the contract, signed and stamped by Respondent. EY received and submitted the drawings to San Mateo for permit approval, but the plans were rejected for lacking necessary structural details. After rejection of the plans, EY learned for the first time that Respondent was not a licensed engineer.

19. On or about March 7, 2024, EY entered into a second contract with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints to provide architectural plans, for new framing layout and new lateral calculations for $5,800. Respondent did not directly enter into any written agreements with EY for work on the Palm Avenue Project. Respondent did not have a written contract with All

Blueprints.

20. EY was provided with additional calculations and drawings that were signed and stamped by Respondent. EY again submitted the plans to the city, but they were again rejected for being incomplete, lacking several critical elements, including the agreed-upon window size calculations.

21. Following rejection of the permit application, EY asked Respondent to fix the issues, with only minimal and ineffective communication from Respondent. Throughout the Palm Avenue Project, EY's communications were entirely with Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints despite the fact that Respondent was the licensed professional signing and stamping the drawings.

22. EY paid All Blueprints a total of $7,200. No payments were made to Respondent directly on the Palm Avenue Project.

23. EY remains without the full services paid for, and without city permit approval due to incomplete and incorrect submissions by Respondent.

24. Throughout the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent's role was limited to endorsing the plans officially without responsible control in the project management. At the same time, Respondent aided and abetted Alberto Orozco of All Blueprints to manage the project operations, using Respondent's stamp and signature in a manner inconsistent with the California Architects Practice Act.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Written Contract Requirements)

25. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8), in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent stamped and signed drawings prepared by All Blueprints, though Respondent failed to enter into a written contract with All Blueprints, as set forth above.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Aiding Unlawful Practice)

26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Palm Avenue Project,

Respondent aided or abetted in the practice of architecture a person not authorized to practice architecture in California, as set forth above.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Permitting Misuse of Name)

27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582.1, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent affixed his signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which had not been prepared by him, or under his responsible control, and/or permitted his name to be used for the purpose of assisting another person to evade the provisions of the California Architects Practice Act, as set forth above.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence)

28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5584, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 160, subdivision (b)(1), in that on the Palm Avenue Project, Respondent failed to act with reasonable care and competence and apply the technical knowledge and skill ordinarily applied by architects of good standing practicing in California under similar circumstances and conditions, as set forth above.

DUARTE COURT PROJECT

29. On or around January 7, 2025, the Board received a complaint from a Plan Check Engineer with the City of Milpitas regarding Respondent's actions related to a home remodel project on Duarte Court in Milpitas, California (Duarte Court Project). While on the Duarte Court Project, the Project's designer, Alberto Orozco with All Blueprints (unlicensed), did not keep Respondent informed of dealings and decisions in the plan review process and was not working under Respondent's supervision.

30. While on Duarte Court Project, Respondent's stamp and signature were included on the drawings but Respondent was not included in email communications between the City of Milpitas and All Blueprints despite the City of Milpitas's repeated requests to obtain Respondent's email address to include Respondent in the email communications.

31. In a letter to the Board dated May 22, 2025, Respondent stated that the "contract to do the drawings was not with me, but with All Blueprints. My job was to stamp the plans for securing the building permit." Respondent admitted that he did not have a written contract with All Blueprints.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Written Contract Requirements)

32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 5578 and 5536.22, subdivisions (a)(1)-(8), in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent stamped and signed drawings prepared by All Blueprints, though Respondent failed to enter into a written contract with All Blueprints, as set forth above.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Aiding Unlawful Practice)

33. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent aided or abetted in the practice of architecture a person not authorized to practice architecture in California, as set forth above.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Permitting Misuse of Name)

34. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 5582.1, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 151, in that on the Duarte Court Project, Respondent affixed his signature to plans, drawings, specifications, or other instruments of service which had not been prepared by him, or under his responsible control, and/or permitted his name to be used for the purpose of assisting another person to evade the provisions of the California Architects Practice Act, as set forth above.

///

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the California Architects Board issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Architect License Number C-21700, issued to Luis Antonio Robles;

2. Ordering Luis Antonio Robles to pay the California Architects Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3 and if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;

and,

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

DATED: 6/30/2026

Laura Zuniga

LAURA ZUNIGA
Executive Officer
California Architects Board
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

SF2026900192
45088792