



**SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL FOR  
PROFESSIONAL AND  
TECHNICAL SURVEYORS**

ESTABLISHED IN TERMS OF ACT 40 OF 1984

Registrar and Secretariat  
PO Box 83018  
South Hills  
2136  
(011) 626 1040  
(011) 626 2007  
[plato@icon.co.za](mailto:plato@icon.co.za)

Unit 4, Heritage Park  
Lower Germiston Road  
Rosherville  
Johannesburg  
Telephone  
Facsimile  
Email

Office of the President  
PO Box 3804  
Johannesburg  
2001  
(011) 436 2133  
(011) 436 2131  
[vdwant@iafrica.com](mailto:vdwant@iafrica.com)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL'S DISCIPLINARY  
COMMITTEE HELD AT THE SOUTHERN SUN HOTEL, OR TAMBO  
AIRPORT, ON MONDAY 15 AUGUST 2011**

THE COMMITTEE WAS CONVENED TO CONSIDER A COMPLAINT OF ALLEGED IMPROPER CONDUCT MADE BY Dr. R GREENLAND (COMPLAINANT) AGAINST PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR PG TEGGIN (ACCUSED).

**Present:** DS Pound – Professional Land Surveyor (Chairperson)  
RJ Buckley – Professional Land Surveyor  
S Shires – Professional Land Surveyor  
H Bresler – Professional Engineering Surveyor  
N van Zyl – Attorney (Council's legal adviser)

Evidence by way of written documentation, affidavits, plans and oral submissions were placed before the committee on Tuesday 31 August 2010 and Monday 15 August 2011.

In considering this evidence the committee was of the opinion that:

- to have achieved the end result of generating a contour plan for the entire property using only three points (bases of trees) was inadequate. His estimate of natural ground level was not based on sound decision making based on facts derived from sound survey practice. There was other information and evidence available which could have provided a better result.
- Teggin's surveyed points which he chose to ignore were more in agreement with van Waart's plan than with his own final plan.
- the discrepancies between the three van Waart plans of the adjoining properties were not sufficiently inconsistent to warrant a total rejection of van Waart's plan.
- on a closer assessment of the van Waart plan it was probably more accurate than the plan eventually produced by Teggin.
- under the circumstances Teggin had insufficient grounds for rejecting the van Waart plan.

- Teggin, as a professional land surveyor, was negligent in that he made no attempt at establishing the purpose for which his client wanted the plan.

The committee was not satisfied that the plan that Teggin submitted to his client was accurate or reliable, given that there was a lot more evidence available which he had ignored.

**The Committee found that:**

**On the first charge:** *“You appear to have brought the profession and its members into disrepute, thereby infringing Section 28(3)(c) of the Professional and Technical Surveyors Act;”* The committee found Teggin - **Guilty**

**On the third charge:** *“You appear to have performed survey work in an incompetent, reckless or negligent manner thereby infringing Rule 15(2) of the Rules published in terms of the Act;”* The committee found Teggin - **Guilty**

**On the fourth charge:** *“You appear to have granted a certificate in your capacity as a registered person without having satisfied yourself that the facts are fully and correctly stated therein, thereby infringing Rule 15(22) of the Rules published in terms of the Act.”* The committee found Teggin - **Guilty**

**On the second charge:** *“You appear to have conducted yourself in an improper manner, thereby infringing the provisions of Section 28(3)(d) of the Professional and Technical Surveyors Act;”* The committee felt that it could not be proved that Teggin had manipulated the results of his survey to achieve the desired end result and so found Teggin - **Not Guilty**

**On the fifth charge:** *“You appear to have performed, through negligence or incompetence, defective surveys or surveys to which adequate checks have not been applied, thereby infringing Section 12(c) of the Land Survey Act, No.8 of 1997.”* The committee felt that this charge related only to acts or omissions in respect of work done in terms of the Land Survey Act and so found Teggin - **Not Guilty**

**The committee recommended that:**

1. Teggin’s registration be suspended for three months, which sanction would be suspended for a period of three years
2. Teggin cover the costs incurred by Plato as set out below
3. The outcome of the hearing be published in English in a suitable newspaper distributed in the Plettenberg Bay area, the Government Gazette and on the Plato web site.
4. The costs referred to in 2. above are R 20 000.00 being one-quarter of the costs attributed to the disciplinary hearings held on 30 August 2010 in Johannesburg and 75% of the costs of the reconvened hearing held on 15 August 2011 in Johannesburg.

**The above findings and recommendations of the committee were upheld, unanimously, by a full meeting of the Council at its annual meeting in Cape Town on 17 October 2011**