

[VASSILIADIS, AG P., JOSEPHIDES, STAVRIDES, JJ  
LOIZOU, HADJIANASTASSIOU, AG JJ]  
ANDREAS TSOURIS (No 2),

*Appellant,*

*and*

THE COUNCIL OF REGISTRATION OF ARCHITECTS  
AND CIVIL ENGINEERS,

*Respondent*

*(Revisional Jurisdiction Appeal No 15)*

---

1966  
Oct 1

—  
ANDREAS TSOURIS  
(No. 2)  
*and*  
THE COUNCIL OF  
REGISTRATION  
OF ARCHITECTS  
AND CIVIL  
ENGINEERS

*Architects and Civil Engineers—Constitutionality of section 9(2) of the Architects and Civil Engineers Law, 1962 (Law No 41 of 1962), prescribing a time-limit for the submission of an application to the Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers for the issue of a licence as an architect by profession under section 9 (1) (A) of the said Law—The matter is fully covered by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers v Kyriakides, reported in this part at p 640, ante—Section 9(2) is therefore constitutional*

*Constitutional Law—Constitutionality of legislative enactments—Section 9 (2) of the said Law No. 41 of 1962 (supra)*

Cases referred to .

*The Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers v Kyriakides* reported in this Part at p 640, *ante*, followed

The decision in *Kyriakides'* case (*supra*) was followed and applied in the following two cases

*Joseph Hyloucas v The Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers* and *Demetrios Papademetriou v The Board for Registration of Architects etc etc*, reported in this Part at pp 666 and 671, *ante*, respectively

This is an appeal against the decision of the Court, sitting in its original jurisdiction, (reported in this Part at p 426 *ante*) whereby it was decided that the provisions in section 9(2) of the Architects and Civil Engineers Law, 1962 (Law No 41 of 1962) prescribing a time-limit for the submission of an application to the Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers for the issue of a licence as an architect

by profession under section 9(1)(A) of the Law, are constitutional. The Supreme Court affirming the decision appealed from dismissed the appeal.

### Appeal.

Appeal against the judgment\* of a Judge of the Supreme Court of Cyprus (Triantafyllides, J.) given on the 30th April, 1966, (Revisional Jurisdiction Case No. 13/65) whereby a recourse against the decision of the Respondent refusing to register Applicant as an architect by profession under section 9(1)(A) of the Architects and Civil Engineers Law, 1962 (Law 41/62) was dismissed.

A. Pantelides, for the Appellant.

Lellos Demetriades, for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by:—

VASSILIADES, AG. P.: The only point raised in this appeal as prescribed by learned counsel for the Appellant at the early part of his address, is, in the unanimous opinion of the Court, fully and clearly covered by the decision in the case of *The Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers v. Christodoulos Kyriakides*, Revisional Appeal No. 9, decided on the 30th June this year (and now reported in this Part at p. 640 *ante*) about a month after the lodging of the present appeal.

The decision in *Kyriakides'* case was followed and applied in two other cases of the same nature, *Joseph Hji Loucas v. The Board for Registration of Architects and Civil Engineers*, and *Demetrios Papademetriou* against the same Board, (reported in this Part at pp. 666 and 671, *ante*, respectively) all turning on practically the same legal issues and constitutional provisions as those raised in the present recourse.

Learned counsel for the Applicant herein has not been able to distinguish in any way, this case from those just referred to; or to show that they were wrongly decided. We, therefore, found it unnecessary to call on the other side; and we dismiss the appeal.

---

\* Reported in this Part at p. 426 *ante*.

As regards costs, we are inclined to the view that as there appears to have been room for doubt regarding the matter in issue in this recourse, at least until the decision in Revisional Appeal No. 9 (supra) and, therefore, room for doubt when the present appeal was taken, we propose to make no order as to costs. Appeal dismissed. No order for costs.

*Order in terms.*

1966  
Oct. 1  
—  
ANDREAS TSOURIS  
(No. 2)  
*and*  
THE COUNCIL OF  
REGISTRATION  
OF ARCHITECTS  
AND CIVIL  
ENGINEERS