

# **Probable Cause Panel Meeting March 29, 2005**

*On March 29, 2005, in [Disciplinary Cases](#), by Smith Thompson Law*

**March 29, 2005**

## **I. Unlicensed Cases**

**Jarvis Nelson Osorio**  
**Case No. 2004-045403**

Probable Cause was found that Jarvis Nelson Osorio of Miami Lakes, Florida is not licensed in the State of Florida and distributed a business card which held himself out as an architect and contained the license number of another. A Notice and Order to Cease and Desist was issued and an Administrative Complaint Seeking Fines was filed.

## **II. Licensed Cases**

**Davanti Architecture, Inc.**  
**Case No. 2004-058467**

Probable Cause was found that Davanti Architecture, Inc., has a certificate of authorization; however, the firm no longer employs a licensed architect and it is offering architectural services from two offices, one in Jacksonville and another in Ocala. An Administrative Complaint seeking discipline was filed.

**Theodore Fine**  
**Case No. 2004-019715**  
**Fine Decorators Inc.**  
**Case No. 2004-014062**  
**Arnold Schulman**  
**Case No. 2004-014068**

Probable Cause was found on Theodore Fine, Fine Decorators Inc. and Arnold Schulman of Hallendale, Florida. Theodore Fine fraudulently misrepresented whether he was ever a defendant in a civil case on his initial application for an interior design license and made misleading, deceptive and fraudulent representations to a client in relation to the practice of interior design. Mr. Fine also failed to perform his legal obligations under the contract with his client and entered into a contract that did not clearly determine the scope and nature of the project.

Fine Decorator's Inc., offered to render architectural services in its hard cover book promoting the firm and on the Internet when it was not licensed to do so and failed to perform its legal obligations under the contract with its client and entered into a contract that did not clearly determine the scope and nature of the project.

Arnold Schulman made misleading, deceptive and fraudulent representations to a client in relation to the practice of interior design and failed to perform his legal obligations under the contract with his client and entered into a contract that did not clearly determine the scope and nature of the project.