BEFORE THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF ARCHITECTS, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
AND LICENSED INTERIOR DESIGNERS OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT AGAINST: DEWAYNE HAVENS 447 S. WOOD STREET PRYOR, OK 74361 ARIS DESIGN GROUP 447 S. WOOD STREET PRYOR, OK 74361 Respondents.	**Case No. 2026-747**

FINAL AGENCY ORDER AS TO COUNT I

The Board of Governors of the Architects, Landscape Architects and Licensed Interior Designers of Oklahoma ("Board") met on Wednesday, September 2, 2026, at the Board's office, located at 220 N.E. 28th Street, Suite 150, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma at 9:30 a.m., in a properly noticed meeting under the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 Okla. Stat. § 301 *et seq*. At the meeting, a sufficient number of members of the Board to constitute a quorum held a hearing in the above-captioned matter. Russell C. Lissuzzo III of RUSSELL C. LISSUZZO, III, PLLC, appeared as the Board Prosecutor, and Dewayne Havens, Respondent ("Mr. Havens" and/or "Respondent") appeared in person and without counsel. Respondent, Aris Design Group, LLC ("Aris") appeared through Mr. Havens, its principal, and was not represented by counsel. The proceeding was brought under the provisions of Article II of the Administrative Procedures Act, 75 Okla. Stat. § 250 *et seq*. All testimony was taken under oath. The meeting was recorded electronically. A permanent record of the hearing will be maintained at the Board's office.

The Board, having reviewed the Notice of Complaint and Hearing, as well as the exhibits thereto, the exhibits admitted at the hearing, and having heard the presentation of the prosecuting

attorney and Mr. Haven's sworn testimony, and deliberated in executive session, and being fully advised in the premises, the Borad FINDS, CONCLUDES, and ORDERS, as to Count I, by a vote of 8-0, with three (3) members abstaining, as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On June 22, 2026, the Notice of Complaint and Hearing was officially filed with the Board.

2. Service of the Notice of Complaint and Hearing was achieved on July 3, 2026. *See* Hearing **Exhibit 1**, Return Receipt No. 9589071052704107348413.

3. A quorum of the Board was present at the hearing. *See* Transcript, at pg. 4, lines 6-11.

4. Respondent appeared in person, identified himself as the principal of Aris Design Group, LLC, stated that he was not represented by counsel, acknowledged that he was aware of his right to counsel, and stated that he was prepared to proceed. *See id*., at pg. 5, lines 19-31.

5. Respondent presented no witnesses, elected to offer testimony on his own behalf, and was placed under oath. *See id*., at pg. 6, lines 1-11.

6. **Exhibit 1** and **Exhibit 2** attached to the Notice of Complaint and Hearing were offered separately by the Board Prosecutor and were admitted into the record without objection from the Respondent. *See id*., at pg. 8, lines 8-22.

7. Aris Design Group, LLC, is a limited liability company whose members are Mr. Havens, Mr. Haven's wife, and a business partner, Matthew Habuda, and has no affiliation with architecture, landscape architecture, or interior design. *See id*., at pg. 10, lines 18-21, pg. 16, lines 27-32, and pg. 17, line 1.

8. Respondent has not been issued, and does not hold, a License to practice architecture in the state of Oklahoma issued by the Board. *See id*., at pg. 7, lines 21-24, pg. 9, lines 1-3, and pg. 11, lines 25-28. Respondent did not dispute that he is unlicensed, and testified that he does not want to and is not attempting to be an architect. *See id*., at pg. 16, lines 9-12.

9. On or about December 6, 2022, Respondent, signing as "Dewayne Havens, Managing Member, Principal & Creative Director," of Aris Design Group, LLC, executed a "Professional Services Agreement," with Collin Bailey. *See* **Exhibit 1** to Notice of Complaint and Hearing; *see also* Transcript, at pg. 7, lines 24-32 and pg. 8, lines 1-7.

10. The Professional Services Agreement describes the project specifics as the "[d]esign of a custom residence/event space styled as a castle," (the "Project"), and states a scope of work that includes schematic and 3D mockups of conceptual designs, floorplan and opening schedules, roof plan, exterior elevations, electrical plan and schedule, site plan, and sections and details. *See* **Exhibit 1**; *see also* Transcript, at pg. 7, lines 30-32, and pg. 8, lines 1-4.

11. Respondent prepared and delivered plans for the Project. The plans admitted as **Exhibit 2** bear the title block of Aris Design Group, LLC, together with Respondent's electronic mail address and telephone number, and consist of a dimensioned first floor plan designated as A101 and a dimensioned second floor plan. *See* **Exhibit 2**; *see also* Transcript, at pg. 8, lines 14-17.

12. Respondent performed multiple rounds of revisions to the design concept. *See* Transcript, at pg. 13, lines 27-29.

13. Respondent testified that he had offered to provide "schematic and 3D mockups of conceptual designs, floor plan and opening schedules, roof plan, exterior elevations, electrical plan

and electrical schedule, a site plan, and sections and details." *See id*., at pg. 14, lines 22-27 and pg. 15, lines 1-10.

14. The intended use of the Project was for "[w]eddings." *See id*., at pg. 12, lines 11-16.

15. Based on the evidence admitted, and applying the Board's specialized knowledge of the Code Use Groups defined by current International Building Code, the Board found that the Project concerns the design building with a Code Use Group of A-3, and a code-defined occupancy in excess of fifty (50) persons. *See* **Exhibit 2**.

16. Count II, against Aris Design Group, LLC, was not submitted for decision. On a motion duly made, seconded, and adopted by a vote of eight (8) in favor, none (0) opposed, and three (3) abstaining, the Board continued deliberation on Count II to a later meeting of the Board to allow Aris Design Group, LLC, to retain counsel for representation. *See* Transcript, at pg. 20, lines 4-31, and pg. 21, lines 1-11.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Board is created and empowered under the State Architectural and Licensed Interior Designers Act, 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.1 *et seq*. (the "Act"), and has promulgated rules recorded in the Oklahoma Administrative Code at OAC 55:10-1-1 *et seq*. (the "Rules").

2. The Board has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceed and over Respondent as a person alleged to have engaged in the practice of architecture within the state of Oklahoma. 59 Okla. Stat. §§ 46.7(12), (14), (15); 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.8a(A); 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.18(A); *see also* Transcript, at pg. 4, lines 14-16.

3. Respondent was afforded Notice and an opportunity for hearing consistent with the Act, the Rules, and the Oklahoma Administrative Procedures Act, 75 Okla. Stat. § 250 *et seq*.

Service of the Notice of Complaint and Hearing was properly achieved by Certified Mail, Restricted Delivery, Return Receipt Requested, and was received by the Respondent on July 3, 2026. OAC 55:10-15-15(a)(1) and (a)(2).

4. Respondent appeared in person, was advised of his right to counsel, elected to proceed without counsel, and was afforded the opportunity to respond, present evidence, and argue on all issues involved. OAC 55:10-15-15(a)(2) and (a)(4)(D)-(E).

5. The Act, at 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.3(3), defines "License" as "a license issued by the Board."

6. The Act, at 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.3(2), defines the "Practice of Architecture" as:

> Rendering or offering to render certain services, in connection with the design and construction, enlargement or alteration of a building or a group of buildings, and the space surrounding such buildings, including buildings which have as their principal purpose human occupancy or habitation. The services referred to include planning, providing preliminary studies, designs, drawings, specifications, investigations and other technical submissions prepared by other consultants including, as appropriate, and without limitation, consulting engineering and landscape architects; provided, that the practice of architecture shall include such other professional services as may be necessary for rendering of or offering to render architectural services.

7. The Act, at 49 Okla. Stat. § 46.8a(A) provides:

> It shall be unlawful for any person to directly or indirectly engage in the practice of architecture in this state or use the title "Architect," "Registered" or "Licensed Architect," "Architectural Designer," or display or use any words, letters, figures, titles, signs, cards, advertisements, or other symbols or devices indicating or tending to indicate that such person is an architect or is practicing architecture, unless the person is licensed under the provisions of this act. No person shall aid or abet any person, not licensed under the provisions of this act, in the practice of architecture

8. The Act, at 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.21b(A) provides that "[a]n architect shall be required to plan, design and prepare plans and specifications for the following Code Use Groups except

where specifically exempt from the provisions of the State Architectural and Licensed Interior Designers Act," and that "[a]ll Code Use Groups in this section are defined by the current International Building Code."

9. The Act, at 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.21b(C)(1) requires that an architect plan, design, and prepare the plans and specifications for buildings no more than two (2) stories tall and having a Code Use Groups of A-3, and a code defined occupancy of more than fifty (50) persons. Therefore, an architect was required for the Project.

10. Respondent, who has not been issued a License by the Board, rendered and offered to render services constituting the Practice of Architecture as defined at 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.3(2) in connection with the alteration of a building in this State, including planning, designs, drawings, an egress plan, and other technical submissions for the Project. Respondent therefore directly engaged in the practice of architecture within the state of Oklahoma without being licensed under the Act, in violation of 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.8a(A), as charged in Count I of the Complaint.

11. The Rules, at OAC 55:10-15-2(2), provides that "[v]iolating the Act, or any Rule or order issued by the Board, including for the unlicensed practice of architecture or landscape architecture," constitutes "[g]rounds for probation, denial, revocation, suspension, refusal to renew, orders, injunctions, civil and/or criminal penalties."

12. The findings of fact set forth above are based exclusively on the evidence and on matters officially noticed. OAC 55:10-15-15(b)(3); 75 Okla. Stat. § 310(4).

13. The violation charged in Count I is established on this record by clear and convincing evidence, including the Professional Services Agreement executed by Respondent as **Exhibit 1** to the Notice of Complaint and Hearing, the plans prepared by the Respondent and attached to the Notice of Compliant and Hearing as **Exhibit 2**, and respondent's own sworn

testimony at the hearing. *Johnson v. Bd. of Governors of Registered Dentists*, 1996 OK 41, 913 P.2d 1339.

14. Pursuant to 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.7, in addition to the other powers and duties imposed by law, the Board shall have the power and duty to:

> (12) Levy civil penalties plus the legal costs incurred by the Board to prosecute the case against any person or entity who shall violate any of the provisions of the State Architectural and Licensed Interior Designers Act or any rule promulgated pursuant thereto;

15. Pursuant to 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.18(A), any person or entity who has been determined by the Board to have violated any provision of Act or any rule or order issued pursuant to the provisions of the Act may be liable for a civil penalty of not more than One Hundred Dollars ($100.00) for each day that said violation continues. The maximum civil penalty shall not exceed Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000.00) for any violation.

16. Pursuant to 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.18(B), the amount of the civil penalty is assessed by the Board after notice and hearing, taking into the account the nature, circumstances, and gravity of the violation and, with respect to the person found to have committed the violation, the degree of culpability.

17. Pursuant to OAC 55:10-15-18(a)(5) and (b)(5), the Board may find the accused party guilty and may impose a civil penalty in accordance with the Act.

18. This Final Agency Order is issued in accordance with OAC 55:10-15-21, and sets forth findings of fact and conclusions of law, separately stated.

19. Any Finding of Fact more properly characterized as a Conclusion of Law shall be so deemed, and any Conclusion of Law more properly characterized as a Finding of Fact shall be so deemed.

20. Count II of the Complaint, charging Respondent Aris Design Group, LLC, with violation of 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.9, was continued and remains pending before the Board. This Order adjudicates Count I only, and is a final agency order as to Count I and as to Respondent Dewayne Havens.

ORDER

It is therefore **ADJUDGED, DECREED, AND ORDERED** by the Board of Governors of Architects, Landscape Architects and Licensed Interior Designers of Oklahoma as follows:

Respondent Dewayne Havens is found GUILTY of directly engaging in the practice of architecture within the state of Oklahoma without having been issued a License by the Board, in violation of 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.8a(A).

It is therefore **FURTHER ORDERED**, having weighed all factors under 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.18(B), that:

Respondent Dewayne Havens is assessed a civil penalty in the amount of One Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000.00), payable to the Board within sixty (60) days of the mailing date of this Order;

Failure to comply with any term of this Order shall constitute grounds for further disciplinary action, including the levy of additional civil penalties under OAC 55:10-15-2(2) and 59 Okla. Stat. § 46.18(A);

Count II of the Complaint, against Aris Design Group, LLC, is **CONTINUED** to a subsequent meeting of the Board to permit Aris Design Group to obtain counsel, and the Board's staff shall notify Aris Design Group, LLC, of the date and time of that meeting. In the event Aris Design Group, LLC is not represented by counsel at the meeting, it shall be deemed to have failed to appear; and

This Order shall be effective upon the date of execution by the Chair and shall be mailed to Respondent's address of record.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 23rd day of October, 2026.



Anthony Blatt, Chair
Board of Governors of Architects, Landscape Architects and Licensed Interior Designers

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

This is to certify that on the 22 day of October, 2026, a true and correct copy of the above Final Agency Order was sent by Certified Mail, Restricted Delivery, Return Receipt Requested, by regular first-class mail, postage prepaid, and email to:

DEWAYNE HAVENS
447 S. WOOD STREET
PRYOR, OK 74361

ARIS DESIGN GROUP
447 S. WOOD STREET
PRYOR, OK 74361
Respondents

Russell C. Lissuzzo, III, Prosecuting Attorney
Russell C. Lissuzzo, III, PLLC
629 W. Main Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Prosecuting Attorney for the Oklahoma Board of Governors of Architects, Landscape Architects and Licensed Interior Designers

Leslie Hanska
Executive Director