

TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING

JUNE 14, 2022

President Charles Rahm called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The meeting was conducted in Conference Room 1-B, Davy Crockett Tower, Nashville, Tennessee.

Board members physically present: Charles Rahm, President; Anthony Harris, Vice President; Tonya Scales Haynes, Christopher Lea, Scottie Poarch, and Pamela Stephens

Board member(s) absent: Fred Berry

Staff physically present: Robert Gribble, Executive Director; Troy Bryant, Associate General Counsel, and Lisa Bohannon, Regulatory Board Administrative Manager

Note: Board member Pamela Stephens arrived at 10:09 a.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to approve the Agenda as published.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to approve the Minutes of the May 10, 2022 Board Meeting.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

LEGAL REPORT:
TROY BRYANT, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

Abbreviations:

GPL – General Price List

CPL – Casket Price List

OBCPL – Outer Burial Container Price List

SFGSS – Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected

1. Case No.: 2021065901 – Funeral Director

An anonymous Complainant submitted a complaint against Respondent funeral director alleging that they had been aiding and abetting unlicensed activity on behalf of a separate unlicensed funeral director. However, little additional information was provided and with no way to contact Complainant for further follow up, the Department was left without suitable evidence to proceed.

Based on the above, due to the lack of specific information included in the complaint, there is no basis for the Department to move forward in investigating this specific complaint.

Recommendation:

- Closure for lack of sufficient evidence.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to close the complaint.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

2. Case No.: 2022006311 – Funeral Director

Complainant, father of the deceased, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent, specifically stating that they had paid for the services of transporting the body of the deceased to Honduras. Complainant stated that as of the date of the complaint, February 17, 2022, they had not been informed that the body had arrived in Honduras.

Due to the nature of the allegations, the Department did not send the complaint for response and attempted to conduct an investigation immediately. However, despite numerous attempts, the investigator was unable to meet with the Complainant. Despite arranging a time and location to meet, and after several phone calls to the Complainant, it became apparent to the investigator that the Complainant was avoiding the investigator's calls and did not want to be interviewed. The investigator did learn that the Complainant's son had arrived in

Honduras and based on the actions of the Complainant, it appeared that Complainant did not wish to continue the complaint.

Recommendation:

- Closure due to lack of evidence and lack of cooperation from Complainant.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

3. Case No.: 2022008561 – Funeral Director

Complainant, friend of the deceased, filed a complaint against Respondent for allegedly aiding and abetting unlicensed activity. Complainant also alleged that the body of the deceased was to be shipped back to Guatemala, but after a month of delay, Respondent had yet to ship the remains as contracted.

Due to the nature of the allegations, the Department did not send this complaint for response and sent for investigation immediately. Although the investigator was able to speak to the Complainant, shortly after the Complainant informed the Department that he wished to retract his complaint. According to Complainant, the body had arrived in Guatemala as contracted for and he no longer wished to move forward with the complaint. Despite the fact that the Department attempted on numerous occasions to convince Complainant to move forward with his complaint and provide further cooperation, Complainant was adamant that he wished to retract his complaint and would not assist the Department moving forward.

Recommendation:

- Closure due to lack of evidence/cooperation of Complainant.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a Letter of Warning.

Seconded by Tonya Scales Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

4. Case No.: 2022006131 – Previously licensed as a Funeral Director and Embalmer

This is a companion complaint to Complaint Number 2 as Respondent to this complaint is an associate of Respondent from the former complaint and was alleged to have been involved in the services contracted for.

Recommendation:

- Closure due to lack of evidence/cooperation of Complainant

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Scottie Poarch

Adopted by Voice Vote

5. Case No.: 2022008581 – Previously licensed as a Funeral Director and Embalmer

This is a companion complaint to Complaint Number 3 as Respondent to this complaint is an associate to Respondent from the former complaint and was the unlicensed funeral director whom the allegations claimed the former Respondent was aiding and abetting unlicensed practice.

Recommendation:

- Closure due to lack of evidence/cooperation of Complainant

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a Letter of Warning.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

6. Case No.: 2022009111 – Previously licensed as a Funeral Director and Embalmer

Complainant, Decedent Affairs at a large medical center, filed a complaint alleging unlicensed practice on behalf of Respondent, a previously licensed funeral director. Complainant detailed two allegations of unlicensed practice, one relating to a patient who informed Complainant that Respondent, not the funeral home, was responsible for funeral arrangements and transport of the deceased.

The second involved a conversation in which the Respondent communicated to Complainant that he was a translator for the family of the deceased. When Complainant contacted the family member, the family member stated that they spoke English and did not need the services of a translator.

Due to the nature of the allegations, the Department did not send this complaint for response and attempted to conduct an investigation immediately. However, due to HIPPA confidentiality restrictions, the Department could never obtain the names or contact information of the families whom the Respondent had allegedly performed services for. As such, any evidence acquired in an investigation would be circumstantial and hearsay and would not be admissible in a hearing.

Recommendation:

- Closure due to insufficient evidence

A motion was made by Pamela Stephen to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

7. Case No.: 2022007311 – Funeral Director

This complaint is a companion complaint to two complaints from the previous legal report regarding allegations of unprofessional conduct relating to the size of the casket provided for the deceased.

The Board has already issued disciplinary action to the Respondent for the same sets of facts and circumstances, and this complaint is identical to the previous two.

Recommendation:

- Closure since disciplinary action has already been issued to Respondent for the facts and circumstances related to this complaint.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

8. Case No.: 2022010021 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant, sister of the deceased, alleged the following against Respondent Establishment:

1. The establishment's personnel lost, misplaced, or destroyed the deceased personal property given to them from the coroner's office.
2. An employee informed Complainant it would take two to three weeks for burial in a Veterans Cemetery, which resulted in family's decision of cremating the deceased to avoid waiting that long.
3. Respondent falsely promised that the remains would be cremated within the next couple of days and sent to Complainant.
4. The funeral director refused to send the deceased's cremated remains to Complainant.

Respondent replied to each of Complainant's allegations stating:

1. Respondent had been transparent with Complainant regarding the theft of the decedent's personal effects. Respondent stated that they had searched several times and never found the personal effects. Respondent stated that they offered their apology, \$600.00, a free urn, and free shipment of the cremated remains out of state to make amends. However, Respondent stated that Complainant rejected this offer and countered that Respondent should compensate Complainant by paying for their round trip airfare, their three night hotel stay, and reimbursement for three days of car rental costs. Respondent declined this counteroffer.
2. Respondent stated that on December 14, 2021, the Department of Veteran Affairs supplied Respondent with paperwork stating that the deceased's discharge from the U.S. Army was categorized as OTH (Other Than Honorable) and thus did not qualify for a free burial at the Veterans Cemetery.
3. Respondent denied that they promised a cremation on this timeline due to the number of factors that go into acquiring a cremation permit.

Respondent stated that in the case of the deceased's cremation, the Illinois death certificate was filed with BURIAL as the disposition method before the family amended it to cremation. Thus, the Illinois funeral home had to file an affidavit of correction with the state, pushing the deceased's cremation timeline back even further.

4. On March 7, 2022 the cremated remains of the deceased were express mailed via United States Postal Service. Respondent included the tracking information in their response. Respondent stated that Complainant received the delivery on March 8, 2022. On March 10, 2022, Respondent claimed that Complainant called Respondent's office and insisted that she pay the shipping cost in the amount of \$85.30; Respondent accepted her payment.

This case was sent for investigation. The investigator spoke to Complainant, owner and funeral director over the Respondent establishment, and an unlicensed assistant who was heavily involved in the arrangements.

1. Regarding the missing personal effects, Complainant stated she requested Respondent pick up the deceased's personal effects during the transfer from Illinois. Complainant did state that she requested Respondent reimburse her for travel to the deceased's home in Illinois to compensate for the lost personal effects. Complainant attached a text message to show that these costs included \$441.00 for airfare, \$468.00 for three nights stay in a hotel, and \$317.49 for car rental. **The manager/funeral director of Respondent establishment confirmed that they had received possession of the personal effects when they received the deceased from Illinois. The manager stated that when the establishment receives personal effects, they are placed in a locked drawer in the funeral home manager's office. The manager surmised that the desk drawer was accidentally left unlocked, and that someone must have stolen the personal effects of the deceased. The manager stated that they have since placed a locking filing cabinet in the office to correct the situation. The manager stated that following the loss of the personal effects, Complainant became difficult to communicate with, and that he had offered Complainant \$600.00 along with shipping of the ashes and a free urn, but stated that Complainant declined the offer and ultimately made her counteroffer of compensation for travel. The manager stated that he did not feel**

that he owed Complainant the travel expenses, but that he did pay for the shipping of the cremated remains. However, the manager stated that Complainant called the establishment on March 10, 2022 and insisted that she pay the shipping costs.

2. Complainant stated that she inquired about having her brother buried in the Veterans Cemetery in Memphis, but was told that due to Covid-19, it would take approximately two to three weeks to have her brother buried there. Complainant stated that she did not want to wait that long to bury the deceased, so agreed to have the funeral service and then have the deceased cremated after the service. **Respondent added they soon received additional information to show that the deceased would not be eligible to be buried in the Veterans Cemetery because his discharge was other than honorable.**
3. Complainant stated that after the funeral service on December 21, 2021 she asked the unlicensed assistant when the deceased would be cremated. Complainant claims that he informed her that the body would be cremated in a couple of days and that he would select a nice urn and ship the cremains to her out of state. **The manager stated that the body of the deceased was delivered to the crematory on January 27, 2022. The manager stated there was a delay in delivering the body to the crematory because the original death certificate submitted to the health department in Illinois listed the disposition as “burial” and had to be amended to “cremation.” The manager stated that the Illinois health department would not issue the cremation permit until the death certificate was amended, which took some time. The manager added that the crematory had a backlog of cremations due to Covid-19. The manager stated that the body was cremated on January 27, 2022, the cremated remains were picked up from the crematory on February 4, 2022 and were mailed to Complainant on March 7, 2022.**
4. Complainant stated that she did receive the cremated remains, but that she should not have had to wait from December 22, 2021 until March 8, 2022, to receive them.

An additional matter was discovered during the course of the investigation. On April 21, 2022, the investigator emailed Complainant three documents obtained

from Respondent. The first was an authorization form signed by the unlicensed assistant dated December 20, 2021, the second was a working copy of the death certificate that listed Complainant as informant, and the final was an Authorization for Cremation and Disposition. All three documents incorrectly spelled Complainant's name and the first and third documents were "signed" by Complainant. Complainant stated that she never gave the unlicensed assistant nor any staff member at Respondent Establishment permission to sign her name on any documents. Complainant stated several times that she never gave a written proxy or verbal permission for Respondent's staff to sign her name to any documents. **When asked about this, the manager stated that it was his understanding that the unlicensed assistant had been given proxy verbally by Complainant to sign her name on the documents. Neither the manager nor another licensed funeral director in the establishment admitted to signing Complainant's name. The investigator also spoke to the unlicensed assistant who admitted that the documents were not signed by Complainant but said that he had communicated with Complainant about signing the documents so that the process would be expedited. The unlicensed assistant denied signing the documents and claimed that he was not sure who had, but thought it might have been one of the secretaries.**

Additionally, Complainant stated that she had never received a Statement of Funeral Goods and Services for the contract. **The manager stated that neither he nor the unlicensed assistant recalled Complainant requesting a Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected because most of the arrangements were made over the phone and by text.**

Recommendation:

- \$3,000.00 civil penalty plus the costs of the investigation. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a civil penalty of \$5000.00, plus the costs of the investigation. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Tonya Scales Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

Complainant, a florist company, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent establishment. Specifically, Complainant stated that on November 9, 2021 the family of a decedent contacted them to provide flowers for their mother's funeral. Complainant then contacted the owner of Respondent establishment who agreed to be billed for the flowers. Complainant stated Respondent informed them that there was a life insurance policy and that they would be responsible for the bill. Complainant stated that he was contacted by the owner and told that they would be sending a check. Complainant further stated that several months had gone by and that they had faxed and mailed bills to Respondent and had still not received payment.

Respondent replied stating that due to complications with the insurance company the family was not able to fax the paperwork to the insurance company until the last week in December. Respondent stated on February 1, 2022 they received checks for the services of the deceased and made the deposit the same day. Respondent stated that the check to Complainant was not written this day as it should have been, but added that it takes a couple of weeks sometimes for payments received to be recorded and checks to vendors to be written. On February 13, 2022 Respondent stated they received another invoice from Complainant, Respondent stated he realized the check had not been written and he informed an employee to write a check to Complainant and mail it to him. On March 14, 2022 Respondent received another invoice from Complainant. Respondent checked the checkbook and noticed that the check had not been written. Respondent asked the employee who said that the insurance company had still not paid the claim; Respondent stated he knew this was not the case since he had already written the receipt and deposited the check. Respondent maintained that because the payments had not been entered into the paper record book, the employee had assumed that it had not been paid yet. On that day, Respondent mailed the check to Complainant and called Complainant stating that the check was in the mail. When Respondent was alerted on May 9, 2022 that a complaint had been filed, Respondent checked his bank to determine if the check had cleared. Respondent discovered that the check had cleared their bank on March 29, 2022, and that the complaint had been filed on March 22, 2022. Respondent attached documentation to show that the check had been sent and that the Complainant's invoice had been paid in full.

Legal spoke to Complainant on June 7, 2022 and confirmed that they had received payment shortly after the complaint had been filed.

Recommendation:

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Christopher Lea to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Scottie Poarch

Adopted by Voice Vote

10. Case No.: 2022012331 – Funeral Establishment

11. Case No.: 2022012231 – Funeral Director

Complainant, daughter of the decedent, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of both the Respondent funeral director and establishment. Specifically, Complainant alleged that they have been trying to get a death certificate for the deceased since their service on November 2, 2020. Complainant stated that every time they speak with Respondent, they are told that they "are working on it."

Respondent did not respond to the complaint.

Based on the above allegations of unprofessional conduct and for failure to respond to the Complaint, Legal recommends a \$1,500.00 penalty to be assessed equally as a \$750.00 civil penalty against the Funeral Establishment license and the Funeral Director license respectively.

Recommendation for Funeral Establishment:

- \$750.00 civil penalty. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Recommendation for Funeral Director:

- \$750.00 civil penalty. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a civil penalty of \$1,000.00 plus check to ensure that the death certificate was received by the family. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a civil penalty of \$1,000.00 plus check to ensure that the death certificate was received by the family. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Pamela Stephens

Adopted by Voice Vote

12. Case No.: 2022012801 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant, sister of the deceased, stated that her sister passed away on November 4, 2016 and that Respondent was responsible for the final care. Complainant stated that Respondent dealt directly with her mother regarding the costs of the service, and that for reasons unbeknownst to her, Respondent was not paid for the entire cost of the services. Complainant alleged that Respondent sent the family pictures of the “naked cancer ridden body” of the deceased stating that “this is what he had to work with” while requesting complete payment.

Respondent replied stating that back in October of 2016, arrangements for the deceased were done over the phone and the payment policy was explained. Respondent stated that prior to the service day, the establishment had advanced upfront a charge of \$8,495.96 despite the fact that the family had yet to pay any of the services cost. Respondent stated that despite this, the service proceeded. Respondent further stated that the deceased had had a life insurance policy, but that the beneficiaries, the mother and the daughter of the deceased, had not tendered any money for payment. Respondent maintained that he did show a facial picture of the deceased to the cousin of the deceased, a friend of Respondent’s, and the cousin’s sister to show the condition in which he had received the deceased and the work that had been done to “make her look presentable for her family.” Respondent stated that the total funeral and burial services provided were \$18,063.96 and that to date he had only received \$6,232.78 of payment. Respondent added that the family had recently received a bill for the remaining balance which provided the motivation to file the complaint.

Recommendation:

- \$1,500.00 civil penalty. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a civil penalty of \$2000.00. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Tonya Scales Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

13. Case No.: 2022015491 – Funeral Director

Complainant, mother of the deceased, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct. Specifically, Complainant stated that Respondent had provided services to the deceased and stated to “pay what you could when you could.” Complainant alleged that Respondent and employees from the funeral home began harassing her regarding payment.

An attorney replied on behalf of Respondent stating that Respondent is actually the nephew of Complainant and due to their familial relationship, Respondent provided services at a greatly discounted rate. Respondent further stated that although Complainant had verbally promised to be responsible for the expenses, ultimately another family member signed the service contract legally obligating them to be the financially responsible party. Respondent attached documentation to show that this was the case. Respondent stated that after the services were provided, Complainant refused to pay as promised. Respondent denies that they at any time they violated the rules of professional conduct. Further, Respondent stated that they do not assert that Complainant is responsible for the debt, nor are they attempting to collect the debt from Complainant.

Recommendation:

- Closure

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Pamela Stephens

Adopted by Voice Vote

14. Case No.: 2022017761 – Funeral Establishment

This complaint was administratively opened on May 2, 2022 regarding advertisements on Respondent establishment’s website. Specifically, despite several courtesy communications with the general manager of the Respondent establishment that had been ongoing since January 2022, the website still

contained an advertisement for “Simple Cremation Starting at \$795.00” without itemizing the services and without providing the price of each service. Although the General Price List was available on the website for potential consumers to access, the initial advertisement seen on the Respondent’s website showed only “Simple Cremation Starting at \$795.00” without itemization or the individual price of each service.

On May 11, 2022, an attorney replied on behalf of Respondent stating that they had interpreted the word “advertisement” in applicable rules and statutes to include the website as a whole and not an individual screen shot of the website. Given this interpretation, Respondent believed that the link below the advertisement of “Simple Cremation Starting at \$795.00” that stated “Find out more” that linked to Respondent’s General Price List was sufficient for compliance. On May 20, 2022 the website had been changed to include an itemized price list under the advertisement and denoted what services would be provided.

Based on the above, although Respondent’s website is currently in compliance with the applicable rules and statutes, the change in the advertisement occurred only after communications informing Respondent of the violation that dated nearly four months prior. Despite the earlier communications, the change was not made until May 20, 2022 nearly four months after the Department first communicated with Respondent.

Recommendation:

- \$250.00 civil penalty. Authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Christopher Lea to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Scottie Poarch

Adopted by Voice Vote

RE-PRESENTS

15. Case No.: 2022008101 – Funeral Establishment

This matter was previously presented to the Board at its May 10, 2022 as follows:

Complainant, a competitor of the Respondent Establishment, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent. Specifically, Complainant stated that they had worked with a particular family for hours on services and that all arrangements were completed. Complainant further stated that the family met with Respondent to secure a grave space, opening and closing and other burial services. However, Complainant stated that there was a funeral home attached to cemetery and that the funeral home offered them a free opening and closing in order to switch to their services. Complainant alleges that Respondent's director called to inform them that the family would be switching to their services. Complainant stated that they had worked extensively with the family and they owed their basic services charge. Complainant alleges that Respondent refused to pay for the charge and then used the obituary Complainant wrote, used the same casket, and emulated the other services that Complainant was going to provide. Complainant stated that it was unfair that they had "worked for free" when Respondent refused to pay them for their services that the family had already rendered and further alleged that Respondent had solicited that family away from their business.

Respondent replied and denied the allegation that they had solicited the family away from Complainant. Respondent claimed that during their meeting with the family, the family inquired about their offering of a free opening and closing when using their funeral home. The employee directed the family to a funeral director at the Respondent establishment, and Respondent stated that the family indicated that they were interested in a comparison of the services between the Complainant and Respondent funeral homes. Respondent reiterated that the funeral director only answered questions posed to him by the family, and never solicited the free opening and closing. Respondent stated that the family later chose to meet with another funeral director of their own volition and then began to compare specifics of the contract with the Complainant funeral home and the offerings of the Respondent funeral home.

Respondent attached to their response a letter from the member of the family that corroborated Respondent's version of events, adding that they had used the same outline for the obituary that they had already helped put together for Complainant's Establishment. The family member stated that they were very appreciative of Respondent's services and corroborated that they were not solicited by Respondent.

Recommendation: Closure

Board Decision: REFERRED BACK TO LEGAL TO DETERMINE FROM COMPLAINANT WHETHER SERVICES WERE PAID FOR, AND IF ANY UNPAID, HOW MUCH PAYMENT IS OUTSTANDING

Update: Legal spoke with Complainant and determined that the Respondent had reimbursed Complainant in the amount of \$325.00 for the removal costs of the decedent.

Recommendation:

- Closure

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:
ROBERT B. GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

Executive Director Robert Gribble recapped concerning Public Chapter No. 1014 and that the Board will be updating information within CORE.tn.gov and sending out communication concerning Public Chapter No. 1014.

LICENSEE REPORT:

REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF MAY 7, 2022 – JUNE 12, 2022

Establishment(s)

Sellars Family Heritage at Gallatin
Gallatin, TN

Type of Action(s)/Change(s)

Name

Individuals)

Benjamin Tod Cain
Chattanooga, TN

Type of License(s)

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Hudson Louis Long
Mount Juliet, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Jerissa Joy Ward Funeral Director and Embalmer
Elizabethton, TN

Russamy Wendy Xayvongsack Funeral Director and Embalmer
LaVergne, TN

Haylee Katherine Ditzler Funeral Director
Jonesborough, TN

Amy Lee Banks Funeral Director
Knoxville, TN Reciprocity – Kentucky and South Carolina

Richard Paul Howard Funeral Director
Murphy, NC Reciprocity – North Carolina

Damion Lee Weaver Funeral Director
Hernando, MS Reciprocity – Mississippi

James Weston Leonard Embalmer
Kingsport, TN

Daniel Herman Morgan Embalmer
Rockwood, TN

CLOSED ESTABLISHMENT REPORT:

One (1) establishment have reported closing since the last board meeting:

- Saddler Funeral Home & Crematory Services, 130 Trousdale Ferry Pike, Lebanon, TN

DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT:

These are Consent Orders that have been administratively accepted / approved by the Executive Director pursuant to Board authority and as reported on the April 2022 Regulatory Board Disciplinary Action Report

Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – East, Memphis, TN

Violation: Unreasonably delaying the filing of death certificates

Action: \$2,000 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – East . Memphis, TN

Violation: Failure to treat members of the public in a respectful manner

- Action: \$1,000 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – East, Memphis, TN
- Violation: Unprofessional conduct (failed to make removal of deceased's body from a hospice facility within a reasonable time and caused delay of visitation) and failed to treat members of the public in respectful manner
- Action: \$3,000 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – Midtown, Memphis, TN
- Violation: Unreasonably delaying the filing of death certificates and failure to respond to the complaint within the time specified in the notice
- Action: \$850 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: Bradford Lee Farmer, Memphis, TN
- Violation: Unprofessional conduct (failed to file a death certificate in a timely manner)
- Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:

As of June 9, 2022, there were 28 open complaints.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept the Executive Director's Report.

Seconded by Pamela Stephens

Adopted by Voice Vote

ADJOURN:

A motion was made Anthony Harris to adjourn.

Seconded by Pamela Stephens

Adopted by Voice Vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Charles Rahm at 11.11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Gribble

Robert B. Gribble, CPM, CFSP
Executive Director