

**TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS**

**MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 8, 2022**

President Charles Rahm called the meeting to order at 10:01 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; Fred Berry, Tonya Scales Haynes, Christopher Lea and Clark McKinney

Board member absent: Scottie Poarch

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

Staff present via video: Anthony Glandorf, Chief Counsel

---

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA:**

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

Seconded by Fred Berry

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was made by Fred Berry to approve the Minutes of the December 14, 2021 Board Meeting.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

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.: 2021066731 – Funeral Establishment**

Complainant, mother of the deceased, filed a complaint against Respondent establishment alleging unprofessional conduct. Specifically, Complainant alleges that Respondent delayed the service for the deceased without notice. Complainant stated that due to limited financial resources they were receiving financial assistance in the form of support from a local organization and donations from friends and family. Complainant alleges that despite having paid the Respondent establishment and the cemetery, the service was ultimately pushed back from early morning to 1:30 p.m. resulting in a cancelled religious ceremony that had been scheduled for the earlier time.

Respondent replied asserting that in the interest of Complainant's limited resources, they proposed more cost affordable options from their General Price List. Respondent asserts that they informed Complainant and her family that whatever they decided to do regarding services and payment, it was expected to be paid in full before the date of the service on October 16, 2020. As Respondent attests, over the course of the next week, Complainant gradually paid additional funds towards the bill. However, Respondent purports that upon calling the cemetery to confirm before placing an order for the vault, they were advised that the family had made arrangements for the burial on October 16, 2020 but had yet to pay. The cemetery informed Respondent that the money had to be received 48 hours prior to the service. On the morning of the service, Respondent contends they received a call from the cemetery at 8:13 a.m. stating that the family had not paid the cemetery. Respondent then informed its employees to delay the 11:00 a.m. graveside setup for the deceased. Respondent contends that they attempted to see what could be done with the cemetery, but that the family was ultimately told they would have to reschedule the graveside due to the cemetery not being paid. However, Respondent asserts that they were later contacted by the cemetery that same day informing them that they had been paid and would allow for a burial to take place at 1:30 p.m. thus resulting in a delayed service.

This case was sent for investigation. The investigator spoke to Complainant who asserted that she had attempted to pay the cemetery on October 15, 2020 but due to a scheduling issue was unable. However, she maintained that she had

been advised by the cemetery that she could submit payment the following morning. The Complainant contends that when she was informed by Respondent that the deceased's service would need to be cancelled due to failing to pay the cemetery, Complainant had already paid the cemetery that morning. However, when the call from the cemetery was delivered to Respondent confirming payment, the service was ultimately rescheduled for later that afternoon. As a result of the delay, the religious portion of the service was canceled due to a prior commitment. The investigator also spoke with a representative of the cemetery who stated she met with Complainant on either October 14 or 15, 2020. The representative stated that she informed Complainant of the price and that it would have to be paid in full at least 48 hours prior to the interment. The representative stated that she was not aware that the interment services were ever cancelled or delayed by the office. The representative provided a receipt for the grave space showing payment on October 16, 2020.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure

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

Seconded by Fred Berry

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**2. Case No.: 2021070870 – Funeral Establishment**

Complainant, wife of the deceased, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent establishment. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent gave the remains of the deceased to a relative despite her request that the remains be given to her alone.

Respondent replied contending that the sister of the deceased called on October 19, 2021 and asked if the deceased's ashes were at the establishment. When an employee of Respondent confirmed that they were, the sister requested they put some of the cremains into two keepsakes that she had purchased. Respondent stated that on the following day, they filled the keepsakes with some cremains and the sister picked them both up. The day after that, Complainant arrived to pick up the cremains where she told the employee of Respondent that no one else was to pick up the cremains. The employee of Respondent contends that they were unaware of the request but admitted they should have checked with

the Complainant before releasing cremains to the sister. On October 22, 2021 the employee called the sister and requested she return the ashes, to which the sister complied. Respondent made several attempts to contact Complainant and stated that as of November 2, 2021 Complainant had not picked up the cremains.

This case was sent for investigation. The investigator spoke first with the Complainant who stated she specifically requested that she receive all her husband's cremains in a sealed container so that her and her children could have a private ceremony. The Complainant stated that prior to obtaining the cremains from the Respondent establishment, she received a call from the deceased's sister informing her that she had received a couple of tablespoons of the deceased's ashes. Upon arriving at the Respondent establishment, Complainant confirmed with an employee of establishment that he had given the sister some cremains, and that he apologized for the error. Complainant stated she received a phone call from Respondent establishment informing her that the sister had returned the cremains, and due to living three hours away, Complainant was unable to return to the establishment for the cremains until November 11, 2021. The investigator next spoke to the funeral director who had made the cremation arrangements with the Complainant. During the interview, the funeral director stated that there was no issue with Complainant being recognized as the legal next of kin. The investigator made numerous attempts to contact the sister of the deceased, but all attempts were unsuccessful. Finally, the investigator spoke to the establishment employee who stated he did not have any involvement with the arrangements of the deceased or Complainant. The employee largely reiterated what had been stated in the formal response, adding that the sister had informed him that she had received permission from Complainant to receive a small portion of the cremains but again admitted that he should have contacted the Complainant prior to releasing any portion of the cremains.

It appears by Respondent's own admission that he should have conferred with Complainant regarding the release of the cremains when specific instructions had been given by the designated next of kin and person with right of disposition to not release the cremains of the deceased to anyone but her, the acts of Respondent constitute a violation of rules relating to professional conduct.

**Recommendation:**

- \$500.00 civil penalty. Authorize via consent order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**3. Case No.: 2021071671 – Funeral Establishment**

Complainant, mother of the deceased, filed a complaint against Respondent funeral establishment alleging that Respondent had released the deceased's body for cremation to a fraudulent person and that Respondent would not speak to Complainant about it.

Respondent replied stating that as part of the pre-arrangement interview, Complainant had informed Respondent that the deceased was married but that his spouse was estranged. Complainant gave Respondent the first name of the deceased's wife but did not know her maiden name. During the process of obtaining the permit for cremation, the wife of the deceased contacted Respondent who began dealing with the wife of the deceased as the person with the right of disposition. The wife gave permission to cremate, and the arrangements were completed the following day. Respondent informed Complainant that the wife of the deceased had contacted them and that she had completed the arrangements. The wife had expressed that she wanted herself, Complainant, and a former wife of the deceased to split the cremains equally. Respondent contends that Complainant was kept informed as to each step of the process.

This complaint was sent for investigation. The investigator spoke first to Complainant who stated that on August 25, 2021 she made arrangements to have her son cremated with Respondent establishment. She signed the paperwork and informed an employee of Respondent that the deceased had married, but that the spouse did not take the last name of the deceased. Complainant asserted that when she later tried to discuss her son's cremation with Respondent, she was informed by the employee that since her son was married, they would have to abide by directions of the wife who was the legal next of kin. Finally, Complainant stated she was upset that Respondent had ceased communication with her after speaking to her son's wife. The investigator spoke next with the employee of Respondent who stated that she received an initial call from Complainant on August 23, 2021 regarding her son, and then received permission from Complainant the following day for removal service and to begin preparation for cremation. After meeting with Complainant, Respondent contends that Complainant mentioned for a second time that her son was

married but that the wife was estranged, Respondent contends that Complainant even wrote on the working copy of the death certificate as “Married” and listed wife’s name with “Last name unknown.” The employee contends that on August 31, 2021 the wife of the deceased contacted Respondent and began overseeing the arrangements for the deceased. Respondent maintains that following the cremation on September 11, 2021, one-third of the deceased’s ashes were shipped to Complainant. Respondent contends that per the instructions of the wife, the legal next of kin of the deceased, Respondent ceased communications with Complainant.

Based on the above the heart of the complaint is a next of kin determination.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure to be decided by a court of competent jurisdiction.

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

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**4. Case No.: 2021072401 – Funeral Director**

Complainant, daughter of the deceased, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent. Specifically, Complainant alleges that Respondent provided her no information regarding the service of the deceased including which location the service was to be held or the address of the cemetery. Complainant contends that she was told by Respondent that they had designated one of her sisters as next of kin with the right of disposition and that per that sister’s request, all information must go through her. Complainant states that her sister provided her little information and due to this lack of information, Complainant almost missed the private viewing and the entombment of her father and only learned of the time and location of these services through another family member. Complainant asserts that Respondent acted unprofessionally by refusing to provide information to Complainant since she too was a daughter of the deceased.

Respondent replied stating that on September 22, 2021 they met with Complainant’s sister and next of kin of the deceased. Respondent contends that during the meeting, Complainant’s sister warned them that she could not verify the legitimacy of individuals calling themselves children of the deceased since

the deceased had multiple children from multiple relationships, and that there would be people calling the funeral home misrepresenting themselves as children of the deceased. As Respondent contends, the sister suggested it would be best if she were responsible for providing information to her family members. The arrangements for the deceased were an immediate burial with no public viewing. The sister of the deceased arranged for a private family visitation and Respondent admits they trusted the sister to provide information of the private visitation to her immediate family again reiterating that all information would go through here. Respondent apologized that Complainant almost missed the private viewing and the entombment of her father and maintains that was the opposite intention of their actions stating they were attempting to protect the privacy of the decedent, not exclude family members from the services.

Based on the above the heart of the complaint is a next of kin determination.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure for determination by a court of competent jurisdiction.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to issue a Letter of Instruction.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**5. Case No.: 2021074321 – Funeral Director**

Complainant, brother of the deceased, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent allowed an unauthorized person to take over the arrangements for the deceased even though Complainant had already signed a contract for services. Complainant however had not paid for the contracted services, as Respondent communicated to them that payment would only be due in person. Complainant alleges that after picking out a service for the deceased and deciding on a date for the services, Complainant discovered that Respondent allowed the deceased's ex-wife and son to take the remains of the deceased. Complainant further contends that as a result of the ex-wife and son's involvement, they were uninvited to the memorial service and were unable to attend the service that they had originally signed for. Finally, Complainant contends that Respondent provided them neither the remains of the deceased nor provided them notice that Respondent was cancelling their contract.

Respondent replied asserting that they were contacted by Complainant on September 24, 2021. Respondent contends that during that call, they inquired as to whether the deceased had a spouse or any children as his next of kin. Respondent asserts that Complainant said no. Respondent maintains that they then emailed Complainant all the necessary paperwork for the requested services since she lived out of town, and that they never contacted Complainant regarding payment. The following day, Respondent contends they were contacted by the son of the deceased, stating he had not authorized them to pick up his father nor had he given his aunt permission to release his father into Respondent's care. After being provided identification, Respondent began making arrangements with the son of the deceased. Respondent claims they informed Complainant that they would not be able to communicate with her regarding the arrangements since she was not the next of kin.

Based on the above the heart of the complaint is a next of kin determination.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure for determination by a court of competent jurisdiction.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**6. Case No.: 2021077131 – Funeral Establishment**

Complainant, daughter of the deceased, alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent embalmed her mother despite specific instructions to forgo embalment. Complainant alleges that upon filling out paperwork at Respondent establishment, she informed them that she wanted the same services they had provided to her father 13 years earlier, Complainant stated in the complaint that her father was not embalmed and that her mother did not want to be embalmed either. Complainant alleged that upon completing the paperwork, she explained her mother's wishes to Respondent and stated numerous times to not embalm the body. However, as Complainant alleges upon receiving an itemized statement, she had been charged for embalming the body. Complainant alleges that she was eventually told by Respondent that "someone told EMS that she could be embalmed" and that no next of kin ever authorized embalment.



Respondent replied asserting that Complainant had never mentioned forgoing embalment until the embalming had already been performed. Respondent stated first that they provided a General Price List to Complainant for a full-service charge which included embalment, a Statement of Funeral Goods and Services where Complainant agreed to pay the full-service charge that included embalming charges and had a first call sheet whereby Respondent claims Complainant gave their staff oral permission to embalm and prepare the body for viewing. Respondent contends that by signing the Statement of Funeral Goods and Services for the full amount, after viewing the General Price List that itemized the entirety of the services provided, which included embalming, Complainant had authorized embalming. Further, Respondent contends that Complainant requested an open casket for family viewing and visitation. As Respondent contends, this would not have been possible had they not embalmed the body. Respondent maintains that the first time they heard Complainant request to not embalm the body was several hours after the private family viewing and visitation after the embalming had already been done. Respondent attached a first call sheet which, as Respondent purports, denoted that Complainant had granted oral permission for Respondent to embalm the deceased.

The Legal Department contacted Respondent regarding several follow up questions. In these communications, Respondent maintained that Complainant first requested to not have the deceased embalmed following the private family viewing, and that they had communicated to Complainant that the private viewing would not have been possible without embalming the deceased. Respondent further provided an itemized Statement of Funeral Goods and services that included the cost of services for the deceased, including an embalming charge. Finally, Respondent was unable to provide a document to show written consent by Complainant regarding embalment services. Instead, Respondent could only provide a date and time that Complainant purportedly orally authorized embalment services, the information provided matched the information that Respondent had included on their first call sheet.

However, the itemized list of charges on the Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected that specifically denoted an embalment charge that Respondent provided to legal was not signed by the Complainant. The Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected document Respondent attached to their complaint was signed by Complainant but did not include an itemized list of the selected services, instead only showing the total charge for services. That is, the

final price was listed, but the items selected that amounted to that charge were not included in the document signed by Complainant.

**Recommendation:**

- \$500.00 civil penalty for failing to provide an itemized price for each item / service provided under Tenn. Code Ann. 62-5-106 and for violation of Board Rule 0660-11-.06 with respect to misleading acts of practice. Authorize via consent order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Tonya Scales Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**7. Case No.: 2021080781 – Funeral Establishment**

Complainant, sister of the deceased, filed a complaint alleging unprofessional conduct. Specifically, Complainant alleged that Respondent embalmed the deceased without family authorization and had transferred the body out of state. Complainant contends that she has attempted to contact Respondent regarding the deceased but has not received a response to either her calls or emails.

Respondent replied stating that they received the initial call from a mortuary on September 24, 2021 requesting removal and preparation of the deceased and upon bringing the deceased into their care, arranged for preparation to transport the body to Georgia. Respondent stated that authorization for removal of remains and embalmment was given by the listed step-daughter of the deceased who also had the power of attorney. On September 27, 2021, Respondent contends they began receiving calls from the sister of the deceased stating that she was the legal next of kin. Respondent confirmed with the healthcare facility they had received the deceased from that the step-daughter was listed as the power of attorney and the care plan details gave consent for the step-daughter to make decisions. Respondent contends they shared this information with Complainant, but that she was not in favor of the decisions being made and became hostile towards Respondent and members of their staff.

Based on the above the heart of the complaint is a next of kin determination.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure for determination by a court of competent jurisdiction.

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:**

**HB2103/SB2570 –**

Funeral Directors and Embalmers - As introduced, authorizes licensed funeral directors to sell pre-need funeral contracts and prearrangement insurance policies without registering with the commissioner of commerce and insurance; requires that continuing education completed virtually for renewal of embalmer and funeral director licenses involve continuous two-way transfer of information; defines unlicensed assistants for funeral establishment licensure laws. - Amends TCA Title 62.

**HB2352/SB1934 –**

Cemeteries - As introduced, specifies that a trustee for an improvement care trust fund may establish a separate trust for each individual cemetery or cemetery company, or a master trust for multiple cemetery companies; specifies that a trustee for pre-need cemetery contracts may establish a separate trust fund for each contract, a single trust fund for all contracts written by an individual cemetery, or a single trust fund for all contracts written by multiple cemetery companies; makes other changes related to the establishment and management of an improvement care trust fund or a trust fund for a pre-need cemetery contract. - Amends TCA Title 35, Chapter 14 and Title 46, Chapter 1, Part 2.

**HB0788/SB1429 –**

Indigents - As introduced, requires this state and the county in which the person resided to pay up to \$2,000 for the burial or cremation of a person who dies from COVID-19 if the person's family is financially unable to pay for a proper burial or cremation of the person. - Amends TCA Title 5, Chapter 9; Title 9 and Title 46.

**HB0738/SB1091 –**

Contracts - As introduced, reduces from 100 percent to 80 percent the amount of funds received for funeral services and merchandise to be held in trust pursuant to a pre-need funeral contract funded by trust deposit; requires the contract to

disclose to the purchaser in boldface type the percentage of funds the seller is required to trust along with the name of the trust officer, the trust institution, and their respective addresses and phone numbers. - Amends TCA Title 62, Chapter 5.

**HB1466/SB1558 –**

Professions and Occupations - As introduced, reduces from 75 to 60 days after the end of the pre-need seller's fiscal year, the time by which a pre-need seller and trustee must file an annual report with the commissioner of commerce and insurance. - Amends TCA Title 38; Title 44; Title 55; Title 62 and Title 68.

**Website for Legislative Bill Searches:**

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/billsearch/BillSearchAdvanced.aspx>

**LICENSEE REPORT:**

**REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF DECEMBER 11, 2021 – FEBRUARY 4, 2022**

<b><u>Establishments</u></b>	<b><u>Type of Action/Change</u></b>
Compassion Funeral & Cremation Services Nashville, TN	New Establishment
Holston Cremation Fall Branch, TN	New Establishment
Lawrence-Sorensen Funeral Home North Chapel Humboldt, TN	New Establishment
McDonald Funeral Home, Inc. Centerville, TN	New Establishment
R. S. Lewis and Sons Funeral Home Memphis, TN	New Establishment
Bilbrey Funeral Home and Cremation Services Crossville, TN	Name and Ownership
Life & Legacy Cremation Center Maryville, TN	Name and Ownership
Mott-McKamey Funeral Home and Cremations Oak Ridge, TN	Name and Ownership
Smith Funeral & Cremation Service	Name and Ownership

Maryville, TN

Sumner Funeral & Cremation Lakeside Hendersonville, TN	Name and Ownership
-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------

Superior Funeral Home Knight Arnold Chapel Memphis, TN	Name and Ownership
-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------

Akard Funeral Home Bristol, TN	Ownership
-----------------------------------	-----------

Spring Hill Memorial Park, Funeral Home & Cremation Services Spring Hill, TN	Ownership
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Williamson Memorial Funeral Home and Cremation Services Franklin, TN	Ownership
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Akins-Cobb Funerals & Cremations Copperhill, TN	Name
----------------------------------------------------	------

Allen Funeral Home Morristown, TN	Name
--------------------------------------	------

Tennessee Cremation and Mortuary Service Greenbrier, TN	Name
------------------------------------------------------------	------

Brown Funeral Home Byrdstown, TN	Location
-------------------------------------	----------

Mountain Empire Cremation & Burial Services Jonesborough, TN	Location
-----------------------------------------------------------------	----------

**Individuals**

**Type of License(s)**

Brittany Lynn Davenport Strawberry Plains, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
--------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Valerie Dawn Haddock McMinnville, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
-----------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Kimberly Ann Roberts Knoxville, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Keri Dawn Wolf Gallatin, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Sharon Leigh Cox Kingsport, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Virginia
Yasamin Elena Dye Gallatin, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Arizona
Brandon Heath Gamble Huntsville, AL	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Alabama
Hunter Evan Hildreth Nashville, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – North Carolina
Amy Irene Poole White House, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Texas
Kaylinn Elisabeth Winchell Hernando, MS	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Mississippi
John William Haben, Jr. Johnson City, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reapplication
Calissta Annalea Bishop Elizabethton, TN	Funeral Director
Johnathan Brent Cox Stantonville, TN	Funeral Director
Jennifer McKinney Gasperson Kingsport, TN	Funeral Director
Roy Cornell Meadows, Jr. Crossville, TN	Funeral Director
Crevon Vivian Palmer Horn Lake, MS	Funeral Director
Jerrid Shane DeLong Cartersville, GA	Funeral Director Reciprocity – Georgia
Taeya Aspen Havens White House, TN	Funeral Director Reciprocity – Texas

**CLOSED ESTABLISHMENT REPORT:**

There are not any closed establishments to report at this meeting.

**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 November 2021 and December 2021 Regulatory Boards Disciplinary Action Reports**

Respondent: Rachael Lynn Jordan, Hartsville, TN  
Violation: Unprofessional conduct (failure to properly control decedent's odor and bodily fluid leakage from casket during funeral services)  
Action: \$1,000 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Bernice Louise Ryan, Columbia, TN  
Violation: Engaged in an act that is misleading or deceptive by allowing a person who was not the next of kin to sign for and receive the decedent's belongings  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – Midtown, Memphis, TN  
Violation: Unprofessional conduct (failure to timely order purchased headstones) and failed to treat a member of the public in a respectful manner  
Action: \$1,000 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Forest Hill Funeral Home & Memorial Park – East, Memphis, TN  
Violation: Failed to treat a member of the public in a respectful manner and failed to file the death certificate of a decedent in a reasonable time  
Action: \$1,000 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Ridgeway Funeral Home, Inc., Paris, TN  
Violation: Permitted an individual to make funeral and cremation arrangements without a valid funeral director license  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

Respondent: Jesse Benjamin Hedges, Paris, TN  
Violation: Conducted funeral and cremation arrangements with an expired funeral director license  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty

**OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:**

As of February 4, 2022, there were 38 open complaints.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept the Executive Director's Report.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**ESTABLISHMENT APPLICATION:**

**KNOXVILLE CREMATION & MEMORIAL SERVICES, LLC  
ATTN: MARQUIS DELAFAYETTE DOTSON, III, MGR.  
2902 TAZEWELL PIKE, SUITE H  
KNOXVILLE, TN 37918-1877**

**New Establishment**

**Ownership: Limited Liability Company**

**Owner(s): Knoxville Cremation & Memorial Services, LLC, 2902 Tazewell Pike, Suite H, P.O. Box 24217, Knoxville, TN 37933-2217**

Fred Berry recused himself from participation in this establishment application.

Upon motion by Anthony Harris and seconded by Clark McKinney, based upon application record, this establishment application was approved for licensure.

Adopted by Vocie Vote

---

**ADJOURN:**

A motion was made Anthony Harris to adjourn.

Seconded by Fred Berry

Adopted by Voice Vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Charles Rahm at 11:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert B. Gribble*

Robert B. Gribble, CPM, CFSP  
Executive Director