

**TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS**

**MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 10, 2024**

President Pam Stephens 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: Pam Stephens, President; Christopher Lea, Vice President; Don Haynes, Randy Nash, Wendell Naylor, and Tim Wheeler.

Board member(s) absent: Scottie Poarch

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

---

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA:**

A motion was made by Christopher Lea to approve the agenda as published.

Seconded by Tim Wheeler

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler to approve the Minutes of the August 13, 2024, 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.: 2024039111 – Funeral Director**

Complainant, daughter of the decedent, stated their mother passed away on May 24, 2024, and that they had gone to the funeral establishment and signed papers entitling her to receive the cremated remains. Complainant alleged that upon their arrival, Respondent would not follow through with what they had promised her. Complainant stated that they were waiting on her siblings to make a determination as to next of kin, and Complainant claimed Respondent had communicated it would be 72 hours before the cremains were provided, but that it ultimately became 7 days. Complainant stated that 6 weeks have now passed, and they still cannot receive the cremains. Complainant claimed to be the executor of the decedent's will and claimed to have sent the proper paperwork stating she is supposed to receive the cremains (Complainant did not attach any of this paperwork to their complaint). Complainant stated, "I've sent all the paperwork and yet they still will not let me have my mom's ashes and now it is going before a judge because my horrible sister had to be contacted to sign for next of kin."

Legal spoke to Respondent's legal counsel to get a better understanding of the situation. Respondent's legal counsel explained that at the beginning of their services, Complainant had filled out documentation with the funeral establishment indicating that the cremains would go to her and implying that she was the sole next of kin candidate. However, it was soon discovered later that there were other siblings in addition to Complainant. Upon bringing this discovery to Complainant, Complainant then stated that the intent was to spread the cremains 50/50 among her and another sibling ultimately leaving one sibling out. After this, Complainant presented information to the funeral establishment indicating she had Power Of Attorney authority, but all appropriate documentation regarding POA had not been submitted. As a result, the funeral establishment referred the matter to probate court so that next of kin could be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, and their legal counsel stated that their hands are tied due to competing claims of the decedent's cremains, and that a judge's determination was ultimately required.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure

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

Seconded by Wendell Naylor

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**2. Case No.: 2024039361 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on June 12, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. The manager for Respondent establishment had a funeral director license that expired May 31, 2024, and was not reinstated until June 2, 2024. The inspector found no evidence that the manager had acted in the capacity of a Tennessee funeral director or embalmer during this time, but the individual was still acting as the manager for Respondent establishment during this time. **Respondent stated they had obtained all CE hours, but that when making a call to a state funeral directors association office on May 31, 2024, (day of the license expiration) the website was erroneously showing that the individual had obtained the necessary hours for their funeral director license, but not their embalmer license; however, one of the individuals at the state association office was not available at that time. The individual spoke with the state association employee the following Monday (June 3, 2024), and they stated it was an error that erroneously listed the embalmer CE has not completed. The individual stated had they known this was an error, they would have paid the renewal fees on Friday, but because they wanted to follow up on the reported lack of embalmer CE, they did not do so until Monday.**

**Recommendation:**

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Don Haynes to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Randy Nash

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**3. Case No.: 2024039371 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 8, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. Respondent establishment had failed to report its change of location after moving into a new place of business as of February 2024. **Respondent replied stating that while the mailing address did change, the change was only to a different suite in the same building (for example, changing from Suite 110 in “Generic Office Building” to Suite 100 in the same “Generic Office Building), but argued that the applicable rule only requires written notice to the Board in event of:**

- (b) Change of location of a funeral establishment; or**
- (e) Change in mailing address of any funeral director, embalmer, or apprentice**

**Respondent argues that the location did not change under (b) because they are in the same building, just a different suite, and agrees that the mailing address changed from Suite 110 to Suite 100, but that (e) only contemplates written notice for a funeral director, embalmer, or apprentice, not a funeral establishment. Respondent did not object to the necessary reinspection and accompanying fee due to the change of suite location.**

“Location” as contemplated in (b) of the applicable rule contemplates the physical location of the establishment. While they are in the same building, and the location change is a minor one, Respondent does not deny their previous location was in Suite 110 and that their new location is in Suite 100.

**Recommendation:**

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Randy Nash to send a Letter of Instruction.

Seconded by Wendell Naylor

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**4. Case No.: 2024039381 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on June 24, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. The pre-need sales agent license of Respondent's employee expired on January 23, 2023, and was not renewed until April 29, 2024. During the unlicensed period, the employee had written seventy-six (76) pre-need sales contracts. **Respondent stated that the employee was unaware of the expiration and once it was brought to their attention, they immediately renewed the pre-need sales agent registration. However, Respondent stated that in the interim, the employee had written several pre-need contracts under just their insurance producer license. Respondent stated the employee was not aware that the pre-need sales agent registration needed to be renewed and that the error was unnoticed until the inspection. Respondent stated that since joining Respondent establishment in 2021, this was the employee's first introduction to the funeral business and was unaware that renewal of the registration was required.**

The Board recently heard a companion complaint to this case at a previous board meeting. The Respondent has multiple establishments where pre-need contracts are sold. At the previous case the Board heard and decided for the exact same violation in the amount of seventy-seven (77) pre-need contracts written at that location, the Board assessed a \$750.00 civil penalty

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Randy Nash to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Don Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**5. Case No.: 2024039391 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 8, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. Respondent manager's funeral director license expired on June 30, 2024, and was not reinstated until July 2, 2024. During the inspection, the inspector found no evidence to indicate that the manager engaged in arrangement conferences, services, or embalming during the unlicensed period. However, the manager was still listed as the establishment manager during this unlicensed period. **The manager replied on Respondent's behalf stating that they unknowingly allowed their funeral director and embalmer licenses to expire on June 30, 2024. The manager admitted that Respondent establishment did not have licensed manager for the period of June 30, 2024 – July 2, 2024.**

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Randy Nash

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**6. Case No.: 2024040801 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 17, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. Respondent manager's funeral director license expired on June 30, 2024, and was not reinstated until July 2, 2024. During the inspection, the inspector found no evidence to indicate that the manager engaged in arrangement conferences, services, or embalming during the unlicensed period. However, the manager was still listed as the establishment manager during this unlicensed period. **The manager replied on behalf of Respondent establishment stating that they had moved in August of 2023 and that the information for renewal was likely sent to the old location. The manager stated that when they realized on June 30, 2024, that the license was expiring, they logged onto CORE to do the renewal. Respondent stated the CORE website did not allow them to log-in so they called the state office for assistance. Respondent stated they received a call a few days later from a state board staff member (who manager was very complimentary of) and were able to renew their license and update the address information. The manager stated that during this**

**three (3) day unlicensed period they did not assist any families with arrangements or embalming.**

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Randy Nash to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Tim Wheeler

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**7. Case No.: 2024040801 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 17, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. Respondent manager's funeral director license expired on April 30, 2024, and was not renewed until June 10, 2024. Respondent establishment had written three (3) funeral contracts during the unlicensed period in which Respondent did not have a licensed manager. **Respondent stated that they were not aware of the lapse until the inspection. Respondent admitted the unlicensed manager had written three (3) funeral contracts during the unlicensed period, but upon being made aware of the lapse, the manager stopped meeting with families.**

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler for a \$750.00 civil penalty and authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Randy Nash

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**8. Case No.: 2024040851 – Funeral Director**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 17, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. Respondent is the individual from the previous complaint whose license had lapsed on April 30, 2024, and was not renewed until June 10, 2024. Respondent wrote three (3) at-need contracts during the period of license and was the manager of a funeral establishment during the unlicensed period. **Respondent stated that they have been experiencing serious health issues for the past eighteen (18) months. Respondent stated that due to their health complications, their memory slipped and they missed in-person classes for continuing education that would have given them the five (5) required in-person hours.**

**Recommendation:**

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Randy Nash to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**9. Case No.: 2024041311 – Funeral Establishment**

This case was administratively opened following a routine inspection conducted on July 17, 2024. During the course of this routine inspection, the inspector observed the following:

a. A pre-need sales agent at Respondent establishment had their registration expire on July 8, 2024, and it had not been renewed as of the date of the inspection. During this time, the employee had written one (1) pre-need sales contract on July 9, 2024. **Respondent replied stating that originally that pre-need contract was written on June 28<sup>th</sup> and was mailed to the customer. Respondent stated that when the customer signed and dated the contract, it was on July 2, 2024. Respondent stated that they received the signed contract on July 9, 2024, and that the employee (with the expired registration) used the date it had been received and signed it. However, upon review, due to a signature error from the consumer, the contract could not be accepted. A new version of the contract was sent to the consumer on July 10, 2024, was signed by the consumer on July 11, 2024,**



**and received by the establishment on July 11, 2024 by the same employee with the expired registration. Respondent stated that the employee thought their registration expired at the end of the month, and once it was discovered, they worked to correct it. Respondent stated their registration was renewed on July 18, 2024.**

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler for a \$250.00 civil penalty and Letter of Instruction and authorize via Consent Order and formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Don Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**10. Case No.: 2024039861 – Funeral Director**

Complainant alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent. Specifically, Complainant stated that Respondent had written an email in a rude and uncourteous tone to colleagues in the funeral industry. Further, the Complainant referred to a banquet where they (Complainant) were attempting to set up an area within the banquet event area and a hotel employee where the banquet was occurring informed the Complainant that a table could not be moved without Respondent's permission because they "did not want to get cursed out again." Complainant also stated during the banquet that Respondent interrupted the speaker when they began to talk about corporate presence in the funeral industry. Finally, Complainant stated that honorees at the banquet had historically received a plaque. However, Complainant stated that no plaque was presented to the honoree and claimed that Respondent had informed the honoree that they had forgotten to bring the plaque but that they would have someone ship it to them on June 12, 2024. Complainant stated that the plaque did not arrive, and they did not receive information about the plaque. Complainant stated the honoree emailed Respondent on June 28, 2024, for an update. Complainant alleged Respondent emailed back the following day with an "uncaring, unbothered, unprofessional tone" and instructed the honoree to contact the individual responsible for shipping the plaque. Complainant stated the honoree did not receive the plaque until July 8, 2024.

Respondent replied and stated that the reason their tone was considered by Complainant as “rough and uncourteous” is because the honoree did not follow the proper vetting process for the banquet. Respondent stated that because the honoree was being honored, they felt they were able to arrange the banquet in the way they chose in conflict with applicable by-laws. Respondent stated they had to remind the honoree of this on several occasions. Specifically, Respondent addressed Complainant’s complaint of “not having time to set up” stating that the banquet is done in conjunction with continuing education and that they were required to adhere to the schedule that had been put in place back in January and February, thus the timeline could not be adjusted as the honoree and Complainant had requested. Regarding the hotel employee, Respondent denied speaking to anyone in that manner. Although Respondent stated they left specific instructions that no changes or additions were made without speaking to them first, this was to avoid incurring additional fees. Next, Respondent stated they did not interrupt the speaking, but did say after the speaker sat down after a “rant about corporations” as a reminder that they did not want to offend any of their members regardless of who they work for. Finally, regarding the plaque, they stated that the treasurer typically orders, pays for, and brings it with them to the convention. Respondent stated they did not find out until June 10, 2024, that the treasurer had left the plaque and that a member of the convention informed Respondent what had happened. Respondent stated they received an email from the honoree inquiring about the plaque. Respondent stated there was no ill will or malice involved and leaving the plaque was purely an accident. Respondent stated they explained this to the honoree after they accused Respondent of having a “personal vendetta.” Respondent advised the honoree to follow up with the treasurer regarding the plaque.

Based on the above, the entirety of the complaint alleging unprofessional conduct are industry and personal disputes. Legal would strongly advise the Board that this is not the appropriate forum nor appropriate function of the Board to settle or discipline for such disputes.

Note: Board member Wendell Naylor recused himself from participating in this complaint and departed the conference room during its discussion and determination by the board.

**Recommendation:**

- Closure

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

Seconded by Tim Wheeler

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**11. Case No.: 2024038341 – Funeral Director**

Complainant, child of the deceased alleged unprofessional conduct on behalf of Respondent funeral director. Specifically, Complainant stated that on the day of the graveside service, the casket did not fit into the vault. Complainant provided that they attempted to lower the casket several times with the family present and purported that they could see the casket shifting. Complainant stated that they and the family walked away to avoid witnessing the issue further. Complainant stated that the cemetery director ultimately assured them that they would make sure the casket got into the vault and sent photographs later showing that it had successfully been placed in the vault. However, Complainant stated that in order to get the casket to fit, they had to remove portions of the casket that were purchased and stated that photographs provided showed the lid was slightly raised off the casket. Complainant stated they followed up with Respondent a few days later and were told by Respondent that the casket was a few centimeters larger than the vault.

Respondent replied stating that upon arriving at the cemetery for the service, a funeral director identified that the wooden casket appeared to be wider than the vault to be used for interment. Upon this discovery, that funeral director asked the representative from the vault company if the inside dimensions of the vault would accommodate the casket. Respondent stated that prior to removal of the casket from the hearse, the outside of the casket and inside of the vault were measured by the vault representative. Respondent stated that the casket measured about 1.5-2 inches less in width than the inside of the vault. Respondent stated once receiving this confirmation, they proceeded with the service. However, Respondent stated that once the casket was being lowered into the vault, it became evident that the vault was not going to accommodate the width of the casket. Respondent stated in an effort to find a solution, they consulted with the vault company to determine other vault options that would fit in a standard size grave, and it was confirmed that the current vault was the largest vault capable of fitting inside a standard grave. Immediately following this conversation with the vault representative, the funeral director spoke to the Complainant and another family member explaining the situation. Respondent stated they agreed to depart the cemetery at that time, and that during this conversation they were given approval that, if necessary, a portion of the exterior

the casket (specifically the decorative knobs) could be removed. The funeral director stated Complainant and the family member would receive confirmation once the casket had been placed in the vault and interment was completed. Respondent provided photos to show that the case of the casket was removed and the casket was successfully lowered into the vault and interment was completed. Respondent stated following this service, they communicated with Complainant to apologize and explain the matter. The next day, Respondent also followed up with the two daughters of the deceased, listened to their concerns, offered clarity regarding the situation, and apologized again. Respondent stated the call concluded with mutual thanks for the call, and that they were under the impression the issue had been resolved.

Complainant provided a rebuttal claiming that they had no idea what the issue was until the cemetery owner contacted the vault company, and they purportedly told her that the funeral home had ordered a regular sized vault for an oversized casket. Complainant contends this was only discovered after the complaint was filed and attached a screenshot of a call from the cemetery owner dated July 10, 2024. Complainant stated they only received a call after the cemetery owner communicated to the funeral home that the family was upset. Complainant further stated that the wood casket and vault were purchased through the funeral home, and that although the funeral director purportedly noticed the casket did not fit the vault upon arrival, since the order had been placed through them, they should have been aware of that prior to that time. Complainant also stated that the wood caskets used by the funeral home are cremation caskets that come in regular and oversized dimensions, Complainant stated their father was 5 feet 8 inches and weighed 145 pounds and that an oversized casket was not required. Complainant refuted Respondent's claim that they explained to the family what was happening at the graveside service stating that they only ensured them that the casket would go into the vault and that they would send follow up communication once they had done so. Complainant stated that only in a phone call two days later (initiated by Complainant) was the issue explained to them by Respondent.

Complainant stated they followed up with the cemetery owner who offered to call the vault company and claimed that they reported back that the funeral director had ordered a regular sized vault for an oversized casket. Complainant claims they received a call from the funeral director where they admitted this error. Complainant provided a photograph of a text exchange where the funeral director offered an apology. Finally, Complainant stated that the Respondent did not reach out to them to offer an apology and explain the issue and that the phone

number Respondent provided in their reply was their sister's number, not theirs. Complainant stated that Respondent never called them.

Based on the above, there are conflicting reports as to who spoke to whom and when these conversations occurred regarding the casket failing to fit in the provided vault. Respondent contends the funeral director explained this to the family and Complainant at the gravesite and that Respondent followed up at a later date and spoke to and apologized to the family again, while Complainant contends they were never contacted and only received an apology after they contacted Respondent. What we are certain of is that, according to Respondent's reply, "the arrangements were made by [family member of Complainant] with [Respondent]. The merchandise was ordered by [funeral director] per the selections of the funeral service contract." Ultimately, the casket that was ordered was too large to fit inside the vault, and Respondent does not deny that they made the funeral arrangements and that a member of their establishment ordered the casket and vault.

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Don Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

Board member(s) voting contrary to the conclusion: Randy Nash

---

**RE-PRESENT**

---

12. Case No.: 2024029491 – Funeral Establishment

This matter was previously presented to the Board at its August 13, 2024 meeting as follows:

*Summary: Complainant stated that they had a pre-plan funeral for her mother that had been purchased in 1987. However, Complainant alleged that upon the day of the funeral (Friday, May 3, 2024 according to the establishment's website), the decedent was swollen and bloated. Complainant theorized that*

*Respondent had left the decedent out of a cooler and in the heat so that decomposition could occur but provided no strict proof of this claim. Complainant further stated Respondent could not find a copy of the decedent's contract, but later did because it was "found. . . in the basement."*

*The manager of Respondent establishment replied on Respondent's behalf. The manager stated that after a thorough investigation, there were no findings of abuse of the decedent's remains. Respondent provided that the decedent came into their care on Friday, April 26, 2024, at 4:18 p.m. and the decedent was placed in their refrigerated storage within 10 minutes of her arrival. Respondent stated that the decedent's remains were only removed from refrigerated storage for embalming and preparation purposes. However, Respondent did not provide the date but stated that when the decedent was removed for embalming, they discovered that the remains were showing signs of tissue gas being present. Respondent stated they utilized a specialized embalming fluid specifically for tissue gas. Respondent stated that once the process of tissue gas has begun, it is difficult to stop the damage, and the manager admitted that the decedent did appear bloated due to the presence of tissue gas. The manager stated that they believe their embalmers took the necessary steps to reduce the effects of the tissue gas, but that they are unable to entirely stop the decomposition process. The manager stated that prior to the family's visitation, they explained to the family the bloating issue the decedent was experiencing due to tissue gas, and stated they attempted to explain this to Complainant, but that Complainant would not speak with them. Respondent further stated, regarding being unable to find a copy of the contract, that this was false. Respondent stated that Complainant was not present at the arrangement conference, so they were unsure how they came to the conclusion it could not be located or was found in the basement. Respondent stated that the contract is stored digitally, and the family service counselor was able to pull the digital and hard copy of the contract during their meeting with the family.*

*Recommendation: Letter of Caution/Instruction*

*Board Decision: Send for further investigation to determine the death date of decedent, obtain the pre-arrangement agreement and what items were paid for in the contract, when Respondent spoke to the family, when embalming took place, if they got verbal permission, when embalming authorization form was signed, who was responsible for making arrangements, how long the decedent was in the refrigeration unit prior to embalming, and obtain the embalming report if available.*

**Update:** Legal called and spoke to the manager of Respondent establishment and obtained information requested by the board and the embalming report. The decedent passed away on April 26, 2024. Respondent stated they spoke to the family the day after the first call, and that the individual who was the next of kin making arrangements was a sister of the Complainant. The manager stated that they received verbal permission to embalm, but the embalming authorization form provided does not include information for verbal permission. Instead, it has a signature from the sister denoting that authorization for embalming was given on Saturday April 27, 2024, at 1:50 P.M. (as a reminder, the decedent was received by Respondent on Friday April 26, 2024, at 4:18 P.M.). The embalming report stated that prep began on April 29, 2024, at 6:59 A.M. and concluded at 8:42 A.M. Collectively, from the time authorization had been received, approximately 41 hours had passed before embalming began.

**Recommendation:**

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

A motion was made by Randy Nash to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Tim Wheeler

Adopted by Voice Vote

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**  
**ROBERT GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**LICENSEE REPORT:**

**REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE  
DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF  
AUGUST 3, 2024 – SEPTEMBER 6, 2024**

**Establishment(s)**

La Paloma Funeral Services  
Memphis, TN

**Type of Action(s)/Change(s)**

Initial

Cremation and Funeral Services of Tennessee Location  
Waverly, TN

**Individual(s)**

**Type of License(s)**

Patrick Wayne Lewis Memphis, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
Charles Ramos, Jr. Smyrna, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
Chelsea Marie Torres Jefferson City, TN	Funeral Director and Embalmer
James Anthony Bell Columbia, SC	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – South Carolina
Caleigh Elizabeth Holland Lawrenceville, GA	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – Georgia
Richard Len Jerkins Castlewood, VA	Funeral Director and Embalmer Reciprocity – North Carolina, Virginia, and Kentucky
Hayden Dobson Correll Kingsport, TN	Funeral Director
Kelvin Lamont Hall Byhalia, MS	Funeral Director
Christa Nicole Knight Bartlett, TN	Funeral Director
Oliver Geary Layne Palmer, TN	Funeral Director
Jordan Jay Butcher Albany, KY	Funeral Director Reciprocity – Kentucky
Donnie Hansel Bobo Burnsville, MS	Funeral Director Reapplication

**CLOSED ESTABLISHMENT REPORT:**

Two (2) establishments have reported closing since the last board meeting:

- Brent Taylor Paul B. McCarver Funeral Directors, 948 Reddoch Cove, Memphis, TN and
- Dickson Funeral Home – White Bluff Chapel, 317 Main Street, White Bluff, 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 July 2024 Regulatory Boards Disciplinary Action Report**

- Respondent: Appalachian Funeral Home & Cremation Services, Johnson City, TN  
Violation: Permitted an individual to serve as manager of a funeral establishment with an expired funeral director license  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: David Wayne Mathes, Johnson City, TN  
Violation: Engaged in funeral directing and served as manager of a funeral establishment with an expired funeral director license  
Action: \$250 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: E. H. Ford Mortuary Services, Memphis, TN  
Violation: Failed to treat a member of the public in a reasonable manner  
Action: \$500 Civil Penalty
- Respondent: Sellars Funeral Home at Mt. Juliet, Mount Juliet, TN  
Violation: Violated a statute pertaining to the pre-arrangement or pre-financing, or both, of a funeral  
Action: \$750 Civil Penalty

**OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:**

As of September 10, 2024, there were 64 open complaints.

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler to accept the Executive Director's Report.

Seconded by Randy Nash

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**2025 Board Meeting Dates:**

A motion was made by Tim Wheeler to set the 2025 board meeting dates as follows:

01.14.2025	02.11.2025	03.11.2025
04.08.2025	05.13.2025	06.10.2025
07.08.2025	08.12.2025	09.09.2025
10.14.2025	11.11.2025	12.09.2025

Seconded by Christopher Lea

Adopted by Voice Vote

---

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

President Pam Stephens asked if anyone desired to make public comments related to the agenda items.

Nobody made public comments at this time.

---

**ADJOURN:**

A motion was made by Randy Nash to adjourn.

Seconded by Don Haynes

Adopted by Voice Vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Pam Stephens at 11:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert B. Gribble*

Robert B. Gribble, CPM, CFSP  
Executive Director