STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF EMBALMERS AND FUNERAL DIRECTORS

Edmund Dougiello
A County Cremation Service
36 South Pine Creek Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06430

Petition Number 940810-30-006
001246

A County Cremation Service
a.k.a. County Cremation Service
36 South Pine Creek Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06430

Petition Number 940810-56-002
001183

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The Department of Public Health ("Department") presented the Connecticut Board of Examiners of Embalmers and Funeral Directors ("Board") with a Statement of Charges brought against Edmund Dougiello, Embalmer ("Respondent Dougiello"), dated August 19, 1996, and a Statement of Charges brought against A County Cremation Service, a.k.a. County Cremation Service, ("Respondent County Service"), dated August 19, 1996. (Department Exhibits 3 & 4). The Statements of Charges allege that there are grounds for disciplinary action against both Respondents pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227.

Prior to the initiation of the present charges, the Department gave the Respondents the opportunity to attend compliance conferences scheduled on October 10, 1995, to discuss alleged violations of §20-220, §20-230a, §20-230b, and §20-233 of the Connecticut General Statutes. (Department Exhibits 1 & 2).

On August 27, 1996, the Department submitted a Motion for Consolidation for the Board to consolidate the hearings for the two Respondents, arguing that the underlying

facts of the two cases arose out of the same transaction and would require testimony from the same family. There was no objection from either Respondent with regard to the consolidation.

The Department sent the Notices of Hearing and Statements of Charges to both Respondents and the attorney representing them both. These documents were sent certified mail, return receipt requested. (Department Exhibits 3 & 4). The Respondents submitted Answers and Special Defenses. (Respondent Exhibits A & B). An Amended Answer was filed for Respondent Dougiello. (Respondent Exhibit D). The Department filed Answers to the Special Defenses. (Department Exhibits 5 & 6).

PETITION NUMBER 940810-30-006: STATEMENT OF CHARGES AND ANSWER[1]

The Department prayed that the Board revoke or take any other action authorized by Connecticut General Statutes §19a-17 against the embalmer license of Respondent Dougiello due to the allegations in the First and Second Counts of the Statement of Charges.

Statement of Charges: First Count

In paragraphs 1 and 2, the Department alleged that during 1993 Respondent Dougiello, holder of Connecticut embalmer license number 001246, was the licensee primarily responsible for services provided at Respondent County Service where Barbara Dougiello and/or her daughter Barbara Dougiello Angerame, neither of whom held a license as an embalmer or a funeral director, worked.

In paragraph 3, the Department alleged that during June of 1993 Respondent County Service contracted to perform funeral directing for the Good family for decedent Ruth Good.

---

[1] Department Exhibit 30; Respondent Exhibits A & D.

In paragraph 4, the Department alleged that during June of 1993, Barbara Dougiello and/or Barbara Dougiello Angerame did the following:

a. made arrangements for the remains of decedent Ruth Good;
b. provided guidance to the decedent's family;
c. rendered services or provided merchandise without first providing a written statement of services, prices and/or financial breakdown to the Goods;
d. represented that Ruth Good's corpse would be cremated within 48 hours, when, in fact, it was not;
e. withheld the release of Ruth Good's corpse; and/or
f. failed to provide an itemized price list.

In paragraph 5, the Department alleged that Respondent Dougiello knew or should have known that unlicensed persons were engaged in licensed activities at Respondent County Service.

In paragraph 6, the Department alleged that the above described facts constituted grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227, including, but not limited to, §20-227(2); §20-227(4); §20-227(5); and/or, §20-227(7).

Statement of Charges: Second Count

In paragraphs 7 and 8, the Department alleged that Respondent Dougiello, holder of Connecticut embalmer license number 001246, suffers from a physical and/or mental condition that impairs his ability to practice as a licensed embalmer.

In paragraph 9, the Department alleged that the above described facts constitute grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227(8).

Answer and Special Defense

In a written answer and an amended answer, Respondent Dougiello admitted paragraph 1; in paragraph 2 admitted that he was the licensee of County Service, stated that Gerald V. Milo (embalmer's license number 2240) was the actual provider of services, and admitted the remainder of the paragraph; in paragraph 3 admitted that during June of 1993 Respondent County Service agreed to perform direct cremation for the Good family for decedent Ruth Good; denied paragraphs 4, 5 and 6; admitted paragraphs 7 and 8; and denied paragraph 9. As a Special Defense, Respondent Dougiello stated that the Department, in Petition Number 930316-30-005, had conducted an investigation of him covering the same subject matter as the charges in the present Statement of Charges and had dismissed these charges. The Respondent Dougiello claimed that the earlier investigation and dismissal of the complaint is res judicata and nullifies the complaints set forth in the present Statement of Charges.

The Department denied the Special Defense.[2]

PETITION NUMBER 940810-56-002: STATEMENT OF CHARGES AND ANSWER[3]

The Department prayed that the Board revoke or take any other action authorized by Connecticut General Statutes §19a-17 against the inspection certificate of Respondent County Service due to the allegations in the Statement of Charges.

Statement of Charges

In paragraph 1, the Department alleged that at present and in June of 1993, Respondent County Service held Connecticut Inspection Certificate number 472.

In paragraph 2, the Department alleged that during 1993 neither Barbara Dougiello nor her daughter, Barbara Dougiello Angerame, were authorized to practice as a funeral director or embalmer, as defined under Connecticut General Statutes §§20-207, et seq.

---

2 Department Exhibit 5.

3 Department Exhibit 4; Respondent Exhibit B.

In paragraph 3, the Department alleged that during June of 1993, Respondent County Service contracted to perform funeral directing with the Good family for decedent Ruth Good, and that Respondent County Service failed to adequately provide the services that were the subject of the contract, violating Connecticut Statutes and Regulations in the following respects:

a. services were provided by unlicensed persons, Barbara Dougiello and/or Barbara Dougiello Angerame;
b. services and/or merchandise were provided without first providing the Good family with a written statement of services, prices and a financial breakdown;
c. the corpse was not cremated with 48 hours as represented;
d. the release of Ms. Good's corpse was withheld; and/or
e. no itemized price list was provided.

In paragraph 5,[4] the Department alleged that the above described facts constitute grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227, including but not limited to §20-227(2); §20-227(4); and/or §20-227(5).

Answer and Special Defense

In a written answer, Respondent County Service admitted paragraphs 1 and 2; denied paragraph 3, except for an admission that Respondent County Service agreed to perform funeral directing with the Good family for the decedent Ruth Good, during June of 1993; and denied paragraph 5. As a Special Defense, Respondent County Service stated that to the extent that the Statement of Charges covers the same matters investigated and ruled on in Petition Number 930316-30-005, Respondent County

[4] There is no paragraph 4.

Service claims that said prior investigation and dismissal constitutes res judicata and nullifies the complaints set forth in the Statement of Charges.

The Department denied the Special Defense.[5]

THE HEARING

The administrative hearing to adjudicate these consolidated cases was held on November 14, 1996 and January 16, 1997. The Respondent Dougiello did not appear at the hearing, but his attorney, Noel R. Newman, Esq., of Friedman, Mellitz & Newman, P.C. in Fairfield, Connecticut, was present to represent him and Respondent County Service. Ellen Shanley, Esq., represented the Department. The Board conducted the hearing in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Chapter 54 and the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies §19-2a-1, et seq.

All Board members involved in this decision attest that they have either heard the case or read the record in its entirety. This decision is based entirely on the record and the specialized professional knowledge of the Board in evaluating the evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Respondent Dougiello is, and has been at all times referenced in the Statements of Charges, the holder of Connecticut embalmer license number 001246. (Respondent Exhibit A; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 51).

2. The Respondent County Service is, and has been at all times referenced in the Statements of Charges, the holder of Connecticut Inspection Certificate number 472. (Respondent Exhibit B).

---

[5] Department Exhibit 6.

3. During 1993, Respondent Dougiello was the licensee primarily responsible for services at Respondent County Service. (Respondent Exhibit A).

4. During 1993, Barbara Ann Dougiello, wife of Respondent Dougiello, worked at Respondent County Service and controlled the day to day operation of the business. (Respondent Exhibit A; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 8-9, 12, 52-53, 55).

5. Barbara Ann Dougiello does not hold and never has held an embalmer or funeral director license. (Respondent Exhibits A & B; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 9-10).

6. During 1993, Barbara Dougiello Angerame, daughter of the Respondent Dougiello and Barbara Ann Dougiello, worked at Respondent County Service. Both Barbara Ann Dougiello and Barbara Dougiello Angerame answered to the name "Barbara Dougiello." (Respondent Exhibit A; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 141-145; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 8-9).

7. During 1993, Ms. Angerame did not hold an embalmer nor funeral director license. (Respondent Exhibits A & B).

8. Ms. Angerame is presently a licensed embalmer and licensed funeral director. She became licensed in September of 1995. (Department Exhibit 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 141, 158, 169-170; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 27).

9. Ruth Good died Saturday, June 5, 1993 at approximately 5:00 p.m. (Department Exhibits 10 & 11; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 44, 54, 83, 127-128).

10. The Good family contacted Respondent County Service immediately when Ms. Good died. (Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 45, 84; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 32).

11. During June 1993, Respondent County Service contracted to perform funeral directing for the Good family for decedent Ruth Good. (Respondent Exhibits A & B; Department Exhibit 13).

12. During 1993 the Respondent Dougiello was not capable of transacting professional business with the Good family and had no contact with the Good family due to his mental and/or physical impairment. (Transcript 1/16/97 p. 11).

13. Barbara Ann Dougiello contacted Gerald V. Milo, holder of embalmer license 2240, to make the removal of Ruth Good's body from her home. Mr. Milo and another man arrived at the Good's home to pick up Ruth Good's body at approximately 5:30 p.m. on June 5, 1993. (Department Exhibits 10 & 13; Respondent Exhibit A; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 84, 128; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 32, 48).

14. Mr. Milo was one of several licensed embalmers that Respondent County Service contracted with to provide licensed embalming and funeral directing services. These independent contractors were not at Respondent County Service on a full-time basis, but were readily available to Respondent County Service when contacted. (Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 149-150, 175-176; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 23, 25-26, 31, 55).

15. Upon arriving at the Good home, Mr. Milo and Mr. Paul Good, the husband of Ruth Good, had a very brief discussion. Mr. Good informed Mr. Milo that he wanted "immediate cremation, that is, 48 hours." The originals of Department Exhibits 7 and 8, a Respondent County Service form entitled "Funeral Instructions" and a Park Crematory form entitled "Authority to Cremate" were filled out and/or signed by Mr. Good. Department Exhibit 9, a letter from Respondent County Service, was left with Mr. Good. (Department Exhibits 7-10, 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 44-53, 91-93, 95-96, 127-131; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 48).

16. Department Exhibit 9, the form letter from Respondent County Service to potential customers, states "We remove the deceased from the place of death to our facility. The body is cremated 48 hours after the time of death." (Department Exhibit 9; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 51-52, 84-85).

17. Mr. Good and his family understood that the cremation would be done in 48 hours. (Department Exhibit 10; Transcript 11/14/96 p. 56).

18. The body of Ruth Good was taken from her home on June 5, 1993 and transported to the Edmund Dougiello Funeral Home ("the funeral home"). The funeral home is co-located with Respondent County Service, at the same address as the Dougiello family home. Ms. Angerame testified that Respondent County Service and the funeral home "[go] for the same thing." (Department Exhibit 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 146, 151; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 32, 47-48).

19. A medical doctor pronounced Mrs. Good dead on Monday, June 7, 1993 at 5:00 p.m. while her body was at Respondent County Service. (Department Exhibit 11; Transcript 11/14/96 p. 185).

20. There is no crematorium on the premises of Respondent County Service. (Transcript 11/14/96 p. 171; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 32-33).

21. The body of Ruth Good was taken from the premises of Respondent County Service to Park Crematory in Bridgeport, Connecticut. The removal of the body was done by Mr. Milo. (Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 60, 147-148; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 38).

22. On Monday evening, June 7, 1993, or perhaps Tuesday morning, June 8, 1993, Mr. Good telephoned Respondent County Service and spoke with someone who identified herself as "Mrs. Dougiello." Mr. Good inquired as to whether the cremation was going to be carried out that day. Mrs. Dougiello told him it would be done "As soon

as we can do it." Mrs. Dougiello complained to Mr. Good that when his daughter had called she had been "snippy" to her. (Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 56-59, 89).

23. On Tuesday afternoon, June 8, 1993, Mr. Good called Respondent County Service again to find out if the cremation had been done. He again spoke to someone who identified herself as Mrs. Dougiello:

a. Mrs. Dougiello stated, "Well, you have to understand Mr. Good, we can't determine what the crematorium does."

b. This was when Mr. Good first understood that his wife's body was not at Respondent County Service, but at Park Crematory.

c. Mrs. Dougiello then told Mr. Good "You know, there are a lot of bodies 'stacked up' and they can't get to your wife's body right away. You know, there are a lot of AIDS cases ahead, and by state law AIDS cases must be handled before other cases. The bodies, you know, get smelly."

d. Mr. Good inquired about the condition of his wife's body and whether it was being refrigerated.

e. Mrs. Dougiello replied that she did not know the condition of the body and did not know if it was refrigerated.

f. Mr. Good asked if his wife's body was in a body bag and if it was lying on the floor.

g. Mrs. Dougiello told Mr. Good she did not know.

h. Mr. Good suggested that Mrs. Dougiello call the crematorium and find out.

i. Mrs. Dougiello responded that she could not do that and suggested Mr. Good go over to the crematorium himself and find out.

(Department Exhibit 10; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 57, 59-63, 92-94, 110-111; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 9, 44-45, 49).

24. When Mr. Good called Respondent County Service on Wednesday, June 9, 1993, to see how things were proceeding, he was told "Nothing had been done." When he asked "When, when?" he was told. "Probably tomorrow." (Department Exhibit 10).

25. On Wednesday evening, June 9, 1993, the Good family contacted the Gallagher funeral home in Stamford, Connecticut. (Department Exhibit 10; Respondent Exhibit G; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 64, 70-71, 106, 111, 132).

26. After making the arrangements with the Gallagher funeral home, Mr. Good contacted Mrs. Dougiello. Ms. Dougiello informed Mr. Good "You must first come here and pay the bill," specifically telling Mr. Good that the Gallagher funeral home would not be able to get his wife's body until he paid his bill with Respondent County Service. (Department Exhibits 10 & 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 65, 106-107, 109, 132-133).

27. On Thursday morning, June 10, 1993, Mr. Good paid $705.00 to Respondent County Service. The bill was itemized as follows:

a. Professional Services	$120.00
b. Removal & Transfers	380.00
c. Cremation Container	75.00
d. Medical Examiner	75.00
e. Park Crematory	

f. Sheltering of Remains 50.00

g. Cremation Permits 5.00

(Respondent Exhibit E; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 54, 65, 69-70, 100-101, 129; Transcript 1/16/97 pp. 6, 16-17, 40, 46).

28. When Mr. Good paid the bill at Respondent County Service this was the first itemized list of expenses that he saw. (Transcript 11/14/96 p. 133).

29. Ms. Good's body was removed from Park Crematory and transported to the Gallagher funeral home on June 10, 1993. Cremation took place the same day. (Department Exhibits 11 & 13; Respondent Exhibit G).

30. The Good family never received from Respondent County Service a written statement of the services that would be provided nor a financial breakdown of the prices for those services. The only list of itemized fees was provided to the Good family on June 10, 1993, at the time the total bill was paid. (Department Exhibits 10 & 13; Respondent Exhibit E; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 53-54, 133, 180, 182; Transcript 1/16/97 p. 40).

31. All contact that the Good family had with Respondent County Service after the removal of Ruth Good's body from her home on June 5, 1993 was with either Barbara Ann Dougiello or Barbara Dougiello Angerame, both of whom were unlicensed in 1993.

32. During June of 1993, Mrs. Dougiello and/or Ms. Angerame:

a. provided guidance to the family of Ruth Good in the days following her death;

b. rendered services or provided merchandise without first providing a written statement of services, prices and financial breakdown to the family of Ruth Good in the days following her death;

c. wrongfully withheld the release of Ruth Good's corpse; and

d. failed to furnish an itemized price list to the Good family regarding the services to be provided.

(Department Exhibits 10 & 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 57-65, 106-107, 109, 132-133, 180, 182).

33. The Respondent Dougiello knew or should have known that unlicensed persons were engaged in licensed activities at Respondent County Service.

34. The Respondent Dougiello suffers from a physical and/or mental condition that impairs his ability to practice as a licensed embalmer. (Respondent Exhibit D; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 29, 177).

35. During June of 1993, Respondent County Service failed to adequately provide the services that were the subject of the contract between Respondent County Service and the Good family in the following respects:

a. services were provided by unlicensed persons, Mrs. Dougiello and/or Ms. Angerame;

b. services and merchandise were provided without first providing the Good family with a written statement of services, prices and a financial breakdown;

c. the release of Ruth Good's corpse was wrongfully withheld; and

d. no itemized list was provided.

(Department Exhibits 10 & 13; Transcript 11/14/96 pp. 57-65, 106-107, 109, 132-133, 180, 182).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Connecticut General Statutes §20-227 provides in pertinent part:

> Disciplinary actions; grounds . . . . [The Connecticut Board of Examiners of Embalmers and Funeral Directors] may take any of the actions set forth in section 19a-17 against a licensee, registrant or holder of an inspection certificate if it finds the existence of any of the following grounds: . . (2) violation of the statutes or regulations of said department relative to the business of embalming or funeral directing in this state; . . . (4) incompetency, negligence or misconduct in the carrying on of such business or profession; (5) violation of or noncompliance with the provisions of this chapter or the rules established hereunder; . . . (7) aiding or abetting the practice of embalming or funeral directing by an unlicensed person; (8) physical or mental illness, emotional disorder or loss of motor skill, including but not limited to, deterioration through the aging process; . . .

The Board found that services were rendered and merchandise was provided without a written statement of services, prices and financial breakdown given to the family of Ruth Good and that no itemized price list was given to the Good family prior to the bill being paid in full on June 10, 1993, in violation of §20-230a and §20-230b of the Connecticut General Statutes.

The Board found that County Service wrongfully withheld the release of Ruth Good's body. The Board, relying on its own expertise, found that it is below the standard of care in Connecticut for a licensed funeral home that has been dealing with a bereaved family for five days, to tell that family that the body of the deceased family member will not be released to another funeral home until the bill is paid in full. The Board finds that

such actions constitute incompetent and/or negligent conduct, which is grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to §20-227.

The Board, relying on its own expertise, found that the activities of Barbara Ann Dougiello and/or Barbara Dougiello Angerame, both known as "Barbara Dougiello" during 1993, constituted providing services and guidance to the Good family that fell within the purview of licensed activities of a licensed embalmer and/or funeral director. The Respondent Dougiello knew or should have known that these unlicensed persons were engaged in licensed activities at Respondent County Service since they were the only persons at Respondent County Service that had contact with the Good family after the removal of Ruth Good's body from her home.

The Respondent Dougiello was licensed as an embalmer and was the licensee primarily responsible for services at Respondent County Service. As such, he was responsible for the actions of his employees or those persons who routinely and openly held themselves out to represent Respondent County Service. By condoning and/or allowing his wife and his daughter to engage in licensed activities of Respondent County Service, Respondent Dougiello aided and/or abetted the practice of funeral directing by unlicensed persons.

The Respondent Dougiello admits that he suffers from a physical and/or mental condition that impairs his ability to practice as a licensed embalmer.

The Department sustained its burden of proof that Respondent Dougiello and Respondent County Service are subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227: Respondent Dougiello pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227(2), (4), (5), (7) and (8); and Respondent County Service pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §20-227(2), (4) and (5).

The Respondents bear the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence with regard to the Special Defense of res judicata. This burden of proof was not met.

Connecticut General Statutes §19a-17(a) provides in pertinent part:

> Disciplinary action by . . . boards. (a) [The Connecticut Board of Examiners of Embalmers and Funeral Directors, established by chapter 385] may take any of the following actions, singly or in combination, based on conduct which occurred prior or subsequent to the issuance of a permit or a license upon finding the existence of good cause: (1) Revoke a practitioner's license . . . ; (3) Censure a practitioner . . . ; (5) Place a practitioner . . . on probationary status and require the practitioner . . . to: (A) Report regularly to such board . . . or department upon the matters which are the basis of probation; (6) Assess a civil penalty of up to ten thousand dollars ....

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

ORDERS

Compliance with the requirements of the Orders set forth below shall begin no later than forty-five (45) days from the date of mailing of this decision ("compliance date"). Based upon the record in these cases, the above findings of fact and the conclusions of law, and pursuant to the authority vested in it by Connecticut General Statutes §20-227 and §19a-17, the Board orders the following:

Petition Number 940810-30-006

The Respondent Dougiello's embalmer license number 001246 is hereby revoked, effective on the compliance date. The Board finds that the facts found under the First and Second Counts of the Statement of Charges are severable and both warrant the disciplinary action imposed.

Petition Number 940810-56-002

A County Cremation Service, a.k.a. County Cremation Service:

a. pursuant to 19a-17(a), is assessed a civil penalty of fifteen hundred dollars ($1500.00), due within thirty (30) days of the compliance date, paid by certified check made payable to Treasurer, State of Connecticut, and with the petition number 940810-56-002 on its face;
b. shall receive a letter of censure; and
c. is placed on probation under the following terms:
    1. The probation shall be for a period of one year from the compliance date;
    2. The following documents shall be submitted quarterly, the first of which is due three months after the compliance date:
        i. All statements of goods and services which itemize the financial breakdown of charges and which is signed by both A County Cremation Service and the customer;
        ii. All disclosure statements; and

iii. All copies of literature associated with A County Cremation Service which clearly state that cremation cannot take place prior to 48 hours after death, which literature will be reviewed at the discretion of the Board; and

3. Any revisions to the terms of the probation plan must be approved by the Board in writing.

All copies of Mr. Dougiello's embalmer's license, the certified check for the civil penalty, and all documents due under the terms of the probation shall be sent to:

Bonnie Pinkerton
Department of Public Health
410 Capitol Avenue MS# 12 LEG
P.O. Box 340308
Hartford, CT 06134-0308

This decision becomes effective on the compliance date.

Celia Pinzi — Oct. 9, 1997

by: Celia Pinzi, Chairperson — Date

Connecticut Board of Examiners of Embalmers & Funeral Directors

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF EMBALMERS AND FUNERAL DIRECTORS

A County Cremation Service
c/o Edmund Dougiello, Licensee
36 South Pine Creek Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06430

Re: Petition Number 940810-56-002

Dear Mr. Dougiello:

Following a hearing in the matter referenced above, the Connecticut Board of Examiners of Embalmers and Funeral Directors ("Board") ordered that A County Cremation Service should receive a letter of censure, pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 19a-17(a)(3). This letter of censure is issued pursuant to the attached order and is addressed to you as the licensee primarily responsible for services provided at A County Cremation Service.

The Board has found that during 1993 A County Cremation Service failed to adequately perform funeral directing services for the Good family for decedent Ruth Good. The Board has found that funeral directing services were provided by unlicensed persons; that services and merchandise were provided without first providing the Good family with a written statement of services, prices and a financial breakdown; the release of Ruth Good's body was wrongfully withheld pending payment of the bill in full by the family; and no itemized price list was provided to the Good family until their bill was paid in full.

A County Cremation Service is hereby censured.

Sincerely,

Celia Pinzi

Celia Pinzi, Chairperson
Connecticut Board of Examiners
of Embalmers & Funeral Directors

Oct. 9, 1997
Date