

**BEFORE THE MISSOURI
STATE REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS COMMISSION**

MISSOURI REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS COMMISSION,)	
)	
)	
)	Petitioner,
)	
v.)	No. 2010007735 PV
)	
TELLEE WARREN)	
)	
)	
)	Respondent.

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS
OF LAW, AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER**

At its scheduled meeting on June 17, 2015, and pursuant to notice described in the Findings of Fact, the Missouri State Real Estate Appraisers Commission (MREAC) took up the probation violation complaint alleging that Tellee Warren (Respondent or Warren) has failed to comply with the terms of his probation.

The MREAC appeared at the hearing through Assistant Attorney Faraz Nayyar. Respondent was not present at the hearing and was not represented by legal counsel. Division of Professional Registration Legal Counsel Thomas Mark Townsend served as the MREAC's legal advisor at the hearing, during deliberations, and in the preparation of this order.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

1. The MREAC was established pursuant to § 339.507, RSMo,¹ for the purpose of executing and enforcing the provisions of §§ 339.500 through 339.549, RSMo, the Missouri Certified Licensed Real Estate Appraisers Act.

2. Respondent is a natural person and is certified by the MREAC as a state-certified residential real estate appraiser, license number 2005037221. In March 2010,

¹ All statutory references are to Missouri Revised Statutes 2000, as amended, unless otherwise indicated.

Respondent and the MREAC entered into a Settlement Agreement which placed Respondent's certification on probation for a period of two years subject to terms and conditions. Respondent's certification was current and valid at all relevant times herein.

3. The Settlement Agreement placing Respondent's certification on probation for two years became effective on March 13, 2010. Respondent was required to comply with the terms and conditions of the probationary period outlined in the Settlement Agreement.

4. On or about August 18, 2011, the MREAC issued a Disciplinary Order suspending Respondent's certification for a period of six (6) months, followed by three (3) additional years of probation for violating the March 13, 2010 Settlement Agreement. The Disciplinary Order became effective on August 18, 2011.

5. The August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order established terms and conditions for the additional probation, which required Respondent's adherence so as to allow Respondent to present himself and serve as a certified residential appraiser, in paragraphs B, G, I K, L and P of Section IV

6. Paragraph B of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

During the probationary period, Warren shall maintain a log of all appraisal assignments completed, including appraisal values. Warren shall submit a true and accurate copy of his log to the MREAC January 1st, April 1st, July 1st and October 1st during the disciplinary period. Each log, except for the final log, shall be submitted within 15 days after the end of the respective six month period. Warren shall submit the final log 30 days prior to the end of the probation period. All logs shall comply with rule 20 CSR 2245-2.050.

7. Paragraph G of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

Warren shall submit written reports to the Commission every six (6) months during the probationary period stating truthfully whether there has been compliance with all terms and conditions of this Order. The first such report shall be received by the Commission

on or before January 1, 2012.

8. Paragraph I of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

Warren shall comply with all provisions of §§ 339.500 through 339.549, RSMo; all federal and state drug laws, rules, and regulations; and all federal and state criminal laws. "State" here includes the state of Missouri, all other states and territories of the United States, and the ordinances of political subdivisions of any state or territory. Warren shall immediately report any violation of this provision to the Commission in writing. Warren shall also immediately report any allegations that he has violated this provision to the Commission, in writing. Examples of allegations of such a violation include, but are not limited to, any arrest, summons, inquiry by any law enforcement official into these topics by a health oversight agency. Warren shall sign releases or other documents authorizing and requesting the holder of any closed record related to this paragraph to release such records to the Commission.

9. Paragraph K of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

Warren shall immediately submit documents showing compliance with the requirements of this Order to the Commission when requested.

10. Paragraph L of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

In the event that the Commission determines Warren has violated any term or condition of this Order, the Commission may, in its discretion, after an evidentiary hearing, suspend, revoke, or otherwise lawfully discipline Warren's certification.

11. Paragraph P of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order states:

Any failure by Warren to comply with any condition of discipline set forth herein constitutes a violation of this Order.

12. Respondent failed to submit logs of all appraisal assignments completed due on July 16, 2014, October 16, 2014 and January 16, 2015 in violation of paragraph B of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order.

13. Respondent failed to submit written reports regarding Order compliance on July 1, 2014 and January 1, 2015, in violation of paragraph G of Section IV of the August

18, 2011 Disciplinary Order.

14. Respondent failed to timely respond to the MREAC requests for appraisal and work files made pursuant to an April 15, 2014 letter request, in violation of paragraph K of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order.

Rusticview Appraisal

15. On or about April 30, 2014, during Respondent's disciplinary period, Respondent completed and signed a "summary appraisal report" for residential real estate located at 1317 Rusticview Drive, Ballwin, Missouri (Rusticview Appraisal Report). The effective date of the appraisal report was April 28, 2014, and the appraisal valued the property at \$265,000.

16. Pursuant to § 339.535, RSMo, and the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement, Respondent was required to develop and report the results of each appraisal in compliance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, 2014-2015 Edition (USPAP).

17. Respondent prepared the Rusticview Appraisal Report for New Castle Home Loans, LLC.

18. Respondent, in the preparation and reporting of the Rusticview Appraisal Report, made significant and substantial errors of omission and/or commission, in violation of USPAP, including but not limited to:

- a. Respondent incorrectly refers to the report as a Summary Appraisal, and references the Departure Rule, which are Terms used under the 2014-2015 edition of USPAP;
- b. Respondent inexplicably makes reference to 1999 changes in USPAP, while ignoring significant changes in 2006 and 2014;

- c. Respondent failed to report the site dimensions;
- d. Respondent understated the number of comparable sales in the neighborhood during the prior twelve months;
- e. Respondent overstated predominant value and price range for one-unit housing in the Neighborhood Section;
- f. Respondent failed to provide support and/or analysis for the conclusion that the highest and best use was single family residential;
- g. Respondent failed to support the opinion of effective age and remaining economic life;
- h. Respondent failed to use more similar and proximate sales located within the subject property's subdivision, including an immediately adjacent property of similar age and style which sold within a few months of the appraisal.
- i. Respondent used comparable sales that were not adequately similar and were significantly superior to the subject property, in that they were all significantly renovated and/or newer and/or on larger sites when the subject property was not, as follows:
 - 1. Comparable Sale #1 was a newer, beautifully renovated property with granite countertops, a chef's delight gourmet kitchen, stainless steel appliances, and custom bath;
 - 2. Comparable Sale #2 had granite countertops, stainless Steel appliances and renovated bathroom;
 - 3. Comparable Sale #3 had a larger site, updated renovations, remodeled master bathroom, and roof covering;
 - 4. Comparable Sale #4 had a "stunning whole house renovation"; and/or
 - 5. Comparable Sale #5 was in a newer subdivision and was On a much larger site.
- j. Respondent failed to provide adequate support for adjustments

and/or lack of adjustments for features and/or characteristics such as site condition, basement finish, location, renovations, etc.; and/or

- k. Respondent failed to adequately reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed within the Sales Comparison Approach.

19. Respondent's Rusticview Appraisal Report is not credible and/or is misleading, and was developed and reported in violation of USPAP Standards 1 and 2, which state:

Standard 1: In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must identify the problem to be solved, determine the scope of work necessary to solve the problem, and correctly complete research and analyses necessary to produce a credible appraisal.

Standard 2: In reporting the results of a real property appraisal, an appraiser must communicate each analysis, opinion and conclusion in a manner that is not misleading.

20. Respondent failed to correctly employ those recognized methods and techniques that are necessary to produce a credible appraisal in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and Standard Rule (SR) 1-1(a), which states:

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must:

- (a) be aware of, understand, and correctly employ those recognized methods and techniques that is necessary to produce a credible appraisal[.]

21. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent committed a substantial error of omission and/or commission that

significantly affected the appraisal in violation of the USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-1(b), which states:

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must:

. . . .

(b) not commit a substantial error of omission or commission that significantly affects the appraisal[.]

22. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent committed a substantial error of omission and/or commission that significantly affected the appraisal in violation of the USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-1(c), which states:

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must:

. . . .

(c) not render appraisal services in a careless or negligent manner, such as by making a series of errors that, although individually might not significantly affect the results of an appraisal, in the aggregate affects the credibility of those results.

23. Based on Respondent's errors and omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent made unsupported assumptions or premises about the effective age and remaining economic life, in violation of USPAP SR 1-3(a), which states:

(a) identify and analyze the effect on use and value of existing land use regulations, reasonably probable modifications of such land use regulations, economic supply and demand, the physical adaptability of the real estate, and market area trends[.]

Comment: An appraiser must avoid making an unsupported assumption or premise about market

area trends, effective age, and remaining life.

24. Based on Respondent's errors and omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent failed to develop an opinion of the highest and best use of the real estate in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-3(b), which states:

Standards Rule 1-3(b)

When necessary for credible assignment results in developing a market value opinion, an appraiser must:

(b) develop an opinion of the highest and best use of the real estate.

Comment: An appraiser must avoid analyze the relevant legal, physical, and economic factors to the extent necessary to support the appraiser's highest and best use conclusion(s).

25. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent failed to use and/or properly analyze sales of similar properties in the Sales Comparison Approach, in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-4(a), which states:

Standards Rule 1-4(a)

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must collect, verify and analyze all information necessary for credible assignment results.

(a) When a sales comparison approach is necessary for credible assignment results, an appraiser must analyze such comparable sales data as are available to indicate a value conclusion.

26. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent failed to reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed within the Sales Comparison Approach, in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-6(a), which states:

In developing a real property appraisal, an appraiser must:

(a) reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed within the approaches used[.]

27. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent failed to clearly and accurately set forth the appraisal in a manner that would not be misleading, in violation of USPAP Standard 2 and SR 2-1(a), which states:

Each written or oral real property appraisal report must:

(a) clearly and accurately set forth the appraisal in a manner that will not be misleading[.]

28. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent failed to prepare a report that contained sufficient information to enable the intended users of the appraisal to understand the report properly in violation of USPAP Standard 2 and SR 2-1(b), which states:

Each written or oral real property appraisal report must:

(b) contain sufficient information to enable the intended users of the appraisal to understand the report property[.]

29. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above,

Respondent failed to summarize the information sufficiently to identify the real estate involved in the appraisal and failed to summarize the information analyzed, the appraisal procedures followed and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions, in violation of USPAP SR 2-2(a)(viii), which states:

(a) The content of an Appraisal Report must be consistent with the intended use of the appraisal and, at a minimum:

(viii) summarize the information analyzed, the appraisal methods and techniques employed, and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions; exclusion of the sales comparison approach, cost approach, or income approach must be explained[.]

30. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Rusticview Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 18 above, Respondent communicated results in a misleading and/or fraudulent manner, in violation of several of the Conduct provisions of the USPAP Ethics Rule, which states in part:

An appraiser must perform assignments with impartiality, objectivity and independence and without accommodation of personal interest.

An appraiser:

- must not communicate assignment results with the intent to mislead or to defraud;
- must not use or communicate a report that is known by the appraiser to be misleading or fraudulent;
- must not knowingly permit an employee or other person to communicate a misleading or fraudulent report[.]

31. Respondent's violations in the Rusticview Appraisal Report of the USPAP Standards 1 and 2, the USPAP Standards Rules cited herein, the USPAP Ethics Rule, and section 339.535, RSMo, constitute violations of paragraph I of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order and provide cause to further discipline Respondent's certification as a state-certified residential real estate appraiser pursuant to section 324.042, RSMo.

Meadow Lane Appraisal

32. On or about April 17, 2014, Respondent, during Respondent's disciplinary period, completed and signed a "summary appraisal report" for residential real estate located at 119 Meadow Lane, Festus, Missouri (Meadow Lane Appraisal Report). The effective date of the appraisal report was April 15, 2014, and the appraisal valued the property as vacant unimproved land at \$135,000.

33. Respondent was required to develop and report the results of the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report in compliance with the USPAP.

34. Respondent prepared the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report for New Castle Home Loans, LLC.

35. Respondent, in the preparation and reporting of the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, made significant and substantial errors of omission and/or commission, in violation of USPAP, including but not limited to:

- a. Respondent incorrectly refers to the report as a Summary Appraisal, and references the Departure Rule, which are Terms used under the 2014-2015 edition of USPAP;
- b. Respondent inexplicably makes reference to 1999 changes in USPAP, while ignoring significant changes in 2006 and 2014;
- c. Respondent failed to report the site dimensions;

- d. Respondent failed to use more similar and proximate sales located within the subject property's subdivision and street;
- e. Respondent failed provide support and/or analysis for the conclusion that the highest and best use was single family residential;
- f. Respondent failed to support the opinion of effective age and remaining economic life;
- g. Respondent used comparable sales that were not adequately similar and were significantly superior to the subject property, in that they were all significantly renovated and/or newer and/or on larger sites when the subject property was not, as follows:
 - 1. Comparable Sale #1 had superior remodeling;
 - 2. Comparable Sale #2 had a larger site, superior quality of Construction, upgraded appliances, bay window, and sunroom; and/or
 - 3. Comparable Sale #4 was a newer ranch with a much larger Site[.]
- h. Respondent failed to make adjustments and/or make adequate adjustments for Comparable Sale #4, which had a larger site; and/or
- i. Respondent failed to adequately reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed within the Sales Comparison Approach providing no explanation for the estimated value within the reported range of \$106,000 to \$184,000, including not discussing Comparable Sale #3, which was extremely similar to the Meadow Lane Property, But its adjusted price was approximately twenty-one percent less Than the estimated value of the Meadow Lane Property.

36. Respondent's Meadow Lane Appraisal Report is not credible is misleading, fraudulent, and/or overstates the value, and was developed and reported in violation of USPAP Standards 1 and 2, as set forth in paragraph 19 of this Order.

37. Respondent failed to correctly employ those recognized methods and techniques that are necessary to produce a credible appraisal in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and Standard Rule (SR) 1-1(a), as set forth in in paragraph 20 of this Order.

38. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent committed a substantial error of omission and/or commission that significantly affected the appraisal in violation of the USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-1(b), as set forth in paragraph 21 of this Order

39. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent committed a substantial error of omission and/or commission that significantly affected the appraisal in violation of the USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-1(c), as set forth in paragraph 22 of this Order.

40. Based on Respondent's errors and omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent made unsupported assumptions or premises about the effective age and remaining economic life, in violation of USPAP SR 1-3(a), as set forth in paragraph 23 of this Order.

41. Based on Respondent's errors and omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to develop an opinion of the highest and best use of the real estate in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-3(b), as set forth in paragraph 24 of this Order.

42. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to use and/or properly analyze sales of similar properties in the Sales Comparison Approach, in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-4(a), as set forth in paragraph 25 of this Order.

43. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to reconcile the quality and quantity of data available and analyzed within the Sales Comparison Approach, in violation of USPAP Standard 1 and SR 1-6(a), as set forth in paragraph 26 of this Order.

44. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to clearly and accurately set forth the appraisal in a manner that would not be misleading, in violation of USPAP Standard 2 and SR 2-1(a), as set forth in paragraph 27 of this Order.

45. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to prepare a report that contained sufficient information to enable the intended users of the appraisal to understand the report properly in violation of USPAP Standard 2 and SR 2-1(b), as set forth in paragraph 28 of this Order.

46. Based on Respondent's errors and omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent failed to summarize the information analyzed, the appraisal procedures followed and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions, in violation of USPAP SR 2-2(a)(viii), as set forth in paragraph 29 of this Order

47. Based on Respondent's errors and/or omissions in developing and reporting the results in the Meadow Lane Appraisal Report, as alleged in paragraph 35 above, Respondent communicated results in a misleading and/or fraudulent manner, in violation of several of the Conduct provisions of the USPAP Ethics Rule, as set forth in paragraph 30 of this Order

48. On or about April 10, 2015, the MREAC sent notice by regular mail and certified mail to Respondent notifying him of the probation violation complaint and of the probation violation hearing in this matter set for June 17, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. at the Missouri Council of School Administrators Building, 3550 Amazonas Drive, Jefferson City, Missouri. The certified mail copy was returned "unclaimed." The regular mail copy was not returned to the MREAC.

49. At the June 17, 2015 probation violation hearing, certified appraiser Cheryl A. Kunzler testified to the violations discussed above in paragraphs 18 and 35. Kunzler established that Respondent's failings in completing the Rusticview and Meadow Lane appraisals, as discussed above, were violations of USPAP. Kunzler testified that the violations led to reports that were misleading and which demonstrated incompetence and lack of reasonable diligence. Kunzler testified that Respondent's violations in the Rusticview and Meadow Lane appraisals were violations of Standards 1 and 2 of USPAP.

50. The MREAC has jurisdiction in this proceeding, pursuant to the March 13, 2010 Settlement Agreement and the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order to determine whether Respondent has violated the terms and conditions of said Settlement Agreement and Disciplinary Order.

51. The MREAC also has jurisdiction pursuant to § 324.042, RSMo, to determine whether Respondent has violated the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement. Section 324.042, RSMo, states, in pertinent part:

Any board, commission, or committee within the division of professional registration may impose additional discipline when it finds after hearing that a licensee, registrant, or permittee has violated any disciplinary terms previously imposed or agreed to pursuant to settlement. The board, commission, or committee may impose as additional discipline, any discipline it would be authorized to impose in an initial disciplinary hearing.

52. Section 339.532.2, RSMo, states, in pertinent part:

2. The commission may cause a complaint to be filed with the administrative hearing commission as provided by chapter 621, RSMo, against any state-certified real estate appraiser, state-licensed real estate appraiser, or any person who has failed to renew or has surrendered his or her certificate or license for any one or any combination of the following causes:

. . . .

(5) Incompetency, misconduct, gross negligence, dishonesty, fraud, or misrepresentation in the performance of the functions or duties of any profession licensed or regulated by sections 339.500 to 339.549;

(6) Violation of any of the standards for the development or communication of real estate appraisals as provided in or pursuant to sections 339.500 to 339.549;

(7) Failure to comply with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice promulgated by the appraisal standards board of the appraisal foundation;

(8) Failure or refusal without good cause to exercise reasonable diligence in developing an appraisal, preparing an appraisal report, or communicating an appraisal;

(9) Negligence or incompetence in developing an appraisal, in preparing an appraisal report, or in communicating an appraisal;

(10) Violating, assisting or enabling any person to willfully disregard any of the provisions of sections 339.500 to 339.549 or the regulations of the commission for the administration and enforcement of the provisions of sections 339.500 to 339.549;

. . . .

(14) Violation of any professional trust or confidence[.]

53. Section 339.535, RSMo, states, in relevant part:

State certified real estate appraisers and state licensed real estate appraisers shall comply with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice promulgated by the appraisal standards board of the appraisal foundation.

54. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes incompetency, misconduct, gross negligence, dishonesty, fraud and/or misrepresentation in the performance of the functions and/or duties of a real estate appraiser, and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(5), RSMo.

55. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes violation of standards for the development and/or communication of real estate appraisals as provided in or pursuant to sections 339.500 to 339.549, RSMo, and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(6), RSMo.

56. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes failure and/or refusal without good cause to exercise reasonable diligence in developing an appraisal, preparing an appraisal report, and/or communicating an appraisal and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(8), RSMo.

57. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes negligence and/or incompetence in developing an appraisal, in preparing an appraisal report, and/or communicating an appraisal and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(9), RSMo.

58. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes a violation of section 339.535, RSMo, and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(7) and (10), RSMo.

59. Respondent's conduct, as described in paragraphs 3 through 47 above, constitutes violation of professional trust and confidence owed to Respondent clients, the intended users of the appraisal reports and the public, and gives the MREAC cause to discipline Respondent's real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to section 339.532.2(14), RSMo.

60. Cause exists to take additional discipline against Respondent's residential real estate appraiser's certification pursuant to paragraphs B, G, I, K, L and P, of Section IV of the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order for violations of sections 339.532.2(5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (14) and 339.535, RSMo.

61. The March 13, 2010 Settlement Agreement, August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order and section 324.042, RSMo, allow the MREAC to take such disciplinary action that the MREAC deems appropriate for failure to comply with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

Decision and Order

It is the decision of the MREAC that Respondent, Tellee C. Warren, has violated the terms of the March 13, 2010 Settlement Agreement and the August 18, 2011 Disciplinary Order, and that his certification is, therefore, subject to further disciplinary action.

The MREAC orders that Respondent's certification as certified residential real estate appraiser, license number 2005037221, be and is hereby **REVOKED**.

Respondent shall immediately return all indicia of certification to the Commission.

The Board will maintain this Order as an open and public record of the Commission as provided in Chapters 339, 610, and 324, RSMo.

SO ORDERED this 27th day of July, 2015.

**MISSOURI REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS
COMMISSION**


Vanessa Beauchamp,
Executive Director