PROBATE COURT OF GEAUGA COUNTY, OHIO JUDGE TIMOTHY J. GRENDELL

ESTATE OF	, DECEASED
CASE NO.	
APPLICATION FOR APPRO	OVAL OF OTHER FUNERAL EXPENSES [R.C. 2113.031(A)(2)(b)]
, the Appli	cant, states that, in addition to the bill of the funeral director, the
applicant paid additional funeral expenses, whi	ich are described below:
Applicant requests that the Court approve those	e funeral expenses as permitted by R.C. 2113.031(A)(2)(b).
Date:	
	Applicant's Signature
Judgment	t Entry Magistrate's Order
The Court finds that this application sati approves those funeral expenses describ	sfies all requirements of R.C. 2113.031(A)(2)(b) and therefore bed above in this Application.
The Court denies this application	
Dated;	
	Judge / Iviagistiate

Case No.

CONSENT TO APPROVAL

The undersigned consent to the Court's approval of those funeral expenses that are described above.		
Signature	Type Name	

MEMORANDUM

R.C. 2113.031(A)(2) allows the cost of reasonable funeral and burial expenses to be included with the bill of the funeral director to determine whether the probate estate qualifies for the filing of a summary release from administration. The statute does not define the meaning of the words "funeral expense" or "burial expenses."

However, the are several cases that have dealt with the issue.

- Cost of Monument and Flowers. In the case titled Smith v. Bauknecht, 2011 WL 3568346 (6th App. Dist, Lucas Cty) the court allowed the cost of both a monument and flowers as a property funeral or burial expense. The court stated,
 - "As aptly stated years ago in Caswell v. Harry Miller Excavating Co. (1969), 20 Ohio Misc. 46, "[W]hile the furnishing of flowers for a funeral and the purchase of a tombstone or marker are not absolute necessities, a reasonable expenditure for such items * * * is appropriate and in harmony with the feelings and sentiments of an enlightened humanity and a reasonable sum expended therefore are to be considered necessary funeral expenses."
- 2. <u>Cost of Luncheon</u>. In the case titled In re Estate of Kathy M. Campbell, 989 N.E. 2d 1090 (6th App. Dist, Wood Cty)(2013), the Court stated
 - "Applying these principles to the case sub judice, we agree with appellant that a funeral luncheon qualifies as a "funeral expense" under R.C. 2117.25(A)(2). We reach this conclusion for three reasons."

The court continued to set forth three reasons for that conclusion