



Mississippi Real Estate Appraisal Board

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
E.C. Neely IV

239 NORTH LAMAR ST., STE 502
JACKSON, MS 39201

P.O. BOX 4915
JACKSON, MS 39296-4915

(601) 359-5440

www.mab.ms.gov

BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:

WILLIAM TIMOTHY WHITE, APPRAISER
LICENSE NO.: RA-977

CASE NO.: 14-2406

RESPONDENT

FINAL ORDER

THIS MATTER came before the Mississippi Real Estate Appraisal Board ("Board") on September 25, 2025, for the purpose of presenting certain charges filed in Complaint Cause No. 14-2406, against William Timothy White, Appraiser ("Respondent"). A quorum of the Board members was present throughout the hearing and deliberations in this matter.

Respondent, having been properly served, called on the day of the hearing and being fully informed of Respondent's rights to a hearing before the Board, did appear at the hearing and was not represented by an attorney. Respondent testified, called no witnesses and introduced one composite exhibit. Assistant Attorney General Kim P. Turner served as legal counsel to the Board. Attorney Turner introduced into evidence the Board's Composite Exh. "1" and called two witnesses, Executive Director Edwin C. Neely IV and Board Investigator Danielle Morales. A court reporter made a record of the proceedings.

Special Assistant Attorney General Kristen N. Love, designated to serve as the Administrative Hearing Officer, presided over the proceeding and was directed by the Board to prepare its written decision in accordance with its deliberations. Based upon the clear and convincing evidence, the Board makes the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and final order:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Board is established pursuant to the *Mississippi Real Estate Appraiser Licensing and Certification Act*, Title 73, Chapter 34 of the Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended and is charged with the regulation of the practice of real estate appraisal in Mississippi including matters relating to real estate appraiser standards, qualifications and licensing, and disciplinary functions.

2. Pursuant to Section 73-34-9, the Board is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it finds necessary to conduct the business of the Board and to carry out its licensure and regulatory functions.

3. Pursuant to Section 73-34-35, the Board is authorized to revoke, suspend, refuse to renew a license, deny an application, place a licensee on probationary status and/or take any other action as appropriate for a violation of the laws, rules and regulations governing the practice and profession of real estate appraisal.

4. Pursuant to Section 73-34-41, the Board is authorized to investigate the actions of an individual licensed or entity registered under the Act. Upon receipt of information indicating that a licensed appraiser, licensed certified real estate appraiser or registered appraisal management company may have committed a violation under Section 73-34-35, the Board may cause one or more of the investigators on its staff to make an investigation of the facts to determine whether there is evidence of any such violation.

5. Each real estate appraiser licensed under this chapter must comply with generally accepted standards of professional appraisal practice and generally accepted ethical rules to be observed by a real estate appraiser. Generally accepted standards of professional appraisal practice are currently evidenced by the uniform standards of professional appraisal practice as directed by the Appraisal Subcommittee of the Federal Financial Institutions Examinations Council or its agent, in accordance with Section 73-34-37.

6. Respondent, William Timothy White, is an adult resident citizen of Mississippi whose last known address of record with the Board is 1057 Deer Ridge Road, McComb, Mississippi 39648 (residence) and Post Office Box 425, Summit, Mississippi, 39666 (business). Respondent was issued a Mississippi Certified Residential Appraiser credential on or about November 7, 2014, No. RA-977 and, as such, he is subject to all the provisions, rules, regulations and statutes governing the appraisal of real property and licensing of real estate appraisers under Mississippi law.

7. On or about March 29, 2024, Respondent submitted an appraisal report for a real property appraisal assignment of property located at 5097 Highway 13, Oak Vale, Mississippi 39656 ("Subject Property") with an effective date of March 19, 2024 ("Appraisal Report" or "Report").

8. On or about June 6, 2024, the Board received written notice of complaint from Chief Appraiser, Class Valuation, LLC, AMC-043 ("Complaint"), client to lender of the subject property, regarding an appraisal report prepared by Respondent. Upon receipt of the Complaint, the Board authorized the Investigative Committee to initiate an investigation of the subject appraisal performed by Respondent. Documents including a copy of the Appraisal Report, work file and respondent to Class Valuation, LLC/AMC-043's allegations were requested and obtained from Respondent for review. Respondent provided two (2) reports and his work file to the Board Investigative Committee on July 2, 2024.

9. Following its investigation, the Board Investigative Committee determined that Respondent maintained a limited work file that was neither properly verified nor sufficiently documented. Respondent failed to provide adequate evidence to support the analysis and conclusions presented in the submitted Appraisal Report. Specifically, Respondent did not properly analyze the comparables included in the Sales Comparison Approach section. Pertinent information was either omitted or inadequately addressed, including the updated condition of comparables #1 and #2; verified gross living area (GLA) for all three comparables; and the site size of comparable #2. The Report listed verification sources as tax assessments, agent input, and appraiser files. However, no tax documents or appraiser file notes were found in Respondent's work file, indicating that the comparables were not properly verified.

10. Inconsistencies were also identified. Adjustments within the Sales Comparison Approach were not sufficiently explained for the client or intended user. There was no analysis or disclosure supporting adjustments related to site, quality, age, or amenities. For example, Respondent made an age adjustment between comparables #1 and #2 without disclosing the basis for the adjustment. Upon verification with the appraisers of the comparables, it was noted that significant updates had been made to comparables #1 and #2, potentially warranting adjustments for quality or condition—none of which were supported by data or documentation in Respondent's file.

11. Additionally, Respondent failed to disclose or analyze a 264 square foot (rounded) bonus room. Although a photo in the report stated that the bonus room was excluded from the GLA, no comments were provided regarding whether it contributed any value. The Cost Approach section also lacked sufficient analysis and disclosure. No documentation was provided to support the site value methodology. Subject amenities such as the porch, patio, shed, generator, and the bonus room were not assigned any value, nor was the double carport. Furthermore, Respondent did not explain the discrepancy between the Cost Approach value of \$197,175 and the final market value conclusion of \$205,000.

12. Respondent also failed to comply with client instructions regarding FHA requirements. The client requested that Respondent include specific language from the FHA 4000.1 Handbook (p. 851), stating: "The intended use of the appraisal is solely to assist FHA in assessing the risk of the Property securing the FHA insured Mortgage." Respondent was also asked to confirm, per FHA 4000.1 Handbook (II.D.3), that faucets, lights, and toilets were tested and that gas service was verified. Respondent refused to include the required FHA language, resulting in the appraisal being deemed non-compliant. Consequently, FHA could not issue mortgage clearance, and the client lost the borrower.

13. Respondent testified in support of his appraisal and subsequent actions, emphasizing that he acted in good faith at all relevant times. He asserted that he substantially complied with the client's revision requests and noted that the written complaint submitted to the Board identified only three specific revisions, which he declined to make. He provided explanations for each refusal. Regarding the utilities, Respondent stated that he believed his obligation was limited to observation rather than testing. He understood that he was only required to report deficiencies if observed. He testified that he checked all utilities and took photographs showing lights turned on to demonstrate operability. Since he did not observe any deficiencies, he did not report any. He further stated that had he observed any issues, he would have documented them

accordingly. Respondent denied that his appraisal was non-compliant with FHA standards. He argued that he had completed over forty (40) FHA appraisal reports for Class Valuation using similar language, all of which had been accepted. He suggested that the complainant simply chose not to use the report and that FHA had not reviewed it. He did, however, acknowledge deficiencies in his work file, specifically his failure to provide supporting documentation, comparable data, and tax records. He explained that he did not include peer appraisals due to their excessive length—over 2,000 pages—and that while he saves MLS data, he does not retain all associated photographs, as they are publicly accessible and therefore not included in his work file.

14. The evidence clearly and convincingly establishes grounds for disciplinary action in that Respondent acted in violation of Section 73-34-35(1)(l), 73-34-37, 73-34-39, 73-34-41 and the 2024 Uniform Standards for Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) Ethics Rules, Conduct, Record Keeping Rule, Scope of Work Rule, Problem Identification, Acceptability and Disclosure Obligations, Standard Rule 1-1(c), 1-2(b)(h), 1-4(a)(b)(i)(ii), 1-6(a)(b), 2-1(a)(b), and 2-2(a)(iii)(viii)(x)(1)(5)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Board has subject matter and personal jurisdiction pursuant to the *Mississippi Real Estate Appraiser Licensing and Certification Act*, Title 73, Chapter 34 of the Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended. Venue is likewise proper at the Board's office located in Jackson, Mississippi.

2. Under the Act, the Board is authorized to conduct hearings if it has reason to believe that the provisions of the Act, or any Board rules or regulations have been intentionally violated or if any of the rules or regulations of the Board have been violated.

3. The Board is specifically authorized to impose discipline when it determines that a licensee has violated the laws, rules and regulations governing the practice of real estate appraisal and to prescribe conditions under which persons may practice in the best interest of the public.

4. The evidence clearly and convincingly establishes grounds for disciplinary action in that Respondent acted in violation of Section 73-34-35(1)(l), 73-34-37, 73-34-39, 73-34-41 and the 2024 Uniform Standards for Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) Ethics Rules, Conduct, Record Keeping Rule, Scope of Work Rule, Problem Identification, Acceptability and Disclosure Obligations, Standard Rule 1-1(c), 1-2(h), 1-4(a)(b)(i)(ii), 1-6(a), 2-1(a)(b), and 2-2(a)(iii)(viii)(x)(1)(5).

5. Respondent maintained a limited work file that was neither properly verified nor sufficiently documented. Respondent failed to provide adequate evidence to support the analysis and conclusions presented in the submitted Appraisal Report. Specifically, Respondent did not properly analyze the comparables included in the Sales Comparison Approach section. Pertinent information was either omitted or inadequately addressed, including the updated condition of comparables #1 and #2; verified gross living area (GLA) for all three comparables; and the site size of comparable #2. The Report listed verification sources as tax assessments, agent input, and

appraiser files. However, no tax documents or appraiser file notes were found in Respondent's work file, indicating that the comparables were not properly verified.

6. Inconsistencies were also identified. Adjustments within the Sales Comparison Approach were not sufficiently explained for the client or intended user. There was no analysis or disclosure supporting adjustments related to site, quality, age, or amenities. For example, Respondent made an age adjustment between comparables #1 and #2 without disclosing the basis for the adjustment. Upon verification with the appraisers of the comparables, it was noted that significant updates had been made to comparables #1 and #2, potentially warranting adjustments for quality or condition—none of which were supported by data or documentation in Respondent's file.

7. Additionally, Respondent failed to disclose or analyze a 264 square foot (rounded) bonus room. Although a photo in the report stated that the bonus room was excluded from the GLA, no comments were provided regarding whether it contributed any value. The Cost Approach section also lacked sufficient analysis and disclosure. No documentation was provided to support the site value methodology. Subject amenities such as the porch, patio, shed, generator, and the bonus room were not assigned any value, nor was the double carport. Furthermore, Respondent did not explain the discrepancy between the Cost Approach value of \$197,175 and the final market value conclusion of \$205,000.

8. Respondent also failed to comply with client instructions regarding FHA requirements. The client requested that Respondent include specific language from the FHA 4000.1 Handbook (p. 851), stating: "The intended use of the appraisal is solely to assist FHA in assessing the risk of the Property securing the FHA insured Mortgage." Respondent was also asked to confirm, per FHA 4000.1 Handbook (II.D.3), that faucets, lights, and toilets were tested and that gas service was verified. Respondent refused to include the required FHA language, resulting in the appraisal being deemed non-compliant. Consequently, FHA could not issue mortgage clearance, and the client lost the borrower.

9. The evidence was insufficient to find Respondent acted in violation of Standard Rule 1-2(b) and Standard Rule 1-6(b).

Based upon its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Board finds as follows:

FINAL ORDER

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that **RESPONDENT**, William Timothy White, 1057 Deer Ridge Road, McComb, Mississippi 39648 (residence) and Post Office Box 425, Summit, Mississippi, 39666 (business), No. RA-977, shall be and is hereby found guilty of acting in violation of Section 73-34-35(1)(l), 73-34-37, 73-34-39, 73-34-41 and the 2024 Uniform Standards for Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) Ethics Rules, Conduct, Record Keeping Rule, Scope of Work Rule, Problem Identification, Acceptability and Disclosure Obligations, Standard Rule 1-1(c), 1-2(h), 1-4(a)(b)(i)(ii), 1-6(a), 2-1(a)(b), and 2-2(a)(iii)(viii)(x)(1)(5).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, for the violation(s) cited above, Respondent shall submit written verification of successful completion of the following courses: Report Writing versus Form Filling (4 hours), Ethics Competency & Neglect (4 hours), Work File (4 hours), Supporting Your Adjustments (7 hours), and FHA Appraisal Principles and Procedures (7 hours). Respondent shall submit such verification within six (6) months of the effective date of this Order. Respondent shall not submit these courses to satisfy the Board's continuing education requirements.

FURTHER ORDERED, this decision and opinion shall be a final order of the Board and shall be conclusive evidence of the matters described herein.

FURTHER ORDERED, this action and order of the Board shall be public record. It may be shared with other licensing boards (in- and out-of-state) and the public and may be reported to the appropriate entities as required or authorized by state and/or federal law or guidelines. This action shall be spread upon the Minutes of the Board as its official act and deed.

FURTHER ORDERED, upon execution of this Final Order by affixing the authorized signature below, the provisions of this Final Order shall become the Final Order of the Board.

FURTHER ORDERED that this Final Order shall be served upon Respondent, William Timothy White, 1057 Deer Ridge Road, McComb, Mississippi 39648 (residence) and Post Office Box 425, Summit, Mississippi, 39666 (business).

SO ORDERED this, the 23rd day of October, 2025.

MISSISSIPPI REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL BOARD

By: Tracy R. Hofford, MAI, AIGRU
Chairman

