



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

Bureau of Consumer Protection
Division of Marketing Practices

November 18, 2011

Filed Electronically

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation, Federal Trade Commission, CG Docket No. 11 - 50, Dish Network, LLC Petition for Declaratory Ruling Concerning the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The undersigned hereby provides notice as required by Section 1.1206 of the Rules of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC" or "Commission"), 47 CFR § 1.1206. On November 17, 2011, Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") employees Allen Hile, Senior Regulatory Counsel, Lois Greisman, Associate Director of the Division of Marketing Practices, Robert Anguizola, Assistant Director of Marketing Practices, and Russell Deitch and Gary Ivens, staff attorneys, met with Commissioner Clyburn, and Angela Kronenberg and Louis Peraertz, legal advisors to Commissioner Clyburn.

FTC staff discussed the importance of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") and its implementing regulations, and the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act ("Telemarketing Act") and its implementing regulations, the Telemarketing Sales Rule ("TSR"). These laws and regulations advance the substantial government interest of protecting individuals' privacy in their homes, and protecting consumers against the risk of abusive telephone practices. FTC staff also noted that consumers have sought these protections in massive numbers – more than 200 million telephone numbers have been placed on the National Do Not Call Registry.

FTC staff also stated that the TCPA and its accompanying regulations should be accorded their plain meaning. For example, the FCC should use the plain meaning of the term "on behalf of" in the TCPA which includes "for the benefit of." This interpretation appropriately places liability on a seller who benefits from the actions of others, including but not limited to, telemarketers and dealers.

The FTC staff also pointed out that all of the elements of a cause of action are already set forth in the TCPA and its regulations and that the FCC need not read agency principles into the statute or regulations. FTC staff noted that the regulations include a safe harbor, in that those who make telephone solicitations (or on whose behalf telephone solicitations are made) will not be liable

if they meet certain specified criteria set forth in the regulations. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2). In so doing, the statute and its regulations strike a fair balance: Sellers initially are responsible for Do Not Call violations, but can avoid liability under a well-defined safe harbor.

FTC staff further stated that the TCPA, its related regulations and common business practices strike a balance between protecting consumers from pre-recorded calls and imposing seller liability. The TCPA prohibits any person from initiating pre-recorded calls to residential phone lines without the express prior consent of the consumer. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B). Sellers may be held liable under the TCPA for initiating pre-recorded calls.¹ Sellers are also liable for pre-recorded calls placed by others when the calls are made on their behalf. Since 1995, the FCC has taken the position that its “rules generally establish that the party on whose behalf a solicitation is made bears ultimate responsibility for any violations.”² Thus, if a marketer placed pre-recorded calls on behalf of a seller, both the marketer and the seller are liable. At the same time, however, sellers can avoid liability by having an existing business relationship with the consumer, having prior express consent of the consumer, or entering into an indemnification agreement with the telemarketer to reimburse the seller for any penalties arising from violations.

At the meeting as well as in its earlier filings, FTC staff has consistently raised specific concerns about the problems that likely would arise from importing agency or apparent agency law into the TCPA. These include:

- It would make litigation more difficult, expensive and time consuming for the States and the FCC, and perhaps create particular hardships for private plaintiffs;
- Without clear and detailed guidance from the FCC, it leaves open the question as to what factors establish agency or apparent agency;
- It gives sellers a potential roadmap to avoid liability;
- Companies could outsource their marketing to others, and structure contractual relationships in such a way as to avoid a court finding that their dealers are agents or apparent agents;
- Sellers could hire telemarketers that are judgment proof or that go out of business when sued, which leaves no effective remedy or deterrent impact;
- Sellers may hire telemarketers who spoof or hide their identities, which makes enforcement difficult or impossible;
- Suing one dealer at a time could result in a whack-a-mole problem when new dealers

¹Both sellers and telemarketers can initiate calls. For example, a seller making calls through its employees initiates calls. Also, a seller can initiate a call by providing financial incentives, directly or indirectly, to a telemarketer or dealer, who physically places the call.

² *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, Memorandum Opinion and Order 10 FCC Rcd 12391, 12397 ¶ 13 (1995).

spring up in their place and engage in the same violations;

- Rules designed to allow consumers to make entity-specific Do Not Call requests could be rendered ineffective; and
- In a large network of marketers, it can be difficult and inefficient for the government to identify which marketers are violating the law.

The FTC staff further stated that the FCC should adopt the plain meaning of the law and regulations. If, however, the FCC is going to incorporate agency principles into the TCPA, the FCC should do so in a way that (1) advances the substantial privacy and consumer protection interests at issue, (2) takes into account the nature of telemarketing and the ways that violations occur, and (3) provides guidance for the courts. A rigid application of agency concepts such as control, direction, authority, manifestation, or ratification likely would pose enforcement challenges, particularly given the numerous marketing techniques in today's global marketplace.

Finally, the FCC should provide guidance to the courts about the nature and scope of seller liability under the TCPA if the FCC does not adopt the plain meaning of certain operative terms. The FTC set forth six factors in its Reply comment that could be used as guidance for courts.³ In addition to the factors identified in its Reply, FTC staff notes that another factor would include whether the telemarketer, dealer, or other person operating on the seller's behalf uses the seller's trademark. Obviously, there may be cases in which a seller is liable for calls placed by another entity even in the absence of one or more of these factors, and that other factors may be applicable.

Regards,

s/Russell Deitch

Russell Deitch

Attorney, Division of Marketing Practices

cc: Angela Kronenberg, Louis Peraertz

³The factors are whether: (1) a seller enters into contracts directly with consumers who choose to purchase the seller's goods or services in response to telemarketing; (2) a seller provides its services directly to those consumers; (3) a seller collects money for those services from its consumers; (4) a seller receives continuing revenue from such consumers; (5) a seller compensates those who market its goods or services; (6) the seller is in a position to monitor its telemarketers. Reply Comment of the Federal Trade Commission, CG Docket No. 11 - 50.