

Matthew A. Brill
Direct Dial: +1.202.637.1095
matthew.brill@lw.com

555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201
www.lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES

Abu Dhabi	Moscow
Barcelona	Munich
Beijing	New Jersey
Boston	New York
Brussels	Orange County
Chicago	Paris
Doha	Riyadh
Dubai	Rome
Frankfurt	San Diego
Hamburg	San Francisco
Hong Kong	Shanghai
Houston	Silicon Valley
London	Singapore
Los Angeles	Tokyo
Madrid	Washington, D.C.
Milan	

June 12, 2012

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

Re: Notification of Ex Parte Presentation of Anda, Inc., Regarding Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify That 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) Was Not the Statutory Basis for Commission's Rule Requiring an Opt-Out Notice for Fax Advertisements Sent with Recipient's Prior Express Consent, CG Docket No. 05-338 (filed Nov. 30, 2010)

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On June 11, 2012, the undersigned and Matthew Murchison, both of Latham & Watkins LLP, met on behalf of Anda, Inc. ("Anda"), with Angela Kronenberg, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Clyburn, in connection with Anda's Petition for Declaratory Ruling and Application for Review in the above-mentioned docket.

At this meeting, we discussed the uncertain legal basis for Section 64.1200(a)(3)(iv) of the Commission's rules, which requires that commercial faxes sent with the prior express consent of the recipient must contain the same opt-out notice that appears on unsolicited fax advertisements. We noted that Anda had filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling 19 months ago asking the Commission to identify the rule's statutory basis, but that the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau recently issued an Order summarily dismissing the Petition.¹ We pointed out that the Bureau did so without seeking public comment, without resolving the substantive issues raised in the Petition, and in a manner that prevents Anda from seeking judicial review.

We urged the Commission to act quickly on Anda's pending Application for Review of that Order, and to clarify that Section 227(b) of the Communications Act, which governs only

¹ See *Junk Fax Prevention Act; Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify That 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) Was Not the Statutory Basis for Commission's Rule Requiring an Opt-Out Notice for Fax Advertisements Sent with Recipient's Prior Express Consent*, CG Docket No. 05-338, Order, DA 12-697 (CGB rel. May 2, 2012).

LATHAM & WATKINS^{LLP}

unsolicited faxes, was not the statutory basis for the rule in question. We explained that if the Commission does not clarify that Section 64.1200(a)(3)(iv) was adopted pursuant to authority other than Section 227(b), class action lawsuits alleging technical violations of that provision will continue to threaten legitimate businesses with massive unwarranted liability based solely on consensual communications with their customers. By jeopardizing Anda's continued viability (not to mention the viability of other senders of solicited, business-to-business fax communications facing similar litigation risks), these lawsuits also endanger the tens of thousands of pharmacies—many of which cannot afford to keep significant amounts of generic pharmaceuticals in stock—that rely on Anda to fill orders of any size on short notice.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions regarding these issues.

Sincerely,

/s/ Matthew A. Brill

Matthew A. Brill
Counsel for Anda, Inc.

Attachment