Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
Pulse Telecom, Inc.)	IC No. 09-S002520
Complaint Regarding Unauthorized Change of)	
Subscriber's Telecommunications Carrier)	

ORDER

Adopted: November 25, 2009 Released: November 30, 2009

By the Deputy Chief, Consumer Policy Division, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau:

- 1. In this Order, we consider the complaint¹ alleging that Pulse Telecom, Inc. (Pulse) changed Complainant's telecommunications service provider without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainant in violation of the Commission's rules.² We conclude that Pulse's actions violated the Commission's carrier change rules and we grant Complainant's complaint.
- 2. In December 1998, the Commission released the *Section 258 Order* in which it adopted rules to implement Section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934 (Act), as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act).³ Section 258 prohibits the practice of "slamming," the submission or execution of an unauthorized change in a subscriber's selection of

Informal Complaint No. IC 09-S002520, filed August 12, 2009.

² See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190.

⁴⁷ U.S.C. § 258(a); Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996); Implementation of the Subscriber Carrier Selection Changes Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers, CC Docket No. 94-129, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 14 FCC Rcd 1508 (1998) (Section 258 Order), stayed in part, MCI WorldCom v. FCC, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. May 18, 1999); First Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 8158 (2000); stay lifted, MCI WorldCom v. FCC, No. 99-1125 (D.C. Cir. June 27, 2000); Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration, 15 FCC Rcd 15996 (2000), Errata, DA No. 00-2163 (rel. Sept. 25, 2000), Erratum, DA No. 00-2192 (rel. Oct. 4, 2000), Order, FCC 01-67 (rel. Feb. 22, 2001); Third Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 18 FCC Rcd 5099 (2003); Order, 18 FCC Red 10997 (2003). Prior to the adoption of Section 258, the Commission had taken various steps to address the slamming problem. See, e.g., Policies and Rules Concerning Unauthorized Changes of Consumers' Long Distance Carriers, CC Docket No. 94-129, Report and Order, 10 FCC Rcd 9560 (1995), stayed in part, 11 FCC Rcd 856 (1995); Policies and Rules Concerning Changing Long Distance Carriers, CC Docket No. 91-64, 7 FCC Rcd 1038 (1992), reconsideration denied, 8 FCC Rcd 3215 (1993); Investigation of Access and Divestiture Related Tariffs, CC Docket No. 83-1145, Phase I, 101 F.C.C.2d 911, 101 F.C.C.2d 935, reconsideration denied, 102 F.C.C.2d 503 (1985).

a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service.⁴ In the *Section 258 Order*, the Commission adopted aggressive new rules designed to take the profit out of slamming, broadened the scope of the slamming rules to encompass all carriers, and modified its existing requirements for the authorization and verification of preferred carrier changes. The rules require, among other things, that a carrier receive individual subscriber consent before a carrier change may occur.⁵ Pursuant to Section 258, carriers are absolutely barred from changing a customer's preferred local or long distance carrier without first complying with one of the Commission's verification procedures.⁶ Specifically, a carrier must: (1) obtain the subscriber's written or electronically signed authorization in a format that meets the requirements of Section 64.1130; (2) obtain confirmation from the subscriber via a toll-free number provided exclusively for the purpose of confirming orders electronically; or (3) utilize an independent third party to verify the subscriber's order.⁷

- 3. The Commission also has adopted liability rules. These rules require the carrier to absolve the subscriber where the subscriber has not paid his or her bill. In that context, if the subscriber has not already paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the subscriber is absolved of liability for charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier for service provided during the first 30 days after the unauthorized change. Where the subscriber has paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the Commission's rules require that the unauthorized carrier pay 150% of those charges to the authorized carrier, and the authorized carrier shall refund or credit to the subscriber 50% of all charges paid by the subscriber to the unauthorized carrier. Carriers should note that our actions in this order do not preclude the Commission from taking additional action, if warranted, pursuant to Section 503 of the Act. 10
- 4. We received Complainant's complaint on August 12, 2009, alleging that Complainant's telecommunications service provider had been changed to Pulse without Complainant's authorization. Pursuant to Sections 1.719 and 64.1150 of our rules, 11 we notified

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120.

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 258(a).

⁷ See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1120(c). Section 64.1130 details the requirements for letter of agency form and content for written or electronically signed authorizations. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1130.

See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1160. Any charges imposed by the unauthorized carrier on the subscriber for service provided after this 30-day period shall be paid by the subscriber to the authorized carrier at the rates the subscriber was paying to the authorized carrier at the time of the unauthorized change. *Id.*

See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1140, 64.1170.

¹⁰ See 47 U.S.C. § 503.

⁴⁷ C.F.R. § 1.719 (Commission procedure for informal complaints filed pursuant to Section 258 of the Act); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150 (procedures for resolution of unauthorized changes in preferred carrier).

Pulse of the complaint. ¹² Pulse has failed to respond within 30 days of receiving the complaint. The failure of Pulse to respond or provide proof of the verification within 30 days is presumed to be clear and convincing evidence of a violation. ¹³ Therefore, we find that Pulse's actions resulted in a violation of the Commission's carrier change rules and we discuss Pulse's liability below. ¹⁴ We also will forward a copy of the record of this proceeding to our Enforcement Bureau to determine what additional action may be necessary.

- 5. Pursuant to Section 64.1170(b) our rules, Pulse must forward to PNG Telecommunications, Inc. (PNG) an amount equal to 150% of all charges paid by the subscriber to Pulse along with copies of any telephone bills issued from Pulse to the Complainant. Within ten days of receipt of this amount, PNG shall provide a refund or credit to Complainant in the amount of 50% of all charges paid by Complainant to Pulse. Complainant has the option of asking PNG to re-rate Pulse charges based on PNG rates and, on behalf of Complainant, seek from Pulse, any re-rated amount exceeding 50% of all charges paid by Complainant to Pulse. Pulse must also send a notice to the Commission, referencing this Order, stating that is has given a refund or credit to Complainant. If PNG has not received the reimbursement required from Pulse within 45 days of the release of this Order, PNG must notify the Commission and Complainant accordingly. PNG also must notify the Complainant of his or her right to pursue a claim against Pulse for a refund of all charges paid to Pulse.
- 6. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 258, and Sections 0.141, 0.361 and 1.719 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.141, 0.361, 1.719, the complaint filed against Pulse Telecom IS GRANTED.
- 7. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 64.1170(b) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1170(b), that Pulse must forward to PNG an amount equal to 150% of all charges paid by the subscriber along with copies of any telephone bills issued from the company to the Complainant within ten (10) days of the release of this order.

Notice of Informal Complaint IC 09-S002520 was mailed on August 19, 2009. On August 31, 2009, the Commission received the certified mail return receipt confirming delivery.

¹³ See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1150(d).

If Complainant is unsatisfied with the resolution of this complaint, Complainant may file a formal complaint with the Commission pursuant to Section 1.721 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.721. Such filing will be deemed to relate back to the filing date of Complainant's informal complaint so long as the formal complaint is filed within 45 days from the date this order is mailed or delivered electronically to Complainant. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.719.

¹⁵ See 47 C.F.R § 64.1170(b)(1)(2).

See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1170(c).

¹⁷ See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1170(e).

8. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is effective upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Nancy A. Stevenson, Deputy Chief Consumer Policy Division Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau