Before the

Federal Communications Commission

**Washington, D.C. 20554**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter ofTelplex CommunicationsComplaint Regarding Unauthorized Change ofSubscriber’s Telecommunications Carrier | **)****)****)****)****)****)****)** |  Complaint No. 3184019    |

**ORDER**

**Adopted: December 12, 2019 Released: December 13, 2019**

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

1. In this Order, we consider a complaint alleging that Telplex Communications (Telplex) changed Complainant’s telecommunications service provider without obtaining authorization and verification from Complainant as required by the Commission’s rules.[[1]](#footnote-3) We find that Telplex has responded fully to the Complainant’s complaint and has taken action to resolve the complaint.
2. Section 258 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act), prohibits the practice of “slamming,” the submission or execution of an unauthorized change in a subscriber’s selection of a provider of telephone exchange service or telephone toll service.[[2]](#footnote-4) The Commission’s implementing rules require, among other things, that a carrier receive individual subscriber consent before a carrier change may occur.[[3]](#footnote-5) Specifically, a carrier must: (1) obtain the subscriber’s written or electronically signed authorization in a format that satisfies our rules; (2) obtain confirmation from the subscriber via a toll-free number provided exclusively for the purpose of confirming orders electronically; or (3) utilize an appropriately qualified independent third party to verify the order.[[4]](#footnote-6) The Commission has also adopted rules to limit the liability of subscribers when a carrier change occurs, and to require carriers involved in slamming practices to compensate subscribers whose carriers were changed without authorization.[[5]](#footnote-7)
3. We received Complainant’s complaint alleging that Telplex had changed Complainant’s telecommunications service provider without Complainant’s authorization.[[6]](#footnote-8) Complainant also alleges that after having had AT&T service for many years, he “received a call from a person claiming to be an AT&T representative offering [him] a new deal for services at a lower cost[] . . . Next thing I know, my AT&T service was cancelled and I received a notice from Telplex Communications stating they were my new phone provider.”[[7]](#footnote-9)
4. Pursuant to our rules, we notified Telplex of the complaint.[[8]](#footnote-10) Based on the information provided by Telplex, it appears that Telplex has fully absolved Complainant of all charges assessed by Telplex in a manner consistent with the Commission’s liability rules.[[9]](#footnote-11) We therefore find that the complaint referenced herein has been resolved.[[10]](#footnote-12)
5. 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 CFR §§ 0.141, 0.361, 1.719, the complaint filed against Telplex Communications IS RESOLVED.
6. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is effective upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

1. *See* Informal Complaint No. 3184019 (filed Apr. 10, 2019); *see also* 47 CFR §§ 64.1100 – 64.1190. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
2. 47 U.S.C. § 258(a). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
3. *See* 47 CFR § 64.1120. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
4. *See* *id*. § 64.1120(c). Section 64.1130 details the requirements for letter of agency form and content for written or electronically signed authorizations. *Id.* § 64.1130. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
5. These rules require the unauthorized carrier to absolve the subscriber where the subscriber has not paid his or her bill. 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. *See* *id.* §§ 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.* Where the subscriber has paid charges to the unauthorized carrier, the Commission’s rules require that the unauthorized carrier pay 150 percent of those charges to the authorized carrier, and the authorized carrier shall refund or credit to the subscriber 50 percent of all charges paid by the subscriber to the unauthorized carrier. *See* *id.* §§ 64.1140, 64.1170. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
6. *See* Informal Complaint No. 3184019. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
7. *Id*. Based on Complainant’s allegation that a misrepresentation was made on the sales call, we will refer this matter to the Enforcement Bureau for further review. *See* 47 CFR § 64.1120(a)(1)(i)(A) (prohibiting material misrepresentations on sales calls). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
8. *Id*. § 1.719 (Commission procedure for informal complaints filed pursuant to section 258 of the Act); *id*. § 64.1150 (procedures for resolution of unauthorized changes in preferred carrier). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
9. *Id.* § 64.1160; *see also* Telplex Response to Informal Complaint No. 3184019 (filed May 13, 2019). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
10. If Complainant is unsatisfied with the resolution of the complaint, the Complainant may file a formal complaint with the Commission pursuant to section 1.721 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 1.721. Such filing will be deemed to relate back to the filing date of such 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 such Complainant. *See* *id.* § 1.719. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)