

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Rules and Regulations Implementing the	)	CG Docket No. 02-278
Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991	)	
	)	
Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005	)	CG Docket No. 05-338
	)	
Dismissal of Outdated or Otherwise Moot	)	CG Docket No. 25-307
Robocalls Petitions	)	

ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION

Adopted: August 17, 2026**Released: August 17, 2026**

By the Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In this Order, we grant three petitions for reconsideration filed by Anderson + Wanca, Career Counseling Services, Inc., and Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc., respectively, seeking to reinstate applications for review that the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (Bureau) dismissed.¹ We conclude that the consideration of facts and arguments not previously presented to the Bureau is in the public interest.² As a result, we grant the petitions and reinstate the petitioners' applications for review.

II. BACKGROUND

2. On October 29, 2025, the Commission released a Public Notice stating its intent to dismiss specified petitions for reconsideration and applications for review absent an objection from the petitioner or applicant filed within 45 days after publication in the Federal Register.³ On November 28, 2025, the Federal Register published a summary establishing that objections to the dismissal were due by

¹ See Petition for Reconsideration of Dismissal with Prejudice of Anderson + Wanca's Application for Review, CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, 25-307 (filed June 11, 2026) (A+W Petition); Petition for Reconsideration of Dismissal with Prejudice of Career Counseling Services, Inc.'s Application for Review, CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, 25-307 (filed June 11, 2026) (Career Counseling Petition); Petition for Reconsideration of Dismissal with Prejudice of Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc.'s Application for Review CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, 25-307 (filed June 11, 2026) (Cin-Q Petition) (collectively "petitioners").

² See 47 CFR § 1.106(c).

³ See *Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls, Call Authentication Trust Anchor, Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Dismissal of Outdated or Otherwise Moot Robocalls Petitions*, Ninth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 17-59, Seventh Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in WC Docket No. 17-97, Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CG Docket No. 02-278, Public Notice in CG Docket No. 25-307, 40 FCC Rcd 8640, 8670-71, at paras. 108-10 (2025) (2025 Public Notice). The 2025 Public Notice stated that, "Upon release of this Notice, the Office of the Secretary will send copies hereof to the Petitioners and Applicants at the last available mailing address associated with the Petitions and Applications." *Id.* at 8671, para. 109.

January 12, 2026.⁴

3. On May 12, 2026, the Bureau released a Public Notice dismissing 11 petitions for reconsideration and applications for review,⁵ including applications for review filed by Anderson + Wanca, Career Counseling Services, Inc., and Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc (collectively, the petitioners).⁶ In so doing, CGB indicated that this action was taken based on the belief that the relief sought in these applications is moot or outdated.⁷

4. On June 11, 2026, the petitioners filed separate petitions for reconsideration seeking to reinstate their respective applications for review.⁸ The petitioners contend that: i) they were not provided with notice reasonably calculated to alert them to the pending dismissal of the pending application for review; and ii) the issues raised in the applications for review are not moot or outdated.⁹

III. DISCUSSION

5. Because the petitions for reconsideration rely on facts and arguments not previously presented to the Bureau, we conclude that consideration of these facts and arguments is required in the public interest pursuant to section 1.106(c) of the rules.¹⁰ Petitioners express opposition to the dismissal

⁴ See *Federal Communications Commission Announces Intent to Dismiss Certain Older Petitions and Applications Related to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act*, 90 Fed. Reg. 54683 (Nov. 28, 2025).

⁵ See *Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau Dismisses Eleven Petitions for Reconsideration or Applications for Review*, CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 25-307, DA 26-465 (CGB May 12, 2026) (*Dismissal Public Notice*).

⁶ *Id.* at 2.

⁷ *Id.* at 1.

⁸ See A+W Petition at 1; Career Counseling Petition at 1; Cin-Q Petition at 1. We note that a party filed a motion for extension of time until July 17, 2026, to file an opposition to the Cin-Q Petition and subsequently filed an opposition to the Cin-Q Petition on July 17. See Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Motion for Extension of Time or Leave to File Late Opposition, CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, 25-307 (filed July 1, 2026) (Akin Gump Motion); Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Opposition to Petition for Reconsideration of Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc., CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, 25-307 (filed July 17, 2026) (Akin Gump Opposition). We deny the Akin Gump Motion and thus dismiss the Akin Gump Opposition as untimely filed. First, we note that “[i]t is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time shall not be routinely granted.” 47 CFR § 1.46(a). Second, our rules provide that “[i]f a motion for extension of time in which to make filings in proceedings other than notice and comment rule making proceedings is filed less than 7 days prior to the filing day, the party filing the motion shall (in addition to serving the motion on other parties) orally notify other parties and Commission staff personnel responsible for acting on the motion that the motion has been (or is being) filed.” *Id.* § 1.46(c). Section 1.46 contemplates that a party will move promptly to file a motion for extension of time. In this case, because Cin-Q served its petition on Akin Gump by mail, the Akin Gump Opposition was due no later than June 24, 2026. See *id.* § 1.106(g); 1.4(h). Although Akin Gump explains that it did not receive the Cin-Q Petition until June 23 and thus it was unable to file its Opposition by June 24, it provides no explanation as to why it did not file its motion for extension until July 1, seven days after the deadline for oppositions and eight days after it received the Cin-Q Petition. See Akin Gump Motion at 2-3. Moreover, in the circumstances of this proceeding—where the Bureau is seeking to “efficiently manage dockets, reduce backlog, and resolve dormant issues,” *Dismissal Public Notice* at 1—the Bureau is inclined not to dismiss those applications or petitions that the applicant or petitioner remains interested in pursuing. See *id.* at 2 (declining to dismiss two petitions for reconsideration filed by the American Bankers Association in light of objections filed by several financial institutions).

⁹ See A+W Petition at 2-3; Career Counseling Petition at 2-3; Cin-Q Petition at 2-3.

¹⁰ See 47 CFR § 1.106(c); see also *Threshold Communications*, Order on Reconsideration, 34 FCC Rcd 4201, 4204 n.24 (2019) (agreeing with petitioner’s argument that “section[] 1.106(b)(2)-(3), which applies to a *denial* of an AFR, does not apply to its [] argument because the Commission *dismissed* this argument in the AFR”). Specifically, petitioners attached a sworn declaration—signed under penalty of perjury—that no mailed notice was received that their application for review would be dismissed with prejudice absent filing an objection, which was required by the

(continued....)

of their applications for review, make at least a threshold showing they are not moot or outdated, and request that the Commission address the issues contained therein.¹¹ As a result, we conclude that it is in the public interest to reinstate the petitioners' applications for review.¹² In so doing, we express no opinion on the merits of the underlying applications for review. The applications for review shall remain pending for full review by the Commission.¹³

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

6. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED**, pursuant to section 405(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 405(a), and section 1.106 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR § 1.106, the Petitions for Reconsideration filed by Anderson + Wanca, Career Counseling Services, Inc., and Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc. in CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, and 25-307 on June 11, 2026 **ARE GRANTED** to the extent described herein.

7. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the applications for review filed by Anderson + Wanca on October 5, 2020, Career Counseling Services, Inc. on January 8, 2020, and Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc. on October 21, 2020 in CG Docket Nos. 02-278 and 05-338, **ARE REINSTATED**.

8. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Motion for Extension of Time or Leave to File Late Opposition by Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld in CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338, and 25-307 on July 1, 2026 is **DENIED**.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Eduard Bartholme
Chief
Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

2025 Public Notice. See A+W Petition at 6-8 & Decl. of Glenn L. Hara; Career Counseling Petition at 7-9 & Decl. of Glenn L. Hara; Cin-Q Petition 8-9 & Decl. of Glenn L. Hara; *2025 Public Notice*, 40 FCC Rcd at 8671, para. 109 ("Upon release of this *Notice*, the Office of the Secretary will send copies hereof to the Petitioners and Applicants at the last available mailing address associated with the Petitions and Applications."). Upon receiving notice of dismissal pursuant to the *Dismissal Public Notice*, petitioners promptly filed timely petitions for reconsideration within 30 days. See 47 CFR § 1.106(f); *supra* n.1.

¹¹ See A+W Petition at 9-12; Career Counseling Petition at 9-13; Cin-Q Petition at 10-13 ("[a]t a minimum, Cin-Q is entitled to a final Commission disposition that resolves the issues presented in the Application for Review and permits judicial review if necessary.").

¹² This action is consistent with the Commission's past practice, which has been to not dismiss a petition for reconsideration or an application for review if the petitioner or applicant objects to the dismissal and presents reasons for such objection. See *Dismissal Public Notice* at 2 ("In light of joint comments filed by various financial organizations, we do not dismiss two petitions filed by the American Bankers Association referenced in the *2025 Public Notice*"); see also *2025 Public Notice*, 40 FCC Rcd at 8670-71, para. 109 ("Consistent with our past practice, we therefore plan to dismiss the Petitions and Applications below with prejudice unless a Petitioner or Applicant files a letter in the relevant docket or dockets within 45 days of the date of Federal Register publication of this *Notice* specifying that it objects to the dismissal of its Petition or Application and the reasons for such objection.").

¹³ In addition, we note that any objections previously filed in response to these applications for review remain pending for consideration by the Commission. See, e.g., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Opposition to Application for Review, CG Docket Nos. 02-278, 05-338 (filed Nov. 12, 2020).