For Immediate Release

CHAIRMAN PAI STATEMENT ON AGREEMENT BY CALIFORNIA NOT TO ENFORCE ITS INTERNET REGULATIONS

WASHINGTON, October 26, 2018—In filings with the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, California has agreed not to enforce its new Internet regulation law pending the resolution of a petition for review of the FCC’s Restoring Internet Freedom Order in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and any subsequent proceedings before the U.S. Supreme Court. All parties have requested that further proceedings in the District Court be stayed pending final resolution of that litigation. The agreement must be approved by the District Court. FCC Chairman Ajit Pai issued the following statement about the matter:

“I am pleased that California has agreed not to enforce its onerous Internet regulations. This substantial concession reflects the strength of the case made by the United States earlier this month. It also demonstrates, contrary to the claims of the law’s supporters, that there is no urgent problem that these regulations are needed to address. Indeed, California’s agreement not to enforce these regulations will allow Californians to continue to enjoy free-data plans that have proven to be popular among consumers.

“The Internet is inherently an interstate information service, as the Supreme Court has recognized, which means that only the federal government can set policy in this area. A patchwork of state laws only introduces uncertainty in the broadband marketplace that will slow investment and deployment of infrastructure and hurt consumers. I am confident that the FCC’s authority to preempt such state laws will be upheld, along with our proven market-based framework for protecting Internet openness, investment, and innovation nationwide.”
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This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).