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| ***FCC - News from the Federal Communications Commission***  **Media Contact:**  Anne Veigle  anne.veigle@fcc.gov  **For Immediate Release**  **FCC ADOPTS ORDER REQUIRING AUREON NETWORK SERVICES TO SUBMIT DATA NEEDED TO REFUND CUSTOMERS FOR ILLEGAL RATE CHARGES**  ***Order Reinforces Commission’s Authority to Ensure Providers Are Not Charging Illegal Tariffed Rates***  ***--***  WASHINGTON, February 18, 2022—The Federal Communications Commission today approved an Order requiring Aureon Network Services to provide the data necessary to determine customer refunds for unlawful rates the company charged for transmitting telecommunications traffic. The Order comes after years of Aureon setting rates higher than allowed, or otherwise impermissible, under Commission rules. The Order directs Aureon to submit data that will enable the Wireline Competition Bureau to calculate the refunds that Aureon owes its business customers.  In 2018 and 2019, Aureon submitted a series of tariffed rates that the Commission rejected because they set a rate not allowable under Commission rules. The company finally submitted a rate that complied with Commission rules and became effective on October 15, 2019, but it has failed to refund customers that were charged impermissible rates between March 1, 2018 and October 14, 2019. Specifically, the Commission found that Aureon did not take steps to refund its customers nor did it submit a refund plan detailing how it would do so. The Order adopted today would remedy this failure by requiring Aureon to file the necessary data so refunds can be calculated.  Action by the Commission February 18, 2022 by Order (FCC 22-14). Chairwoman Rosenworcel, Commissioners Carr, Starks, and Simington approving. Chairwoman Rosenworcel issuing a separate statements.  WC Docket No. 18-60  ###  **Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 / ASL: (844) 432-2275 / Twitter: @FCC / www.fcc.gov**  *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).* |