

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: CS/CS/HB 1307 Telephone Solicitation

SPONSOR(S): Commerce Committee, Regulatory Reform Subcommittee, Beltran and others

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:**

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Regulatory Reform Subcommittee	16 Y, 0 N, As CS	Thompson	Anstead
2) Civil Justice & Property Rights Subcommittee	17 Y, 0 N	Mathews	Jones
3) Commerce Committee	22 Y, 0 N, As CS	Thompson	Hamon

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Chapter 501, part IV, the Florida Telemarketing Act (FTA), requires non-exempt businesses engaged in telemarketing and their salespeople to be licensed by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACs) before operating in Florida. The law prohibits telephonic sales calls that use an automated system for the selection or dialing of telephone numbers or the playing of a recorded message (robocall) when a connection is completed. However, the law allows the use of an automated telephone dialing system with live messages if:

- The calls are made or messages given solely in response to calls initiated by the persons to whom the automatic calls or live messages are directed;
- The telephone numbers selected for automatic dialing have been screened to exclude any telephone subscriber who is included on DACs' then-current "no sales solicitation calls" listing or any unlisted telephone number; or
- The calls concern goods or services that have been previously ordered or purchased.

The bill:

- Prohibits robocalls when a connection is completed to a number called without the prior **express written consent** of the called party, and provides disclosure requirements.
- Authorizes a called party to revoke his or her express written consent.
- Clarifies that the use of an automated telephone dialing system is not prohibited if the calls or messages are made in response to calls "originally" initiated by the persons to whom the calls or messages are directed, and clarifies that repeated calls in response to a call originally initiated by a called party are not allowed.
- Clarifies that the use of an automated telephone dialing system is not prohibited if the calls concern the order, purchase, or delivery of goods or services that have previously been ordered by the called party, and prohibits calls made solely because the called party previously conducted business with the person initiating the call.
- Removes the requirement that calls be screened by using the DACs do not call list prior to making calls related to goods or services previously purchased.
- Provides a rebuttable presumption that such calls made to a Florida area code are considered to be made to a resident of, or person in, this state.
- Reduces the number of hours during which telephone sellers and salespersons may call consumers to prohibit calls after 8 p.m.; and
- Prohibits more than three commercial telephone solicitation phone calls from any number to a person over a 24-hour period on the same subject matter or issue, regardless of the phone number used to make the call.

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state or local government.

The effective date of the bill is July 1, 2021.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current Situation

Florida Telemarketing Act

Chapter 501, part IV, the Florida Telemarketing Act (FTA), requires non-exempt businesses engaged in telemarketing and their salespeople to be licensed by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACs) before operating in Florida. Certain exempt entities must have a valid affidavit of exemption on file prior to operating in Florida. There are approximately 28 exemptions, including, but not limited to: soliciting for religious, charitable, political or educational purposes, research companies, newspapers, book and video clubs, cable television, and persons or companies with whom the consumer has a prior business relationship.¹

The FTA generally requires businesses that solicit the sale of consumer goods or services to:

- Be licensed;²
- Post a form of security;³
- License all of their salespeople;⁴ and
- Provide DACs with a list of all telephone numbers used to make sales calls.⁵

An application for licensure as a telemarketer must include the applicant's identifying information, prior experience in the field, criminal and administrative history, especially relating to fraud, theft, or unfair and deceptive trade practices, phone numbers from which the telemarketer will make sales calls, and parent or affiliate entity under which it will transact business, if applicable.⁶

Additionally, a telemarketer applicant must submit with the application:

- A script that will be used by its salespersons during calls, or other related literature;
- The identity, address, date of birth, and alias of each of the applicant's principal officers, directors, trustees, shareholders, owners, partners, office managers, and salespersons who are employed by or affiliated with the applicant; and
- A \$1,500 licensing fee.⁷

In Florida, it is unlawful for telemarketers to:

- Accept novelty payments.⁸
- Employ or be affiliated with an unlicensed salesperson.
- Be employed by or affiliated with an unlicensed commercial telephone seller.
- Operate without a license.
- Make calls before 8 a.m. or after 9 p.m. local time at the called person's location.
- Fail to provide the call recipient with their name and telephone number.⁹

¹ S. 501.604, F.S.

² S. 501.605, F.S.

³ Section 501.611, F.S., requires a \$50,000 bond, irrevocable letter of credit issued for the applicant, or a certificate of deposit in favor of the Department for payment on findings of fraud, misrepresentation, breach of contract, or other violation by the applicant.

⁴ Section 501.607, F.S.

⁵ Section 501.605, F.S.

⁶ S. 501.605(2), F.S.

⁷ S. 501.605(5)(b), F.S.

⁸ S. 501.603(8), F.S., defines a "novelty payment" as a payment method that does not have systematic monitoring and includes remotely created checks, remotely created payment orders, cash-to-cash money transfers (such as Western Union) and cash reload mechanisms (such as MoneyPak or ReloadIt). Novelty payment methods are not systematically monitored, have little to no consumer protection in the case of fraud or theft, and are used frequently in scams and other fraudulent activity.

⁹ S. 501.616, F.S.

Violations of the FTA are punishable by a civil fine of up to \$10,000 per violation,¹⁰ the imposition of criminal penalties, and up to a third degree felony with repeat violations constituting a second degree felony.¹¹ DACS and the office of the state attorney have investigative authority, including the power to subpoena witnesses if a violation occurs.¹² Reasonable attorney's fees and costs may be awarded to the prevailing party in a civil action as part of a judgment or administrative order.¹³

Florida Do Not Call Act

A component of the FTA, the Florida Do Not Call Act, also known as the "Do Not Call" list (list), prohibits unsolicited phone calls and text messages from telemarketers. Residents who do not wish to receive sales calls may have their residential, mobile, or paging device telephone number included on the list.¹⁴ DACS maintains the list, it is free to register, and a registered number remains on the list indefinitely.¹⁵

Telephone solicitors¹⁶ are prohibited from making telephonic sales calls to consumers who register for the list. A "telephonic sales call" is a telephone call, text message, or voicemail transmission to a consumer for the purpose of soliciting a sale of any consumer goods or services, soliciting an extension of credit for consumer goods or services, or obtaining information that will or may be used for the direct solicitation of a sale of consumer goods or services or an extension of credit for such purposes.¹⁷

In addition to those consumers who are registered for the list, a telephone solicitor may not call or text a consumer who previously communicated to the telephone solicitor that they do not wish to be contacted. Businesses and charities are required to maintain a list of consumers who have made a do-not-call registration request, and it is a violation to call a consumer who has asked to be placed on the company's do-not-call list.¹⁸

When a telephone number is made available through a caller ID service during a telephonic sales call, the solicitor must ensure that the number is capable of receiving phone calls, and that the dialing of the number will connect the call recipient with the telephone solicitor or the seller on behalf of which the phone call was placed.¹⁹

Anyone who receives an unsolicited sales call can report the call to DACS using the online Do Not Call Complaint Form.²⁰

A telephone solicitor who violates the provisions of Florida's "Do Not Call" program is currently subject to an injunction and a civil penalty²¹ with a maximum fine of \$10,000 per violation, or an administrative fine²² with a maximum of \$1,000 per violation. Additionally, a telephone solicitor may be subject to responsibility for the consumer's attorney fees and costs.

¹⁰ S. 501.619, F.S.

¹¹ S. 501.623, F.S.

¹² S. 501.617, F.S.

¹³ S. 501.621, F.S.

¹⁴ See s. 501.059, F.S., FDACS, *Florida Do Not Call*, <https://www.fdacs.gov/Consumer-Resources/Florida-Do-Not-Call> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021). The Florida No Sales Solicitation Act added specific language to prohibit unwanted sales texts.

¹⁵ Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Do Not Call, <https://www.fdacs.gov/Consumer-Resources/Florida-Do-Not-Call> (last visited April 15, 2021).

¹⁶ Section 501.059(1)(f), F.S., defines "Telephone solicitor" as "a natural person, firm, organization, partnership, association, or corporation, or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof, doing business in this state, who makes or causes to be made a telephonic sales call, including, but not limited to, calls made by use of automated dialing or recorded message devices."

¹⁷ S. 501.059(1)(g), F.S.

¹⁸ S. 501.059(5), F.S.

¹⁹ S. 501.059(8)(c), F.S.

²⁰ FDACS, <http://www.freshfromflorida.com/Consumer-Resources/Florida-Do-Not-Call> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

²¹ s. 501.059(9)(a), F.S.

²² s. 501.059(9)(b), F.S.

Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) History

In an effort to address a growing number of telephone marketing calls, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) in 1991. The TCPA restricts the making of telemarketing calls and the use of automatic telephone dialing systems and artificial or prerecorded voice messages. The rules apply to common carriers as well as to other marketers. In 1992, the Commission adopted rules to implement the TCPA, including the requirement that entities making telephone solicitations institute procedures for maintaining company-specific do-not-call lists.²³

In July 2015, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) established rules indicating that telephone carriers can block unwanted calls at the request of consumers.²⁴ Following the FCC's ruling, the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) called upon the major telephone carriers to do more to provide these services to consumers.²⁵ Currently there are a number of call-blocking applications that provide some relief from unwanted and spam calls.²⁶

On November 16, 2017, the FCC adopted new rules to allow voice service providers to proactively block certain types of robocalls that are likely to be fraudulent because they come from certain types of phone numbers, including those that do not or cannot make outgoing calls.²⁷ For example, perpetrators have used IRS phone numbers that do not dial out to impersonate the tax agency, informing the people who answer that they are calling to collect money owed to the U.S. government. Such calls appear to be legitimate to those who receive them and can result in fraud or identity theft. Service providers now can block such calls, as well as calls from invalid numbers, such as those with area codes that do not exist, from numbers that have not been assigned to a provider, and from numbers allocated to a provider but not currently in use.²⁸

The FCC requires telemarketers to transmit caller identification information, including the number and name of the caller. The telephone number provided must permit any individual to make a do-not-call request during regular business hours. It also provides that any person or entity that engages in telemarketing is prohibited from blocking the transmission of caller identification information. However, tax-exempt nonprofit organizations are not required to comply with these rules.²⁹

With regard to telephone carriers, the FCC allows carriers to offer their customers external call-blocking apps on their landlines and allows carriers to block certain illegal robocalls directly. In addition, in December 2019, Congress enacted the "TRACED Act" to aid enforcement efforts between law enforcement agencies and the private sector on traceback issues, and required the FCC to issue rules "for the registration of a single consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls." In July 2020, the FCC designated the US Telecom-led Industry Traceback Group (ITG) as the Official Consortium for coordinating industry-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.³⁰

²³ Federal Communications Commission, FCC Actions on Robocalls, Telemarketing, <https://www.fcc.gov/general/telemarketing-and-robocalls> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

²⁴ Declaratory Ruling and Order, In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telecommunications Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 30 FCC Rcd. 7961 (July 10, 2015).

²⁵ National Association of Attorneys General, *Do Not Call: The History of Do Not Call and How Telemarketing Has Evolved*, <https://www.naag.org/consumer-protection/attorney-general-journal/do-not-call-the-history-of-do-not-call-and-how-telemarketing-has-evolved/> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

²⁶ CTIA, The Wireless Association, How to Stop Robocalls, <https://www.ctia.org/consumer-tips/robocalls> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

²⁷ 32 FCC Rcd 9706 (11).

²⁸ FCC, Stop Unwanted Calls and Texts, <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/stop-unwanted-calls-and-texts> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

²⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 64.1601.

³⁰ USTelecom The Broadband Association, FCC Names USTelecom's Industry Traceback Group as Official Robocall Traceback Consortium, <https://www.ustelecom.org/fcc-names-ustelecoms-industry-traceback-group-as-official-robocall-traceback-consortium/> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

According to the ITG's first annual report, in 2019, over 100 companies participated in over 1,000 ITG traceback investigations, implicating more than 10 million illegal robocalls and resulting in more than 20 subpoenas and/or civil investigative demands from federal and state enforcement agencies.³¹

The ITG reported in a letter to the FCC on November 13, 2020, that about 100 providers have failed to cooperate with the ITG, including approximately 30 that are based in the United States.³² The ITG encouraged the FCC to bring aggressive enforcement against robocallers and voice service providers that routinely refuse to participate in the traceback process.³³

In its Fourth Report and Order on Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls released December 30, 2020, the FCC required "all voice service providers to respond to traceback requests from the FCC, civil and criminal law enforcement and the Consortium."³⁴

National Do Not Call Registry

Although individual states were first to address consumers' requests to stop unwanted telemarketing calls,³⁵ the federal government soon followed with a National Do Not Call Registry in 2003.³⁶ In July 2003, the federal government issued a report and order establishing the National Do Not Call registry. The national registry covers all telemarketers (with the exception of certain nonprofit organizations), and applies to both interstate and intrastate calls. The registry is administered by the FTC. To reduce the number of hang-up and dead air calls consumers experience, the Commission's telemarketing rules also contain restrictions on the use of autodialers and requirements for transmitting caller ID information.

As the National Do Not Call Registry has gained popularity, some states have decided to forgo the expense of maintaining their own lists. As of September 2017, only 12 states maintained their own Do Not Call lists: Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas and Wyoming.³⁷

Constitutionality of Do Not Call Registries

Do Not Call registries have been subject to numerous state and federal lawsuits challenging their constitutionality. These suits have failed and the National Registry has been upheld. The courts have found that the Do Not Call Registry is a reasonable restriction on commercial speech and that the FTC is authorized to promulgate rules for the registry. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals has stated, "the do-not-call registry prohibits only telemarketing calls aimed at consumers who have affirmatively indicated that they do not want to receive such calls and for whom such calls would constitute and invasion of privacy." Thus, the government may have a role in restricting the ability of a telemarketer to reach a household via telephone, and because the government has left the ultimate decision of whether or not to be placed on the registry up to the individual, the government did not restrict the First Amendment rights of the solicitor.³⁸

³¹ InsideArm, *The Latest Developments in the World of Call Delivery*, <https://www.insidearm.com/news/00047073-latest-developments-world-call-delivery/> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

³² USTelecom, Enforcement Bureau Requests Information on the Status of Private-Led Traceback Efforts of Suspected Unlawful Robocalls, EB Docket No. 20-195, Nov. 13, 2020, <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DOC-368957A2.pdf> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

³³ InsideArm, *The Latest Developments in the World of Call Delivery*, <https://www.insidearm.com/news/00047073-latest-developments-world-call-delivery/> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

³⁴ FCC, Fourth Report and Order, Dec. 29, 2020, <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-20-187A1.pdf> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

³⁵ At least 28 states, starting with Florida in 1987, have implemented Do Not Call registries.

³⁶ Federal Trade Commission, *National Do Not Call Registry*, <https://www.donotcall.gov/> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

³⁷ Donald Peterson, TCPA – Telephone Consumer Protection Act, State Do Not Call Lists, [https://tcpa.mobi/state-do-not-call-list/#:~:text=Today%20\(September%2C%202017\)%2C,and%20Wyoming](https://tcpa.mobi/state-do-not-call-list/#:~:text=Today%20(September%2C%202017)%2C,and%20Wyoming), (last visited Apr. 15, 2021).

³⁸ *Mainstream Marketing Services Inc v. Federal Trade Commission*, 358 F.3d 1228 (10th Cir. 2004).

Claims of preemption have also been unsuccessful. The TCPA's non-preemption clause,³⁹ often referred to as the savings clause, has been relied upon by courts to uphold states' Do Not Call Registries. The clause states that: "[n]othing in this section or in the regulations prescribed under this section shall preempt any State law that imposes more restrictive intrastate requirements or regulation." The clause indicates specific types of actions that a state may prohibit or place more restrictive regulations on, such as sending unsolicited advertisements via fax, regulation of the use of automatic dialing systems and prerecorded messages, and the making of telephone solicitations.⁴⁰

The TCPA is silent on a state's ability to place regulations that are more stringent than the TCPA requirements for interstate calls.⁴¹ However, at least one court has held that state regulations and prohibitions of telemarketing can cross state lines.⁴²

Caller ID and "Spoofing"

"Spoofing" is the practice of altering or manipulating the caller ID information that is received in conjunction with an incoming telephone call. In the past, caller ID services were not common and spoofing required special equipment or a relatively high degree of technical sophistication. However, advances in technology, such as the proliferation of cellular phones, cell phone applications, and the widespread availability of Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) allows anyone to inexpensively spoof his or her caller ID using the services of a third-party spoofing provider.⁴³ For example, one such spoofing provider allows a consumer to download an app on their smartphone, purchase credits towards call time, and simply input the number that they want displayed on the receiving end in order to place an untraceable, spoofed call.⁴⁴

In response to the growing practice of spoofing, Congress amended the TCPA to add the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009. Under the Act and FCC rules, a person or entity is prohibited from transmitting false or misleading caller ID information "**with the intent to defraud**, cause harm, or wrongly obtain anything of value," and carries a penalty of up to \$10,000 for each violation.⁴⁵ However, spoofing is not illegal when no harm is intended or caused, or if the caller has legitimate reasons to hide his or her information. Examples may include law enforcement agencies working on cases, victims of domestic abuse, or doctors who wish to discuss private medical matters.⁴⁶

In 2008, Florida passed its own anti-spoofing legislation, The Florida Caller ID Anti-Spoofing Act (2008).⁴⁷ The Act prohibits **any person** from:

- Making a call with knowledge that false information was entered into a telephone caller ID system with the intent to deceive, defraud, or mislead the call's recipient; and
- Entering false information into a telephone caller ID system "with the intent to deceive, defraud, or mislead" the call's recipient.

However, a U.S. District Court in Miami found that Florida's Caller ID Anti-Spoofing Act (2008) violated the Commerce Clause of the United State Constitution because it had the effect of controlling spoofing practices that took place entirely outside the state, wherein individuals or companies could not ascertain what telephone numbers are subject to Florida law, and would have to subject all of their call

³⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 227(f)(1).

⁴⁰ National Association of Attorneys General, *Do Not Call: The History of Do Not Call and How Telemarketing Has Evolved*, NAGTRI Journal, Vol. 1 No. 4.

⁴¹ 47 U.S.C. s. 227 (f)(1).

⁴² See *Patriotic Veterans, Inc. v. Indiana*, 736 F.3d 1041 at 1044-45 (7th Cir. 2013) and *Patriotic Veterans, Inc. v. State of Indiana*, No. 16-2059 (7th Cir. 2017) ("Preventing automated messages to persons who don't want their peace and quiet disturbed is a valid time, place, and manner restriction.").

⁴³ See FCC 11-100, *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009*, WC Docket No. 11-39, (June 22, 2011), at 9116, https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-11-100A1_Rcd.pdf (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

⁴⁴ Business Insider, *It's Surprisingly Easy for a Hacker to Call Anyone From Your Personal Phone Number* (March 1, 2016), <http://www.businessinsider.com/phone-number-spoofing-2016-2> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

⁴⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 227(e).

⁴⁶ FCC, *Caller ID Spoofing*, <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/spoofing-and-caller-id> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

⁴⁷ s. 817.487, F.S. (2008).

practices to Florida law to avoid liability.⁴⁸ Similarly, in 2011, a federal court in Mississippi struck Mississippi's anti-spoofing law, which was substantially similar to Florida's.⁴⁹

Spam Robocalls

According to the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), robocalls have become an epidemic. YouMail, a company that provides call-blocking and call-management services, estimates that there were 58.5 billion robocalls in the U.S. in 2019 and that 44 percent of them were placed by scammers.⁵⁰

A February 2021 survey found that 46 percent of Americans reported receiving spam phone calls on their cell phone every day, and another 24 percent receiving them multiple times per week.⁵¹

Scammers often use caller ID spoofing to mask their true location and make it appear the call is from a legitimate or local number to raise the odds of the called party to answer. What follows is a robotic voice on the other end claiming to represent a utility, a name-brand company or a government agency (such as the Social Security Administration or the Internal Revenue Service). It might offer a free cruise, inexpensive health insurance or a low-interest loan. Answering and/or engaging with the call may lead to a live scammer, who realizes they have found a "live" number, and thus may call repeatedly.⁵²

Many robocalls are legal. The FCC allows such robocalls for informational or noncommercial purposes, such as polling, political campaigning and outreach by nonprofit groups.

Advances in technology have magnified fundamental flaws in the American phone system, enabling unrelenting robocalls from untraceable origins. As a result, it is incredibly profitable to use spam calls to drive business whether the caller is a scammer or an actual business using telemarketing to increase sales.⁵³

Consent and Revocation

The TCPA prohibits a telemarketer from using an automatic telephone dialing system (ATDS) to place a call or send a text message to a cell phone without the recipient's "**prior express consent**."⁵⁴ The type of consent depends on the nature of the call or text. Consent generally can be revoked by any reasonable method. However, some courts recently have considered whether revocation may be restricted in circumstances where the consent is included on a bilateral agreement.⁵⁵

There are two types of prior consent provided under the TCPA:

- **Prior express consent** is required to place autodialed, non-solicitation calls or texts to a cell phone.
- **Prior express written consent** is a heightened form of consent, must be evidenced by a written agreement signed by the call recipient, and is required to place autodialed telemarketing

⁴⁸ *TelTech Systems, Inc. v. McCollum*, No. 08-61664-CIV-MARTINEZ-BROWN (S.D. Fla. Filed Oct. 16, 2008).

⁴⁹ *TelTech Systems, Inc. v. Barbour*, 866 F. Supp. 2d 571 (S.D. Miss. 2011), *aff'd sub nom Teltech Systems, Inc. v. Bryant*, 702 F. 2d 232 (5th Cir. 2012).

⁵⁰ American Association of Retired Persons, Robocalls, https://www.aarp.org/money/scams-fraud/info-2019/robocalls.html?CMP=KNC-DSO-Adobe-Google-FRD-Ongoing-Robocalls-NonBrand-Exact-Robocalls&gclid=EAIAIqobChMIIVmq_4Sr7wIVFYvICh2RAwjqEAAYAiAAEgJD4vD_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

⁵¹ Simon van Zuylen-Wood, *How Robo-Callers Outwitted the Government and Completely Wrecked the Do Not Call List* (Jan. 11, 2018), https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/magazine/how-robo-call-moguls-outwitted-the-government-and-completely-wrecked-the-do-not-call-list/2018/01/09/52c769b6-df7a-11e7-bbd0-9dfb2e37492a_story.html?utm_term=.8a6e6ea55f32 (Last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

⁵² AARP, *supra* note 50.

⁵³ AARP, *supra* note 50.

⁵⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

⁵⁵ The National Law Review, Consent and Revocation Under the TCPA, <https://www.natlawreview.com/print/article/consent-and-revocation-under-tcpa> (last visited Mar. 30, 2021).

or advertising calls or texts to a cell phone. The written agreement must include a clear and conspicuous disclosure informing the consumer signing that:

- By signing the agreement, the consumer is authorizing autodialed telemarketing or advertising calls or texts; and
- The consumer is not required to sign the agreement as a condition of purchasing any property, goods, or services.⁵⁶

Prior express consent can be written or verbal. Voluntarily providing one's cellular number also constitutes prior express consent where:

- The individual gives "prior express consent" to be called or texted at the number provided;
- The individual has provided his or her number to the party calling or texting; and
- There is some relation between the communications and the reason for which an individual provided his or her number.⁵⁷

Prior express written consent is required for calls or texts to cell phones that introduce an advertisement,⁵⁸ or constitute "telemarketing"⁵⁹ and are sent using an ATDS. The TCPA's advertising prong merely requires introducing at the most basic level the commercial availability of a service. In similar fashion, telemarketing occurs when the context of a text or call indicates that it was initiated and transmitted to a person for promoting property, goods, or services. Neither the TCPA nor its implementing regulations require an explicit mention of a good, product, or service where the implication of an improper purpose is clear from the context.⁶⁰

Revocation of consent is controlled by the consenting party, and may be communicated orally or in writing by any reasonable means. However, where consent is contractually provided, as in credit agreements, the parties can bargain to require mutuality or particular revocation methods. Recently, a number of courts have addressed whether a consumer may unilaterally revoke consent when it is a term in a bargained-for contract.⁶¹

In 2017, the Second Circuit Court of Appeal held that a consumer **may not unilaterally revoke** consent in a bargained-for, bilateral contract.⁶² The court based its decision on "black-letter" contract law, referring to a fundamental aspect of contractual relationships that one party may not alter or revoke a term of a bilateral agreement without the other party's consent. The court found that a consumer, having consented to be contacted via an auto-dialer, could not unilaterally revoke consent without the caller's permission. Notably, the court distinguished case law from the Third and Eleventh Circuit Courts of Appeal, where consumers retained their ability to revoke consent because it was given in credit applications, rather than as part of a bilateral contract.⁶³

In 2018, a United States District Court in Florida also held that consent provided by contract **cannot be unilaterally revoked**.⁶⁴ The court noted that no provision in the TCPA indicates that contractually-granted consent can be unilaterally revoked where it would contradict black-letter contract law. The court held that a consumer who has consented to auto-dialed communication in a contract for services cannot later revoke such consent.⁶⁵

However, other courts have disagreed, rejecting the argument that consent is irrevocable. In 2018, a United States District Court in Tennessee adopted the general rule that consumer consent **may be**

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ Federal Communications Commission, Rules & Regulations Implementing the TCP Act of 1991 et al., 30 FCC Rcd at 7991-92.

⁵⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(1), defines an "advertisement" as "any material advertising the commercial availability or quality of any property, goods, or services," and "telemarketing" is defined as "the initiation of a telephone call or message for the purpose of encouraging the purchase or rental of, or investment in, property, goods, or services, which is transmitted to any person."

⁵⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(12).

⁶⁰ The National Law Review, *supra* note 55.

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² *Reyes v. Lincoln Auto. Fin. Servs.*, 861 F.3d 51, 53 (2d Cir. 2017).

⁶³ The National Law Review, *supra* note 55.

⁶⁴ *Medley v. Dish Network, LLC*, Case No. 8:16-cv-2534-T-36TBM, 2018 WL 4092120, at *10 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 27, 2018).

⁶⁵ The National Law Review, *supra* note 54.

revoked at any time by “any reasonable means.”⁶⁶ The court held that consumers **retain the ability to revoke** their prior consent despite having a bilateral agreement with the caller. Other courts have also allowed for revocation of consent by any means in the absence of a contractual restriction on the means by which a consumer may revoke consent.⁶⁷

In December 2020, the U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments in a landmark case that may determine whether consumers can sue a company for using an ATDS to text or call the consumers at a phone number saved in the company’s system. At issue is the meaning of the TCPA’s prohibition on using an ATDS to transmit communications to cell phones. The question before the Supreme Court is “whether the definition of ATDS in the TCPA encompasses any device that can ‘store’ and ‘automatically dial’ telephone numbers, even if the device does not use a random or sequential number generator.”⁶⁸

Currently, the TCPA rules require telemarketers to:

- Obtain prior express written consent from consumers before robocalling them;
- No longer be able to use an "established business relationship" to bypass the consent requirement; and
- Provide an automated, interactive "opt-out" mechanism during each robocall so consumers can immediately tell the telemarketer to stop calling.⁶⁹

The TCPA includes a private right of action.⁷⁰ A caller who places a call to a cell phone without consent using an ATDS is subject to \$500 in damages per call. The damages amount is \$1,500 per call if the court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly committed the violation.⁷¹

The Florida telephone solicitation law prohibits robocalls.⁷² However, the law allows the use of an automated telephone dialing system with live messages if:

- The calls are made or messages given solely in response to calls initiated by the persons to whom the automatic calls or live messages are directed;
- The telephone numbers selected for automatic dialing have been screened to exclude any telephone subscriber who is included on the department’s then-current “no sales solicitation calls” listing or any unlisted telephone number; or
- The calls concern goods or services that have been previously ordered or purchased.⁷³

Effect of the Bill

The bill amends s. 501.059, F.S., prohibits robocalls and provides related exceptions. The bill prohibits such calls without the prior express written consent of the called party, and allows a called party to revoke his or her express written consent through any reasonable means clearly expressing a desire to receive no further calls, texts, or messages.

The bill creates s. 501.059(8)(c) and specifies that express written consent must include a clear and conspicuous disclosure informing the called party that:

- By executing the agreement, the called party authorizes a person to make or knowingly allow a telephonic sales call to be made using an automated system for selecting or dialing telephone numbers, playing a recorded message when a connection is completed to a telephone number called, transmitting a text message, or transmitting a prerecorded voicemail.
- The called party is not required to sign the agreement or consent to enter into such an agreement as a condition of purchasing any property, goods, or services.

⁶⁶ *Ammons v. Ally Fin., Inc.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-00505, 2018 WL 3134619, at *15 (M.D. Tenn. June 27, 2018).

⁶⁷ *Few v. Receivables Performance Mgmt.*, Case No. 1:17-CV-2038-KOB, 2018 WL 5923765 at *1 (N.D. Ala. Nov. 13, 2018).

⁶⁸ *Facebook, Inc., Petitioner vs. Noah Duguid, et al.*, U.S., No. 19-511.

⁶⁹ FCC, *supra* note 23.

⁷⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

⁷¹ *Id.* at § 227(b)(3)(B)-(C).

⁷² S. 501.059(8), F.S.

⁷³ *Id.*

The bill clarifies the exemption that allows the use of an automated telephone dialing system with live messages when the calls or messages are made in response to calls “originally” initiated by the persons to whom the calls or messages are directed. However, the bill specifies that this does not authorize repeated calls in response to a call originally initiated by a called party.

The bill maintains the exemption that allows the use of an automated telephone dialing system when the calls concern the order, purchase, or delivery of goods or services that have previously been ordered by the called party. However, the bill specifies that this does not authorize telephonic sales calls made solely because the called party conducted business with the person initiating the call.

The bill removes the requirement that prior to the use of an automated telephone dialing system with live messages the telephone numbers selected for calling must be screened to exclude subscribers to the Florida Do Not Call list or any unlisted telephone number.

The bill provides a rebuttable presumption that any telephonic sales call made to a Florida area code is considered to be made to a resident of this state or to a person who is in this state at the time of the telephonic sales call.

The bill defines a "called party" as a person who is the regular user of the telephone number that is delivered a telephonic sales call.

The bill defines "express written consent" as a written consent agreement bearing the handwritten, electronic, or digital signature of a called party that states the telephone number to which the called party authorizes a telephonic sales call to be delivered and clearly authorizes a person to make or knowingly allow a telephonic sales call to be made using an automated system for selecting or dialing telephone numbers, playing a recorded message when a connection is completed to a telephone number called, transmitting a text message, or transmitting a prerecorded voicemail.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1: Amends s. 501.059, F.S., relating to telephone solicitation.

Section 2: Amends s. 501.616, F.S., relating to unlawful acts and practices.

Section 3: Reenacts s. 501.604, F.S., relating to exemptions.

Section 4: Reenacts s. 648.44, F.S., relating to prohibitions, and penalties.

Section 5: Provides an effective date.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

Indeterminate. According to DACS, “a new violation will be created, and an existing violation will be expanded. Both violations are punishable through the imposition of existing fines.”⁷⁴ It is unknown how many new violations will occur.

2. Expenditures:

Indeterminate. According to DACS, it “is unable to estimate a fiscal impact, if any, the proposed bill may have on the Department. However, with the addition of another prohibited act, there may be an increase in the number of complaints filed with and cases worked by the Department.”⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Agency Analysis of 2021 House Bill 857, p. 2, (Feb. 25, 2021).

⁷⁵ *Id.*

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

The bill may have an indeterminate negative fiscal impact on legitimate telemarketers to the extent they do not currently engage in business practices consistent with the requirements in the bill.

The bill may protect consumers from unwanted and fraudulent telephone solicitations.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not Applicable. This bill does not appear to affect county or municipal governments.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not appear to create a need for rulemaking or rulemaking authority.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

On March 17, 2021, the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee adopted a strike-all amendment and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute. The amendment:

- Prohibited calls made using an automated telephone dialing system with live messages without the prior express written consent of the called party.
- Authorized a called party to revoke their express written consent through any reasonable means clearly expressing a desire to receive no further calls, texts, or messages.
- Clarified that the use of an automated telephone dialing system is not prohibited in certain instances.
- Clarified that repeated calls in response to a call originally initiated by a called party are not allowed.
- Prohibited calls made solely because the called party previously conducted business with the person initiating the call.
- Removed the requirement that calls be screened by using the DACS do not call list prior to making calls related to goods or services previously purchased.

- Provided a rebuttable presumption that such calls made to a Florida area code are considered to be made to a resident of, or person in, this state.

On April 19, 2021, the Commerce Committee adopted one amendment and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute. The amendment:

- Reduced the number of hours during which telephone sellers and salespersons may call consumers to prohibit calls after 8 p.m.; and
- Prohibited more than three commercial telephone solicitation phone calls from any number to a person over a 24-hour period on the same subject matter or issue, regardless of the phone number used to make the call.

This analysis is drafted to the committee substitute as passed by the Commerce Committee.