

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS FOR FY 2006

PURSUANT TO THE DO NOT CALL IMPLEMENTATION ACT  
ON IMPLEMENTATION OF  
THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY



NATIONAL  
DO NOT CALL  
REGISTRY

SUBMITTED BY THE  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
APRIL 2007

# FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Deborah Platt Majoras	Chairman
Pamela Jones Harbour	Commissioner
Jon Leibowitz	Commissioner
William E. Kovacic	Commissioner
J. Thomas Rosch	Commissioner

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS FOR FY 2006

PURSUANT TO THE DO NOT CALL IMPLEMENTATION ACT  
ON IMPLEMENTATION OF  
THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY

SUBMITTED BY THE  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
APRIL 2007



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction . . . . .	1
II.	Analysis of the Effectiveness of the National Do Not Call Registry . . . . .	2
	Ensuring the National Do Not Call Registry is Operational Throughout the Year . . . . .	2
	Ensuring that the System Can Enroll Large Volumes of Consumer Telephone Numbers . . . . .	3
	Reducing the Number of Unwanted Telemarketing Solicitations . . . . .	4
III.	Number of Consumers Who Placed Their Telephone Numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry as of the End of FY 2006 . . . . .	4
IV.	Number of Entities Paying Fees for Access to the National Do Not Call Registry During FY 2006 . . . . .	5
V.	Analysis of the Progress of Coordinating the Operation and Enforcement of the National Do Not Call Registry with State Do Not Call Lists . . . . .	5
VI.	Analysis of the Progress of Coordinating the Operation and Enforcement of the National Do Not Call Registry with the FCC . . . . .	6
VII.	Review of the FTC's Enforcement Proceedings . . . . .	6
VIII.	Conclusion . . . . .	11
	Endnotes . . . . .	12



## I. INTRODUCTION

The National Do Not Call Registry is, by virtually every available measure, an effective consumer protection initiative. By the end of FY 2006, more than 132 million telephone numbers were registered. The available data show that compliance with the National Do Not Call Registry provisions of the Amended Telemarketing Sales Rule (“Amended TSR”)<sup>1</sup> is high and that, as a result, consumers are receiving fewer unwanted telemarketing calls.

The Do Not Call Implementation Act (“DNCIA”),<sup>2</sup> signed into law on March 11, 2003, mandates, *inter alia*, that the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”) and the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) each transmit to Congress an annual report on the National Do Not Call Registry for fiscal years 2003 to 2007, inclusive. Specifically, the DNCIA requires that the FTC’s annual report provide the following information:

- (1) an analysis of the effectiveness of the registry;
- (2) the number of consumers who have placed their telephone numbers on the registry;
- (3) the number of entities paying fees to access the registry and the amount of such fees;
- (4) an analysis of the progress of coordinating the operation and enforcement of the National Registry with similar registries established and maintained by various States;
- (5) an analysis of the progress of coordinating the operation and enforcement of the National Registry with the enforcement activities of the FCC; and
- (6) a review of the FTC’s enforcement proceedings under the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 C.F.R. Part 310.

This Annual Report from the FTC provides an overview of the operation of the National Do Not Call Registry through the end of FY 2006.

## II. ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY

During FY 2006, the Commission continued to use the following measures to judge the performance of the National Do Not Call Registry program:

- (1) ensuring that the system remained fully operational throughout the year;
- (2) ensuring that the system could enroll large volumes of consumer telephone numbers; and
- (3) reducing unwanted telemarketing calls to consumers who sign up for the National Registry, which continues to be the ultimate goal of the registry.

Each of these measures is discussed in turn below.

### ENSURING THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY IS OPERATIONAL THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

The National Do Not Call Registry was built to accomplish four primary tasks:

- (1) allow consumers to register their preference not to receive telemarketing calls at registered telephone numbers;
- (2) allow telemarketers and sellers to access the telephone numbers included in the National Registry and to pay the appropriate fees for such access;
- (3) gather consumer complaint information concerning alleged do not call violations automatically over the telephone and the Internet; and
- (4) allow FTC, State, and other law enforcement personnel access to consumer registration, telemarketer access information, and complaint information maintained in the registry.

Consumers can register their telephone numbers through two methods: either by calling a toll-free number from the telephone number they wish to register, or over the Internet. The process is fully automated, takes only a few minutes, and requires consumers to provide minimal personally identifying information.<sup>3</sup>

Telemarketers and sellers can access registered telephone numbers, and pay the appropriate fee for that access, if any, through an Internet website dedicated to that purpose. The only information about consumers that companies receive from the National Registry is the registered telephone number. Those numbers are sorted and available for download by area code. Companies may also check a small number of telephone numbers at a time via interactive Internet pages.

## *Implementation of the National Do Not Call Registry*

Consumers who receive unwanted telemarketing calls can register a complaint via either a toll-free telephone number, using an interactive voice response system, or via the Internet. To conduct investigations, law enforcement officials also can access data in the National Registry, including consumer registration information, telemarketer access information, and consumer complaints. Such access is provided through Consumer Sentinel, a secure Internet website maintained by the FTC, to the law enforcement community throughout the United States, Canada, and Australia.<sup>4</sup>

Since its implementation in 2003, the National Registry has continuously served several functions: providing consumers with the ability to register their preference not to receive telemarketing calls and file complaints; providing telemarketers with the ability to subscribe to the list, download registered telephone numbers, and request help; and providing thousands of law enforcement personnel with access to data maintained in the registry.

### ENSURING THAT THE SYSTEM CAN ENROLL LARGE VOLUMES OF CONSUMER TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Since inception, the National Registry has time-and-again proven to be capable of handling massive numbers of consumer registration requests. Within four days of the initial launch, more than 10 million telephone numbers were registered. After the first 40 days of operation, more than 30 million numbers were registered. By the end of FY 2003, a mere 13 weeks after the opening of consumer registration, more than 51 million telephone numbers were included on the National Registry. By the end of FY 2004, more than 64 million telephone numbers had been registered on the National Registry, and by the end of FY 2005, there were more than 107 million registered telephone numbers.

The capability to enroll large numbers of consumer telephone numbers continued in FY 2006. In fact, in FY 2006 the registry received almost 25 million new registrations. During the most active period in FY 2006, the registry received more than 10 million consumer registration requests in a single month and more than three million in a single week. During FY 2006, there were nine weeks with over one million registrations. Since inception, the registry has experienced no outages and has continued to provide consumers with an uninterrupted mechanism by which to add their telephone numbers to the National Do Not Call

Registry.<sup>5</sup> As a result, by the end of FY 2006, over 132 million numbers had been registered.

### REDUCING THE NUMBER OF UNWANTED TELEMARKETING SOLICITATIONS

The Commission believes that the fundamental goal of the National Do Not Call Registry — to provide consumers with a simple, free, and effective means to limit unwanted telemarketing calls — has been realized. As described in the FY 2005 annual report, independent surveys conducted by Harris Interactive® and Customer Care Alliance<sup>6</sup> demonstrate that the National Registry has been an effective means for consumers to limit unwanted telemarketing calls.<sup>7</sup> The results of these surveys illustrate that the National Registry has been a success in terms of registration volume and reduction of unwanted telemarketing calls.

The National Registry complaint data also provide some information as to the effectiveness of the registry. During FY 2006, the FTC received 1,148,955 complaints, which constituted approximately 0.87% of the total number of registered telephone numbers at that time.<sup>8</sup> This is indicative of both a high degree of compliance by telemarketers and a meaningful reduction in unwanted calls for consumers who have registered their telephone numbers.

### III. NUMBER OF CONSUMERS WHO PLACED THEIR TELEPHONE NUMBERS ON THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY AS OF THE END OF FY 2006

Americans continue to enthusiastically embrace the National Do Not Call Registry. As previously stated, in the first four days following the launch of the registry on June 27, 2003, more than 10 million numbers were registered. As of September 30, 2003, a total of 51,968,777 telephone numbers had been registered. By the end of FY 2004, the number of registered telephone numbers was 64,288,175 and by the end of FY 2005 that number had increased to a total of 107,440,316 registered telephone numbers. As of September 30, 2006, there were 132,219,163 telephone numbers registered on the National Registry.<sup>9</sup>

#### IV. NUMBER OF ENTITIES PAYING FEES FOR ACCESS TO THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY DURING FY 2006

In FY 2006, a total of 6,824 entities paid fees totaling \$21,698,970 for access to the National Registry.<sup>10</sup> Since inception, a total of 15,218 unique entities have paid fees for access to the National Registry. The total amount of fees paid by all entities since the inception of the National Registry through the end of FY 2006 is \$59,027,775.

Certain entities can access data from the National Registry without having to pay a fee. These include entities that access five or fewer area codes of data in a year, as well as entities that are exempt from the do not call requirements of the Amended TSR, but that voluntarily access the National Registry in order to avoid calling consumers who do not wish to receive calls.<sup>11</sup> In FY 2006, 58,816 entities accessed five or fewer area codes at no charge, and 845 entities claiming “exempt organization” status obtained free access. Since inception, a total of 162,296 entities accessed five or fewer area codes at no charge, and 2,956 entities claiming “exempt organization” status obtained free access.

#### V. ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESS OF COORDINATING THE OPERATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY WITH STATE DO NOT CALL LISTS

At the time the FTC announced its intention to create a National Do Not Call Registry, more than two dozen States had some form of a do not call list. As noted in the Statement of Basis and Purpose for the Amended TSR,<sup>12</sup> the FTC has worked diligently with the States to further the goal of creating a single National Do Not Call Registry. Such a National Registry allows consumers to effect their preference not to receive telemarketing calls by going to a single governmental agency and streamlines the process for businesses, allowing them to have a single point of contact to obtain the list of all consumer telephone numbers that they should not call.

The dialogue with States regarding coordination of do not call efforts continued throughout FY 2006. Since the inception of the program, seven States that had established State do not call lists have stopped collecting consumer

registrations at the State level.<sup>13</sup> Instead, they have relied upon the National Registry to enforce their State laws. Another ten States that did not have a State registry in place at the time enacted laws that “adopt” the National Registry as the State registry for State law purposes.<sup>14</sup> In addition, 18 States that operated or continue to operate do not call lists contributed their data to the National Registry, with over 11.5 million telephone numbers transferred by those States to the registry as of the end of FY 2006.<sup>15</sup> As of the end of FY 2006, seven States still have not shared their state lists with the National Registry.<sup>16</sup>

The FTC also assists States with their law enforcement investigations by enabling law enforcement officials to access data in the National Registry through the Consumer Sentinel website. Consumer Sentinel contains searchable information on registered phone numbers, organizations accessing the National Registry, complaints of registry violations, and top violator reports for each State.

## VI. ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRESS OF COORDINATING THE OPERATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DO NOT CALL REGISTRY WITH THE FCC

The FTC and the FCC have worked closely to coordinate their efforts to enforce the National Do Not Call Registry. Since inception of the program, the two agencies have worked closely together to (1) ensure efficient enforcement of their respective do not call rule provisions, (2) avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, and (3) promote cooperation in investigations. During FY 2006, coordination has continued with regular meetings to discuss issues pertaining to do not call enforcement, including review of the agencies’ respective enforcement priorities. This close cooperation, in combination with active enforcement efforts at each of the agencies, has sent a strong message to industry regarding the FTC’s and FCC’s commitment to mandating compliance.

## VII. REVIEW OF THE FTC’S ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS

Although compliance with the National Do Not Call Registry has been high, the FTC actively investigates and prosecutes violators. National Do Not Call Registry enforcement protects the success of the National Registry in safeguarding consumer privacy. The FTC also works with its enforcement

## *Implementation of the National Do Not Call Registry*

partners at the U.S. Department of Justice, the FCC, and the States to enforce the National Do Not Call Registry rules.

Violating the National Do Not Call Registry subjects telemarketers to civil penalties of up to \$11,000 per violation. Civil penalty actions are filed by the Department of Justice on behalf of the FTC. Some violators of the National Do Not Call Registry also engage in fraud or other law violations. In these fraud cases, the Commission seeks equitable relief in federal court, such as injunctions against future violations, consumer redress, and disgorgement of profits.

As of September 30, 2006, the FTC had filed 28 cases alleging violations of the National Do Not Call Registry and had reached settlements in 21 of these cases, obtaining injunctive relief in all 21 cases.<sup>17</sup> In eleven of the cases, the court ordered civil penalties totaling more than \$7.6 million. In the remaining cases, the court ordered redress and/or disgorgement for other violations, totaling more than \$8.2 million.

During FY 2006, based upon a review of complaints in its database and other investigative activities, the FTC initiated 13 cases alleging violations of the National Do Not Call Registry against the following principal defendants:

- Executive Financial Home Loan Corp., a corporation also doing business as Executive Home Loan, and individual defendants allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: initiating telephone calls to thousands of numbers on the National Registry and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee. Defendants claimed that the company relied on service providers for their compliance with the Amended TSR rules — specifically by buying “lead lists” of phone numbers from list brokers such as title companies — but the FTC’s complaint alleged that it is not enough to rely on brokers’ claims that the lists had been properly “scrubbed” against the National Registry.<sup>18</sup>
- Malvern Marketing, LLC, a corporation also doing business as Phase One Marketing and Peoples Benefit Services, Inc., allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: initiating telephone calls to thousands of numbers on the National Registry as well as to persons who had made a company-specific request not to be called; abandoning outbound telephone calls by failing to connect the call to a representative

within two seconds of the completed greeting; and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee.<sup>19</sup>

- Credit Foundation of America and a host of other corporate and individual defendants allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: making misrepresentations about their debt management services; initiating or causing others to initiate telephone calls to numbers on the National Registry; abandoning calls; and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee.<sup>20</sup>
- Srikanth Venkataraman, an individual doing business as Scorpio Systems, Ltd., allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: calling phone numbers on the Do Not Call Registry; failing to transmit its telephone number and name to consumers' caller identification service; and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee. This was the first case in which civil penalties were sought for the alleged transmission of false caller ID information.<sup>21</sup>
- Debt Solutions, Inc., a seller of a purported debt elimination program, and a host of other corporate and individual defendants allegedly violated provisions of the Amended TSR, in addition to Section 5 of the FTC Act and Washington state law. The complaint alleges that the defendants violated the Amended TSR by calling phone numbers listed on the Do Not Call Registry; failing to pay the required annual fee for access to DNC-listed numbers; and calling persons who had asked them to stop calling.<sup>22</sup>
- Bookspan, a well-known bookseller, allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: initiating telephone calls to more than 100,000 numbers on the National Registry as well as to persons who had made a company-specific request not to be called.<sup>23</sup>
- Entrepreneurial Strategies, Ltd. and an individual allegedly assisted and facilitated violations of the Amended TSR. This case follows an earlier FTC action brought against Debt Management Foundation Services, Inc., ("DMFS") in which the FTC alleged that DMFS initiated telephone calls to

thousands of numbers on the National Registry. The FTC's complaint alleged that defendants assisted and facilitated DMFS's violations of the Amended TSR by providing consulting and other services to enable DMFS to portray itself as a nonprofit corporation, despite knowing that DMFS was a sham nonprofit and that it was calling consumers on the National Registry. This was the first case in which the FTC and the Department of Justice sought civil penalties from defendants solely for alleged violations of the assisting and facilitating provisions of the Amended TSR.<sup>24</sup>

- Conversion Marketing, Inc., a corporation doing business as National Health Support Center, Natural Bright, and Pounds Off Patch, as well as a host of other corporate and individual defendants, allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: falsely representing that consumers would get free samples of the Fast White tooth whitening kit, but instead enrolling them in programs where consumers would continue to receive monthly shipments; billing consumers without their express, informed consent; making false and unsubstantiated claims about their weight-loss patches; calling numbers listed on the National Registry; abandoning calls placed to consumers; and not paying the required annual fee to access numbers on the National Registry.<sup>25</sup>
- FMFG, Inc., a purported surveyor, and an individual allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: initiating telephone calls to hundreds of thousands of numbers on the National Registry; abandoning calls; and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee. Although genuine survey calls are exempt from the do not call provisions of the Amended TSR, the FTC's complaint alleged that the defendants called consumers asking to take a survey of their sleep habits and then made a sales pitch.<sup>26</sup>
- The Broadcast Team, a company that delivers voice broadcasting messages to consumers on behalf of a variety of clients, allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: calling more than one million telephone numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry and failing to pay the required fee for access to numbers listed on the National Registry.<sup>27</sup>

- DirecTV, a well-known satellite TV provider, and a host of other corporate and individual defendants who telemarketed on its behalf allegedly violated various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: abandoning, or causing others to abandon, outbound telephone calls and initiating or causing others to initiate telephone calls to numbers on the National Registry. The FTC's complaint also alleged that DirecTV provided substantial assistance and support to one of its telemarketers, co-defendant Global Satellite, even though DirecTV knew or consciously avoided knowing that Global Satellite was violating the Amended TSR by abandoning calls.<sup>28</sup>
- Del Sol, LLC, a corporation also doing business as Del Sol Educational Telephone, allegedly violated Section 5 of the FTC Act and various provisions of the Amended TSR, including the following: misrepresenting material aspects of its goods and services; initiating telephone calls to numbers on the National Registry; and initiating telephone calls to consumers within a given area code without first paying the required access fee.<sup>29</sup>
- John Raymond Salvator Bezeredi, a Canada-based telemarketer, allegedly violated Section 5 of the FTC Act and various provisions of the Amended TSR by telemarketing foreign bonds to U.S. consumers. The FTC's complaint alleged that the defendant misrepresented that consumers who buy from, or pay fees to, Dominion Investments, Eurobond Fidelity LTD, or Imperial Investments would receive regular cash payments, would be entered into monthly drawings to win cash or prizes, or likely would receive cash winnings. Further, the FTC's complaint alleged that the defendant failed to disclose to consumers that importing and trafficking in foreign lotteries is a crime in the United States, and that the bond scheme he was pitching constitutes such a lottery. Finally, the FTC's complaint alleged that the defendant violated the Amended TSR by calling, or causing other people to call, numbers on the National Registry and by failing to pay the required fees for access to telephone numbers in the area codes he and his telemarketers called.<sup>30</sup>

## VIII. CONCLUSION

Since inception of the program, the National Do Not Call Registry has been in continuous operation successfully accepting consumer registrations and complaints, allowing businesses to obtain access to registry data, and providing law enforcement with the tools and information that they need to investigate complaints and bring enforcement actions. During FY 2006, the National Registry managed large volumes of consumer registrations without incident and, as of the end of the Fiscal Year, more than 132 million telephone numbers had been registered. During the Summer of 2008, the registrations of those consumers who registered their telephone numbers in 2003 and have not subsequently re-registered will expire.<sup>31</sup> In the Spring of 2008, the FTC will conduct a consumer education campaign providing information to consumers on how to re-register their telephone number.

To protect the ongoing success of the National Registry, the FTC continues to pursue an active enforcement program, with numerous ongoing non-public investigations, which, as of the end of FY 2006, have resulted in 28 cases being filed, 21 of which have settled, bringing significant relief to consumers. Even though the FTC pursues an active enforcement program, data from surveys and analysis of complaints about do not call violations strongly suggest that compliance with the National Do Not Call Registry provisions of the Amended TSR is high and that consumers are receiving fewer unwanted telemarketing calls.

## ENDNOTES

1. 16 C.F.R. Part 310.
2. Pub. L. No. 108-10, 117 Stat. 557 (2003).
3. In the case of registration by telephone, the only personal information provided is the telephone number to be registered. In the case of Internet registration, a consumer must provide, in addition to the telephone number(s) to be registered, a valid e-mail address to which a confirmation e-mail message is sent. Once the confirmation is complete, however, the e-mail address is hashed and made unusable. Thus, only consumers' telephone numbers are maintained in the database.
4. In addition to National Do Not Call Registry complaints and registry information, Consumer Sentinel contains millions of fraud and identity theft complaints that can be accessed by law enforcement. Other Consumer Sentinel tools include: (1) an "alert" function that allows users to flag companies, suspects, and identity theft victims that are part of an investigation in order to inform other law enforcers using Consumer Sentinel; (2) an "auto query" function that will periodically scan the database for new complaints relating to the user's interest and notify the user via e-mail if it finds any new complaints meeting their criteria; (3) top violator reports that allow users to identify companies or individuals receiving the most complaints; (4) consumer fraud and identity theft trend reports prepared by FTC data analysts; (5) an index of taped, allegedly fraudulent telemarketing sales pitches available from the National Tape Library; (6) a list of all registered Sentinel law enforcer users with contact information; (7) a library of reference materials and website links, how-to manuals for investigating different types of fraud, and periodicals; and (8) the ability to add complaints on behalf of consumer fraud and identity theft victims, that are then entered into Consumer Sentinel.
5. The registry accepts registrations from both land line and cell phones. The FTC has circulated a press release titled "The Truth about Cell Phones and the Do Not Call Registry," which addresses the claim made by a re-circulating e-mail that cell phone numbers will be released to telemarketers. The press release is available at [www.ftc.gov/opa/2007/02/dnccellphones.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2007/02/dnccellphones.htm).
6. Harris Interactive® and Customer Care Alliance did not conduct independent surveys in FY 2006.
7. In January 2004, Harris Interactive® surveyed nearly 3,400 adults and found that 92% of those who signed up for the National Registry had received fewer telemarketing calls since signing up, and 25% stated that they had received no telemarketing calls. Customer Care Alliance surveyed 850 adults nationwide between February and April 2004. In this survey, the 60% of respondents who had registered their primary home telephone number on the National Registry reported that they had experienced an 80% reduction in the volume of telemarketing solicitations since registration. In September 2005, the Customer Care Alliance performed a two-question follow-up study. The survey found that approximately 73% of those who responded to the poll had registered their primary home telephone number on the National Registry, a 19.7% increase in registrations from the prior year. In its December 2005 survey, Harris Interactive® found that 76% of all U.S. adults had registered for the National Registry compared to 57% in 2004, a one-third increase in registrations. The survey again found that 92% of U.S. adults who had placed their numbers on the registry reported receiving fewer telemarketing calls.
8. The FTC received these complaints from 374,937 unique registered phone numbers, which represents 0.28% of the registered telephone numbers at the end of FY 2006.

## *Implementation of the National Do Not Call Registry*

9. The FY 2004, FY 2005, and FY 2006 totals represent the total number of unique telephone numbers that were registered at any time since inception. A telephone number that was registered in FY 2003 and again in FY 2004, FY 2005, or FY 2006 is counted only once in these totals. A telephone number that was registered in FY 2003, FY 2004, FY 2005, or FY 2006, but subsequently deleted or removed from the National Registry is also counted once in these totals. In total, 11,594,559 numbers were transferred by States to the National Registry as of the end of FY 2006. This total includes the number of unique State records added to the National Registry.
10. In FY 2006, the annual fee per area code started at \$56 (with the first five area codes provided at no cost) with the maximum annual fee for accessing the entire National Registry being \$15,400 for the entire fiscal year up to August 31, 2006. See 70 Fed. Reg. 43273 (July 27, 2005). As of September 1, 2006, the annual fee per area code became \$62 (with the first five area codes again provided at no cost) with the maximum annual fee for accessing the entire National Registry increasing to \$17,050. See 71 Fed. Reg. 43048 (July 31, 2006).
11. Such “exempt” organizations include entities that engage in outbound telephone calls to consumers to induce charitable contributions, to raise funds for political purposes, or to conduct surveys. They also include entities engaged solely in calls to persons with whom they have an established business relationship or from whom they have obtained express written agreement to call, pursuant to the Amended TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(b)(1)(iii)(B)(i) or (ii), and who do not access the National Registry for any other purpose.
12. 68 Fed. Reg. 4580, 4638 (Jan. 29, 2003).
13. Those States are: Alabama, Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, New York, Oregon, and Vermont.
14. Those States are: Arizona, California, Illinois, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota.
15. The States that have transferred registrations to the National Registry are: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania.
16. Those States are: Indiana, Louisiana, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.
17. A complete list of the Commission’s Do Not Call enforcement actions is available at [www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/microsites/donotcall/cases.html](http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/microsites/donotcall/cases.html).
18. United States v. Executive Fin. Home Loan Corp., No. 0423143 (C.D. Cal., filed June 21, 2006). A stipulated judgment and order for permanent injunction was entered in this matter in June 2006, which included an order to pay \$50,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgment is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423143/0423143ExecutiveHomeLoanStipulatedJudgment.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423143/0423143ExecutiveHomeLoanStipulatedJudgment.pdf).
19. United States v. Malvern Mktg., LLC, No. 06 CV 4612 (S.D. N.Y., filed June 13, 2006). Stipulated judgments and orders for permanent injunctions were entered against two of the defendants in June 2006, which included collectively \$350,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgments are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423077/0423077.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423077/0423077.htm).
20. United States v. Credit Found. of America, No. CV06-3654 ABC (VKx) (C.D. Cal., filed June 13, 2006). Stipulated judgments and orders for permanent injunctions were entered against ten of the defendants in June 2006, which included collectively \$250,000 in civil penalties

## *Federal Trade Commission*

and \$676,754 in consumer redress. The stipulated judgments are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423044/0423044.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423044/0423044.htm).

21. United States v. Srikanth Venkataraman, No. 06-1928 (MCL) (D. N.J., filed Apr. 25, 2006). Litigation is ongoing in this matter. The complaint is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523120/060427scorpiosystemplt.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523120/060427scorpiosystemplt.pdf).
22. United States v. Debt Solutions, Inc., No. CV06-0298 (W.D. Wash., filed Mar. 6, 2006). Litigation is ongoing in this matter. The complaint is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523002/0523002.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523002/0523002.htm).
23. United States v. Bookspan, No. 06 786 (E.D. N.Y., filed Feb. 23, 2006). A stipulated judgment and order for permanent injunction was entered in this matter in February 2006, which included an order to pay \$680,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgment is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423200/060223bookspanstlmnt.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423200/060223bookspanstlmnt.pdf).
24. United States v. Entrepreneurial Strategies, Ltd., No. 2:06-CV-15 (WCO) (N.D. Ga., filed Jan. 24, 2006). A stipulated judgment and order for permanent injunction was entered in this matter in January 2006, which included an order to pay \$13,454.71 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgment is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523098/060124stipjudg.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523098/060124stipjudg.pdf).
25. United States v. Conversion Mktg., Inc., No. SACV 06-256 (C.D. Cal., filed Mar. 10, 2006). Stipulated judgments and orders for permanent injunction were entered in this matter in January and March 2006, which included an order to pay \$463,000 in consumer redress and \$11,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgments are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423079/0423079.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423079/0423079.htm).
26. United States v. FMFG, Inc., No. 3:05-CV-00711 (D. Nev., filed Dec. 29, 2005). Litigation is ongoing in this matter. The complaint is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423155/051229calsleepresearchcmplt.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423155/051229calsleepresearchcmplt.pdf).
27. United States v. The Broadcast Team, No. 6:05-cv-01920-PCF-JGG (M.D. Fla., filed Dec. 29, 2005). In FY 2007, a stipulated judgment and order for permanent injunction was entered, which included an order to pay \$1,000,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgment is available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523025/0523025.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523025/0523025.htm).
28. United States v. DirecTV, No. SACV05 1211 (W.D. Cal., filed Dec. 12, 2005). Stipulated judgments and orders for permanent injunctions were entered against DirecTV and two of the telemarketers calling on behalf of DirecTV — Communications Concepts, LLC and American Communications of the Triad — in December 2005, which included collectively \$5,410,000 in civil penalties. A stipulated judgment and order for permanent injunction was entered against another telemarketer calling on behalf of DirecTV — Nomrah Records, Inc. — in August 2006, which included an order for \$75,000 in civil penalties. In FY 2007, stipulated judgments and orders for permanent injunction were entered against D.R.D., Inc. and Global Satellite, Inc., which included orders for D.R.D., Inc. to pay \$35,000 and Global Satellite, Inc. to pay \$65,000 in civil penalties. The stipulated judgments are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423039/0423039.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423039/0423039.htm).
29. United States v. Del Sol, LLC, No. CV-05-3013 GAF (RCx) (C.D. Cal., filed December 8, 2005). The FTC amended its April 2005 complaint in December 2005 to include violations of the Amended TSR. In FY 2007, a stipulated final judgment and order for permanent injunction and monetary relief was entered, which included a monetary judgment for \$236,261. The amended complaint and stipulated judgment are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523020/0523020.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0523020/0523020.htm).

*Implementation of the National Do Not Call Registry*

30. United States v. John Raymond Salvator Bezeredi, No. CV5 1739 (W.D. Wash., filed Oct. 17, 2005). A temporary restraining order is in place in this matter, and litigation is ongoing. The complaint and temporary restraining order are available at [www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423152/0423152.htm](http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0423152/0423152.htm).
31. The registration expiration date is five years from the date of the most recent registration.







NATIONAL  
DO NOT CALL  
REGISTRY

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[ftc.gov](http://ftc.gov)

1-877-FTC-HELP

FOR THE CONSUMER