

Buzz.¹ According to the complaints, Buzz telemarketers claimed to be calling on behalf of the consumers' local telephone companies but failed to tell the consumers they were calling to switch them to a new service. The consumers reported that the telephone bills they received after being contacted by Buzz were higher than their previous bills. In some cases, consumers said they were charged for Buzz's services even though their long distance service was not actually switched to Buzz. Based on the number of complaints brought by or on behalf of elderly consumers, it appears Buzz may have targeted senior citizens, allegedly promising a senior discount in some cases. Many complainants reported that they live on fixed incomes and make few long distance calls, and some stated they do not subscribe to long distance service. Several complainants live in retirement homes and care facilities. Charges from Buzz included varying combinations of charges for long distance calls, a \$9.85 monthly service fee, a \$19.95 cancellation fee, and a \$29.95 activation fee.

Staff forwarded each of the complaints to Buzz for response. Buzz did not respond to any of the 19 complaints that are the subject of this order. Board staff's proposed resolutions found, variously, that Buzz violated the Board's rules by failing to respond to the complaints or that Buzz violated the Board's rules against slamming or cramming by failing to show the changes in service were authorized. Staff directed Buzz to close the accounts and credit all charges.

¹ From April 2006 through January 10, 2007, the Board has received 283 written complaints against Buzz.

In the petitions for proceedings to consider civil penalties and other remedies, Consumer Advocate states the complaints against Buzz allege multiple fraudulent and abusive practices in Buzz's telemarketing activities, particularly as directed to elderly lowans. Consumer Advocate states: 1) Buzz has misrepresented its affiliation with customers' local telephone companies; 2) Buzz has misrepresented that its rates are lower than those of the customers' existing carriers; 3) Buzz has misrepresented that certain charges would be refunded or credited; 4) Buzz has not obtained verification from an independent third party; 5) third-party verification recordings submitted by Buzz have not been authentic; and 6) customers have not been able to speak to Buzz to inquire or complain about charges as they have been kept on hold for extended periods of time.

Consumer Advocate states it is well established that misrepresentations sometimes occur during the unrecorded portion of a marketing call and contends that the potential for misrepresentation is elevated in the telemarketing context. Consumer Advocate argues that the misrepresentations in these cases were fraudulent and vitiate any authorization the consumers may have given for the changes in service. Consumer Advocate contends civil monetary penalties should be assessed in order to secure future compliance with the statute. Also, Consumer Advocate suggests it appears that Buzz may have engaged in a pattern of violations

in these and other cases and suggests that the Board consider implementing the remedies provided for in Iowa Code § 476.103(5).²

Consumer Advocate argues a formal proceeding is necessary to give Buzz notice and opportunity for hearing; affirm staff's determinations that Buzz committed a slamming or cramming violation in these cases; consider civil penalties in an amount to deter future violations; and to consider the penalties for a pattern of violations.

Buzz has not responded to any of Consumer Advocate's petitions for proceedings to consider civil penalties.

The Board concludes there are reasonable grounds for further investigation of whether the consumers in these cases cooperated with the third-party verification process based on the telemarketer's various assurances that the telemarketer was calling on behalf of or was affiliated with the consumer's local telephone company, was offering a senior discount, or would waive certain charges. The Board agrees with Consumer Advocate that further investigation of the alleged misrepresentations, and of other alleged problems with the third-party verifications and with Buzz's sales tactics in general, is necessary.

² If the Board determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that a service provider has shown a pattern of violations of rules adopted pursuant to § 476.103, Iowa Code § 476.103(5) allows the Board to prohibit other service providers from billing charges on behalf of the violating provider and prohibit local exchange service providers from providing exchange access services to the violating provider, among other remedies.

DOCKET NO. FCU-06-55 (C-06-238, C-06-241, C-06-243, C-06-244, C-06-246, C-06-247, C-06-248, C-06-251, C-06-252, C-06-253, C-06-254, C-06-255, C-06-260, C-06-262, C-06-263, C-06-264, C-06-265, C-06-266, C-06-273)

PAGE 5

Also, the Board concludes that further investigation is appropriate to determine whether the Board should assess civil penalties, whether Buzz engaged in a pattern of violations, and whether the Board should implement the remedies provided for in Iowa Code § 476.103(5). Therefore, the Board will grant Consumer Advocate's requests for proceedings to consider civil penalties. Also, because these complaints involve allegations similar to those raised in another proceeding involving Buzz, the Board will consolidate these proceedings with Docket No. FCU-06-55.

Finally, the Board will delay establishing a procedural schedule to allow Buzz an opportunity to respond to the allegations Consumer Advocate raises in its petitions. However, given the number of complaints alleging similar misconduct by Buzz, the Board believes it is appropriate to accelerate this proceeding. Therefore, the Board will require Buzz to respond to the allegations raised in Consumer Advocate's petitions within seven days of the date of this order. Buzz is cautioned that no extensions of this deadline will be granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. The petitions for proceedings to consider civil penalties and other remedies filed by the Consumer Advocate Division of the Department of Justice on November 27 and December 4, 2006, are granted. File Nos. C-06-238, C-06-241, C-06-243, C-06-244, C-06-246, C-06-247, C-06-248, C-06-251, C-06-252, C-06-253, C-06-254, C-06-255, C-06-260, C-06-262, C-06-263, C-06-264, C-06-265, C-06-266,

DOCKET NO. FCU-06-55 (C-06-238, C-06-241, C-06-243, C-06-244, C-06-246, C-06-247, C-06-248, C-06-251, C-06-252, C-06-253, C-06-254, C-06-255, C-06-260, C-06-262, C-06-263, C-06-264, C-06-265, C-06-266, C-06-273)

PAGE 6

and C-06-273 are docketed for formal proceeding, identified as Docket No. FCU-06-55.

2. The motions to consolidate filed by the Consumer Advocate on November 27 and December 4, 2006, are granted. File Nos. C-06-238, C-06-241, C-06-243, C-06-244, C-06-246, C-06-247, C-06-248, C-06-251, C-06-252, C-06-253, C-06-254, C-06-255, C-06-260, C-06-262, C-06-263, C-06-264, C-06-265, C-06-266, and C-06-273 are consolidated with Docket No. FCU-06-55.

3. Buzz Telecom, Corp., is directed to file a response to Consumer Advocate's petitions within seven days of the date of this order.

UTILITIES BOARD

/s/ John R. Norris

/s/ Curtis W. Stamp

ATTEST:

/s/ Judi K. Cooper

Executive Secretary

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 17th day of January, 2007.