

**Department of Legislative Services**  
Maryland General Assembly  
2007 Session

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**

House Bill 211  
Economic Matters

(Delegate Howard, *et al.*)

---

**Consumer Protection - Unsolicited Transmissions to a Facsimile Device - Private Actions**

---

This bill authorizes a recipient of an unsolicited commercial solicitation sent to a facsimile (fax) device, in addition to any action by the Attorney General, to bring an action to recover: (1) the greater of \$500 or actual damages; and (2) reasonable attorney's fees. The court may award three times the authorized amount of damages if it finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated the prohibition against sending an unsolicited commercial fax.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** Authorizing a private cause of action for the transmission of an unsolicited commercial fax is not expected to materially affect the workload of the Judiciary.

**Local Effect:** None.

**Small Business Effect:** Minimal.

---

**Analysis**

**Current Law:** A person may not intentionally transmit a fax for the purpose of commercial solicitation. The Attorney General may initiate a civil action against a person who violates the prohibition to recover for the State a penalty of up to \$1,000 for each violation.

**Background:** The federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act prohibits a person from using a fax machine, computer, or other device to send an unsolicited advertisement to a fax machine. The Act authorizes a person or entity, if otherwise permitted by the laws or court rules of a state, to bring an action in state court: (1) to enjoin a violation of this prohibition; and/or (2) to recover the greater of \$500 or actual monetary damages. In *R.A. Ponte Architects, Ltd. V. Investors' Alert, Inc.*, 382 Md. 689 (2004), the Maryland Court of Appeals held that Maryland courts have jurisdiction to try a private cause of action brought under this federal prohibition.

The federal Act does not preempt State laws that prohibit the use of fax machines or other electronic devices to send unsolicited advertisements.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** Nearly identical bills, HB 766 of 2006 and HB 1011 of 2005, received unfavorable reports from the House Economic Matters Committee.

**Cross File:** None.

**Information Source(s):** Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts), Office of the Attorney General (Consumer Protection Division), Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 12, 2007  
ncs/jr

---

Analysis by: T. Ryan Wilson

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510