UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

In his Opposition, Crosby argues that FTC's proposed ban on the sale of credit repair products and services "would be a violation of my First Amendment Right to freedom of speech." Oe60Tj11.2rst Amendme

interest." Id.1

The FTC's proposed ban on advertising or selling credit repair products and services is valid because of the government's substantial interest in preventing deceptive advertising. *See United States v. Readers Digest Ass'n*, 464 F. Supp. 1037, 1051 (D. Del. 1978) ("The Government's interest in preventing the use of deceptive advertising is a legitimate and important one."). The proposed ban directly advances this interest and is sufficiently tailored in light of Defendant's pervasive misrepresentations and continued invo

¹ The prohibition need not be the *least* restrictive means.

forth in the proposed order is narrowly tailored to the circumstances of this case.

Nonetheless, the FTC now proposes modified order language that prohibits false and misleading representations that are not protected speech. *See Miller v. Stuart*, 117 F.3d 1376, 1382 (11th Cir. 1997) (noting that "[t]he government may completely ban false and inherently misleading commercial speech").

Section I of the FTC's modified Proposed Order provides for a total ban on Defendant's advertising, marketing, promoting or sale of credit repair services. As noted above, such a ban is valid because of the government's substantial interest in preventing deceptive advertising and Crosby's extensive and continued use of misleading advertising for credit repair services. *See Gill*, 265 F.3d at 957.

In Section II, the FTC no longer proposes a total ban on credit repair products, but instead prohibits certain claims that are false. As explained in the FTC's Motion for Summary Judgment, assertions that consumers can improve their credit scores "into the 700s in as little as 30 days" or "remove any or all negatives" are false and deceptive. *See* Mot. Summ. J. at 10-14. Additionally, Crosby has advised individuals to obtain a Taxpayer Identification Number or Employer Identification Number to use in lieu of that person's Social Security Number for the purpose of concealing adverse credit information. For instance, in an email to Ronald L. Wray, Crosby states that his credit repair program will provide instructions on how to obtain "a NEW 9-Digit Number that can be used for building credit with credit cards, bank loans, mortgage loans, auto loans ect. [sic]." Ex. 2. p.2. Advising an individual to obtain a number to use in lieu of a Social Security number for

applications for credit is a common credit repair scam that is specifically prohibited by Section 404(a)(2) of the Credit Repair Organizations Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1679b. Because all of these claims are false or concern unlawful activity, they do not enjoy Constitutional protection. *See Central Hudson*, 447 U.S. at 563-64 ("The government may ban forms of communication more likely to deceive the public than inform it, or commercial speech related to illegal activity."); *FTC v. Stefanchik*, 2004 WL 5495267, *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 12, 2004) ("The law is well settled that, once speech is deemed to be false, misleading and commercial, it is not constitutionally protected."). Accordingly, the Court should prohibit Defendant from making these claims in any manner.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court grant its Motion for Summary Judgment against Defendants RCA Credit Services, LLC and Rick Lee Crosby, Jr.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James L. Chen___

Peter Lamberton K. Michelle Grajales James L. Chen Federal Trade Commission 601 N.J. Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001

Telephone: (202)326-3274;(202)326-3172;

(202) 326-2659

Facsimile: (202) 326-3768 E-Mail: plamberton@ftc.gov; mgrajales@ftc.gov; jchen2@ftc.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, James L. Chen, hereby certify that on May 4, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's Affidavit in Opposition To Plaintiff's Dispositive Motion for Summary Judgment on the Court's ECF system and served *pro se* Defendant Rick Lee Crosby Jr. by Federal Express at 10426 65th Avenue North, Seminole, FL 33772.

____/s/_James L. Chen____

James L. Chen Federal Trade Commission 601 New Jersey Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001

Tel: (202) 326-2659 Fax: (202) 326-3629 Email: jchen2@ftc.gov Attorney for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission