

In the Matter of Staffordshire Property Management, LLC

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CONSENT ORDER TO AID PUBLIC COMMENT

The Federal Trade Commission (“Commission”) has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement containing a consent order as to Staffordshire Property Management, LLC and Aaron Fischer (“respondents”).

The proposed consent order (“order”) has been placed on the public record for 30 days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After 30 days, the Commission will again review the order and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw the order or make it final.

This matter involves the respondents’ use of non-disparagement provisions in consumer form contracts in the course of processing the applications of prospective tenants to rent residential properties that respondents manage. The complaint alleges that the respondents violated Section 2(c) of the Consumer Review Fairness Act (“CRFA”) by offering to consumers form contracts that contained non-disparagement provisions made void by Section 2(b) of the CRFA. The CRFA defines a form contract as a contract with standardized terms, used in the course of selling or leasing goods or services, and imposed on an individual without a meaningful opportunity for such individual to negotiate the standardized terms.

The order includes injunctive relief that prohibits these alleged violations and fences in similar and related conduct involving the use of contract terms that prohibit, restrict, penalize, or transfer rights in consumer reviews or evaluation of the respondents, their goods, or their services. The CRFA authorizes the Commission to seek civil penalties for knowing violations, but the complaint does not allege that the respondents’ violations were knowing, and the order does not provide for monetary relief.

Part I prohibits, in the sale or leasing of any good or service, the respondents from: offering to any prospective customer a contract, or offering to any customer a renewal contract, that includes a review-limiting term; requiring that a customer accept such a term as a condition of the respondents’ fulfillment of their obligations under contracts entered into before the effective date of the order; or attempting to enforce or assert the validity of such a term in customer contracts entered into before the effective date of the order. Part I would not require that the respondents publish or host the content of any person, affect any other legal duty of a party to a contract, or affect any cause of action arising from the breach of such duty.

Part II requires the respondents to notify customers via letters or emails, and via their web site, that the non-disparagement provisions in their form contracts are void and cannot be enforced, and that customers who entered into contracts with those provisions can publish their honest reviews about the respondents, even if their comments are negative.

Part IV requires the respondents to file compliance reports with the Commission, and to notify the Commission of bankruptcy filings or changes in company structure that might affect compliance obligations.

Part V contains recordkeeping requirements for personnel records, consumer contracts, communications with consumers threatening any legal action relating to any review; and court filings and the company's discovery responses in legal actions over consumer reviews, as well as all records necessary to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance with the order.

Part VI contains other requirements related to the Commission's monitoring of the respondent's order compliance.

Part VII provides the effective dates of the order, including that, with exceptions, the order will terminate in 20 years.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the order, and it is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the complaint or order, or to modify the order's terms in any way.