



www.lsc.ohio.gov

# OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Office of Research  
and Drafting

Legislative Budget  
Office

S.B. 145  
133<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly

## Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

[Click here for S.B. 145's Bill Analysis](#)

**Version:** As Introduced

**Primary Sponsor:** Sen. Burke

**Local Impact Statement Procedure Required:** No

Jessica Murphy, Budget Analyst

### Highlights

- The costs for the Office of the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Section to investigate and enforce civil violations are likely to be minimal at most annually and potentially offset to some degree by the collection of civil penalties credited to the Consumer Protection Enforcement Fund (Fund 6310).
- There could be a very small number of additional offenders sentenced to a state prison, which would result in a minimal annual increase in the institutional operating expenses of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- There may be a negligible annual increase in locally collected state court costs credited to the Indigent Defense Support Fund (Fund 5DY0) and the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 4020).
- The number of violations for local criminal and civil justice systems to adjudicate is likely to be relatively small with any additional costs minimal at most annually. Revenue in the form of court costs, fees, and fines may offset those costs to some degree.

### Detailed Analysis

The bill creates four new offenses that generally prohibit a person "knowingly" using specified electronic means to transmit false information of a specified nature regarding a telephone number or exchange or caller identification. It also makes violations of its prohibitions an unfair or deceptive act or practice subject to the remedies available under the existing Consumer Sales Practices Law (CSP Law).

### Criminal penalties

Violations of the bill's prohibitions are most likely to be applicable in circumstances where, under current law, an individual may be charged with identity fraud or

telecommunications fraud. Depending upon the circumstances present, a violation of either of these existing offenses is a felony of the fifth, fourth, third, second, or first degree.

The bill may make it easier for prosecutors to file charges and secure convictions for conduct involving the transmission of false information regarding a telephone number or exchange or caller identification than otherwise might have been the case under current law. In addition, offenders could be subject to sanctions that are more serious.

Conversations with the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association indicate that violations of the bill's prohibitions will create few, if any, new criminal cases. This suggests that any additional costs that counties may incur annually to investigate, prosecute, and sanction violators will largely be absorbed by existing staff and resources. Related revenues in the form of fines, fees, and court costs collected from offenders will be minimal annually.

Any increase in costs incurred by the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) will result from:

- Certain offenders sentenced to a prison term that might otherwise not have been arrested, successfully prosecuted, and so sentenced; and
- Certain offenders sentenced to a prison term for similar conduct under existing law and practice sentenced to a longer prison term under the bill.

It would appear, however, that the number of offenders affected annually by these changes will be relatively small, and that any resulting increase in DRC's annual GRF incarceration costs would be unlikely to exceed minimal. The marginal annual cost for DRC to incarcerate a few additional offenders is between \$3,000 and \$4,000 per offender.

At the state level, the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 4020) and the Indigent Defense Support Fund (Fund 5DY0) may experience a negligible annual gain in court cost revenue. The state court costs total \$60 for a felony divided as follows: \$30 to Fund 5DY0 and \$30 to Fund 4020. The table below lists the new offenses created by the bill, including the potential fine and prison term.

Sentences and Fines for Bill's New Criminal Offenses			
Offense	Felony Level	Fine	Prison Terms
Theft or conversion of a telephone number or exchange	5 <sup>th</sup> Degree	Up to \$2,500	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 months definite
Theft or conversion of a telephone number or exchange against a person in a protected class	4 <sup>th</sup> Degree	Up to \$5,000	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 months definite
Providing misleading caller identification information	4 <sup>th</sup> Degree	Up to \$5,000	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 months definite
Providing misleading caller identification information against a person in a protected class	3 <sup>rd</sup> Degree	Up to \$10,000	9, 12, 18, 24, 30, or 36 months definite

## **Exemption**

Under the bill, an individual who uses a telephone number that is identified as “unknown” or “blocked” or if they leave a message that includes their identity is exempt from the new offenses.

## **Civil remedies**

Currently, there are two remedies available for handling violations of the CSP Law. The first such remedy is available to the Attorney General, who is authorized to investigate violations; seek a declaratory judgment, an injunction, or other equitable relief; or organize and bring a class action. The second remedy permits a private individual to initiate a civil action.

It is uncertain how many consumers will elect to pursue a civil remedy without the assistance of the Attorney General. It is expected to be small, as these consumers would, most likely, report a complaint to the Attorney General’s Office initially and then allow the Consumer Protection Section, funded with money appropriated from the Consumer Protection Enforcement Fund (Fund 6310) and the GRF, to seek a resolution to the complaint. However, the actual number of cases would most likely be relatively small, as, under current practice, the Attorney General would try to settle the issues surrounding violations prior to seeking any formal legal action. For example, the violators could simply agree to cease their conduct, and assuming they do so, the Attorney General’s Office would stop incurring investigative and legal expenses. The Attorney General would seek court action against a violator as a last resort if they perceive that the violator is receiving a pattern of consumer complaints. The additional costs for the Attorney General, if any, are likely to be no more than minimal annually.

Assuming a less formal negotiating strategy does not work, the Attorney General’s Office could bring an action requesting that a court of common pleas issue a declaratory judgment, a temporary restraining order, or an injunction in order to persuade violators to cease their offending behavior. The court is permitted to impose a civil penalty of: (1) not more than \$5,000 for each day of violation of a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, or a permanent injunction, and (2) not more than \$25,000 for each violation of the CSP Law. The civil penalties will be distributed in the following amounts: three-fourths, or 75%, to the state’s Fund 6310, and one-fourth, or 25%, to the treasury of the county where the Attorney General’s action is brought. The timing and magnitude of this potential revenue stream is uncertain.