## **Legislative Analysis**



CHILD PROTECTION REGISTRY

Phone: (5)

Mitchell Bean, Director Phone: (517) 373-8080 http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa

House Bill 5663

Sponsor: Rep. David Palsrok

**Committee: Energy and Technology** 

Complete to 6-1-04

## A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 5663 AS INTRODUCED 3-18-04

The bill would create the "Michigan Children's Protection Registry Act" to do the following:

- Require the Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG) to establish and operate a "Child Protection Registry" on which a person or school could register contact points (e.g., e-mail addresses, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers) belonging to a minor or to which a minor might have access.
- Prohibit a person from sending to a registered contact point a communication that advertised a product or service that a minor is prohibited by law from purchasing or that contained material that is harmful to minors.
- Require a person who wanted to send such a communication to pay a fee set by DLEG to verify compliance with the registry.
- Prohibit the release of information contained on the registry.
- Prescribe criminal penalties for violations and allow a recipient, a person through whose facilities the illegal communications were transmitted, or the attorney general to bring a civil action against a violator.
- Fund the registry's operation completely from the fees, fines, and civil penalties collected by DLEG under the proposed act.

<u>Child Protection Registry.</u> The bill would require DLEG to establish and operate, or contract with a third party to establish and operate, the child protection registry. A person with control of a contact point belonging to a minor, or to which a minor could have access, could register that contact point with DLEG. Schools and other institutions or entities primarily serving minors also could register and make one registration for all of their contact points.

The registry would have to be fully operational by January 1, 2005, or 90 days after the bill's effective date, whichever was later. The registry would not be subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

<u>Prohibited Communications</u>. A person could not send, cause to be sent, or conspire with a third party to send a communication to a contact point that had been registered for more than 30 calendar days if the communication advertised a product or service that a minor is prohibited by law from purchasing; or contained or advertised material that is harmful to minors as defined by the rules promulgated under the proposed act. A sender would have to establish procedures to ensure that no communication was sent to a registered contact point. The consent of a minor or third party to receive the communication would not be a defense to a violation.

A person who desired to send such a communication would have to use a mechanism as required by DLEG to verify compliance with the registry and remove registered contact points for any communications. The sender would have to pay DLEG a fee for access to the verification mechanism. The department would have to set the fee based on the number of contact points the person checked. The mechanism and fee would have to be established by the rules promulgated under the proposed act.

The bill specifies that the registry's operation would be funded completely from the fees, fines, and civil penalties collected by the department under the proposed Act. If the amount of funds collected for a fiscal year exceeded the registry's administration costs, the excess amount would have to be deposited into the General Fund.

<u>Registry Information</u>. A person could not release to another person information concerning people or provide access to addresses contained on the registry, except as provided by the bill, and could not sell or use the registry for any reason other than to meet the bill's requirements. A person could not access or attempt to access the registry except as provided by the act.

<u>Penalties and Damages</u>. A violation would be a misdemeanor punishable by one of the following:

- -- For the first violation, imprisonment for up to six months and/or a maximum fine of \$5,000.
- -- For the second violation, imprisonment for up to one year and/or a maximum fine of \$10,000.
- -- For the third and any subsequent violation, imprisonment for up to two years and/or a maximum fine of \$25,000.

Additionally, all money and other income, including all proceeds earned but not yet received by a defendant from a third party as a result of the defendant's violations, and all computer equipment, all computer software, and all personal property known by the

owner to have been used in a violation would be subject to lawful seizure by a law enforcement officer and forfeiture by the state.

A civil action could be brought by a person who received a communication in violation of the act, a person through whose facilities the communications were transmitted, or the attorney general. In each action, a recipient or the attorney general could recover either actual damages or the lesser of the following: \$5,000 per communication received by a recipient or transmitted through the e-mail service provider, or \$250,000 for each day that the violation occurred.

The bill specifies that a person would not violate the new act solely by being an intermediary between the sender and recipient in the transmission of communication that violated the act. It would be a defense to either an action that the communication was transmitted accidentally. The burden of proving that the communication was sent accidentally would be on the sender.

Legislative Analyst: Chris Couch

<sup>■</sup> This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.