

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 6245

As Reported by Senate Committee On:
Judiciary, February 3, 2010

Title: An act relating to prohibited practices of collection agencies.

Brief Description: Concerning prohibited practices of collection agencies.

Sponsors: Senators Kline, Carrell and Rockefeller.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Judiciary: 1/19/10, 2/03/10 [DPS].

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Majority Report: That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6245 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Kline, Chair; Regala, Vice Chair; Gordon, Hargrove and Kohl-Welles.

Staff: Karen Campbell (786-7448)

Background: Collection agencies are prohibited from engaging in certain practices when attempting to collect debts. For example, a collection agency cannot threaten a debtor with impairment of the debtor's credit rating if a claim is not paid. Credit agencies cannot harass a debtor. Harassment is presumed if the collection agency:

- contacts a debtor more than three times in a single week;
- contacts a debtor at the debtor's place of employment more than one time in a single week; or
- contacts the debtor or spouse at his or her place of residence between 9:00 p.m. and 7:30 a.m.

Collection agencies are required to provide a debtor with an itemization of the amounts the collection agency will seek to collect on the claim. This information must be included in the first claim notice sent to the debtor and includes the following:

- the amount owing on the original obligation at the time it was received by the collection agency;
- interest or service charge, collection costs, or late payment charges, if any, added by the original creditor before it was received by the collection agency;

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

- interest or service charge, if any, added by the collection agency customer or assignor after it was received by the collection agency;
- collections costs, if any, the collection agency is attempting to collect;
- attorneys' fees, if any, that the collection agency is attempting to collect on its behalf or on the behalf of the customer or assignor; and
- any other charge or fee that the collection agency is attempting to collect on its behalf or on behalf of the customer or assignor.

Collection agencies have to include this information in subsequent notices if the amount owed changes. If a debtor disputes a claim in writing, the collection agency must forward a copy of the dispute to the credit reporting bureau.

Summary of Bill: The bill as referred to committee not considered.

Summary of Bill (Recommended Substitute): A collection agency is not required to itemize the amounts contained in a judgment against the debtor in a subsequent claim notice unless the amount includes post judgment interest. Post judgment interest, if claimed, must be itemized. When the debtor provides the collection agency with written notice disputing the claim, the collection agency must inform the credit reporting bureau, by written or electronic means of the dispute, and create a record of the dispute and when the notification was provided.

A collection agency may communicate with a debtor more than three times in a single week only if the collection agency is responding to a communication from the debtor. A collection agency can not deceptively threaten the debtor with impairment of their credit rating if a claim is not paid.

A collection agency is allowed to presume that a call to a telephone is received in the local time zone to which the area code of the number called is assigned for landline numbers, unless the collection agency has reason to believe otherwise. If the number is a toll free, a collection agency may presume that a call to a telephone is received in the local time zone of the debtor's last known place of residence, unless the collection agency has reason to believe the telephone is located in a different time zone.

Gender inclusive nomenclature is used.

EFFECT OF CHANGES MADE BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE (Recommended Substitute As Passed Committee): The effect of the substitute bill significantly narrows the changes to the prohibited practices statute.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Committee/Commission/Task Force Created: No.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony on Proposed Substitute As Heard in Committee:

PRO: The notice requirements should be simplified. Judgments do not need to be itemized because the amounts are clearly set forth in the judgment. A collection agency should not have to itemize a change in amount if it occurs solely because of the accrual of interest. Because of the technology used in processing claims, it is difficult for collections agencies to determine how much interest has accrued when subsequent notices are sent. It is difficult to know when a debtor is at work when a collection agency calls a cell phone number. For this reason, a call to a cell phone should not constitute a call to a debtor at their place of employment. The law should be changed to reflect the fact that cell phone usage is common and prevalent in today's society. Collection agencies need guidance regarding what constitutes a week to ensure that the term is applied uniformly.

CON: Harassment by debt collectors is sky rocketing. The act would allow the debtor to be buried by mail and for debtors to be harassed as long as they were at the collection agency's place of business. Itemization in all claim notices is necessary because debtors need to know what they owe and how the collection agency calculated the amount. This helps a debtor determine whether or not he or she should contest the amount. Federal law regulating debt collection may conflict with the news sections of the act that address cell phone usage and the definition of communicate or communication.

Persons Testifying: PRO: Kevin Underwood, Bob Polus, Washington Collector's Association.

CON: Bruce Neas, Columbia Legal Services.