

Path: Home Page > Main Menu > Supervisory and Decision-Making Business Company

The control of compliance with obligations in the dissemination of commercial communications was initiated on the basis of 18 initiatives received by the Office. The messages were sent via e-mail messages and contained offers of commission for recommending the services of the liquidation company and offers of the services of the liquidation company, as well as encouraging visitors to visit websites intended to directly support the services offered. The inspected person did not respond in any way to the notification of the start of the inspection or to the repeated calls for comments, he did not cooperate in the inspection. For failure to cooperate, she was fined CZK 50,000. Based on a technical analysis of the electronic headers of the e-mail messages in question containing commercial communications, as well as the content of these communications and the Office's own findings, it was found that the inspected person is the person on whose behalf the commercial communications are sent. The Office also evaluated the information provided by the addressees of the commercial messages themselves, who stated in their complaints that they had never given consent to the sending of commercial messages to the sender, nor were they his customers or registered users. Some complainants also clearly documented that they had previously refused to receive commercial communications. The audited person did not provide any evidence during the inspection, and therefore did not prove consent (legal titles) to sending commercial communications to the e-mail addresses in question and thus committed a breach of the obligation stipulated in § 7 paragraph 2 of Act No. 480/2004 Coll., i.e. the obligation to use electronic contact details for the purpose of disseminating commercial communications by electronic means only in relation to users who have given their prior consent. The Office further concluded that there was also a violation of § 7 paragraph 4 letter b) of Act No. 480/2004 Coll., because the commercial communication did not contain a clear indication of the person on whose behalf the communication is being carried out. taking into account the fact that, in the case of 3 e-mail addresses, commercial messages were sent more than once, and in the case of 4 e-mail addresses, commercial messages were sent even after their users had demonstrably refused to receive commercial messages, and further to the time it took to disseminate commercial messages communication was running out (9 months).

ContextLocation: Document folders > Site map > Main menu > Supervisory and decision-making activities > Completed inspections > Inspections for 2019 > Unsolicited commercial communications - 2nd half-year > Business companyView current documents | document archive | documents including the archive