

of Error and request for investigative documents, which it failed to do. I find that Respondent breached its contract with Claimant.

2. Violation of the Utah Consumer Sales Practices Act

For the same reasons that Respondent was in breach of contract, I find that Respondent engaged in deceptive and unconscionable acts or practices in violation of the Utah Consumer Sales Practices Act.

3. Violation of the EFTA – Improperly Declined Transaction

Based on the evidence submitted, and Respondent’s failure to timely provide copies of the Electronic Funds Transfer Report to Claimant’s Counsel, I find that Respondent violated the EFTA by improperly declining a transaction.

4. Violation of the EFTA – Response time – Notice of Error & Investigative Documents

Claimant’s counsel sent Respondent a Notice of Dispute and Error, as well as a request for investigative documents. I find Claimant’s Notice of Error sufficient and unambiguous in that Respondent was able to identify the error in question. In addition, I find the request for investigative documents sufficient under 12 C.F.R. 205.11 (b)(1)(iii), as requests for investigative documents are not subject to the same requirements of Notices of Error.

Regardless of whether the hold was originally justified on Claimant’s Card, Claimant and his counsel both reported a valid Notice of Error, and Respondent had a duty to timely and properly respond under both the contractual agreement, and the EFTA, which it failed to do.

I find that Respondent violated the procedural requirements of the EFTA by failing to timely respond to the Notice of Error, and failing to provide copies of the investigative documents requested.

Respondent alleges that Claimant’s arbitration demand is frivolous and is brought in bad faith and for purposes of harassment. Based on the evidence submitted, I find that it is not. Respondent failed to both respond to Claimant’s counsel’s Notice of Dispute and Error sent before the arbitration demand was filed, as well as failed to timely provide copies of Claimant’s Card EFT report requested before Claimant filed the Opening Brief.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Claimant, DENNIS COUNCIL, is hereby awarded damages in the amount of \$557.00, the actual balance in Claimant’s Card account at the time the hold was placed.
2. Claimant, DENNIS COUNCIL, is awarded statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000.00, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1693 (m).
3. Claimant’s attorney fees are hereby awarded in the amount of \$3,000.00, for pursuit of the case. The hours were adjusted to be appropriate in accordance with the reasonable

amount of time which this Arbitrator finds should have been spent on this case by the Claimant's lawyer.

4. Respondent, GREEN DOT BANK'S, claims presented herein are DENIED.
5. All damages and fees awarded to Claimant, DENNIS COUNCIL, shall be borne by Respondent, GREEN DOT BANK, and paid within thirty (30) days.
6. The administrative fees of the AAA totaling \$1,000.00, and the compensation of the arbitrator totaling \$750.00, shall be borne as incurred.

This Award is in full settlement of all claims submitted in this Arbitration. All claims not expressly granted herein are hereby denied.

November 26, 2019

Robert L. Cowles

Date

Robert L. Cowles, Arbitrator