

## FTC Delays Enforcement of Amended Negative Option Rule

May 13, 2025

On May 9, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) [voted unanimously](#) to delay enforcement of most portions of its amended Negative Option Rule (rule) by 60 days, shifting the compliance deadline for these portions from May 14 to July 14, 2025. Once fully enforced, the rule will impose [sweeping new requirements](#) on businesses offering subscription-based services, including enhanced consent, disclosure and cancellation obligations.

While the rule itself remains in effect, according to a [Statement of the Commission](#), the decision is an enforcement policy choice, not a legal stay. The statement emphasized that the delay is intended to give businesses additional time to account for “the complexity of compliance.”

### Key takeaways

**The rule is still technically in force.** The FTC’s decision does not alter the legal status of the rule – it merely postpones the agency’s own enforcement efforts. Additionally, the amendments to the rule that prohibit misrepresentations of material facts in selling any good or service with a negative-option feature went into effect on January 19, 2025, and are currently enforceable.

**The delay may permit the Eighth Circuit to hand down a decision regarding the rule before the FTC begins to enforce it.** The FTC’s decision comes as the US Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit considers a legal challenge to the rule brought by several industry groups. The delay may allow the court to issue a ruling before the new compliance date, potentially resolving key questions about the rule’s legality.

**Alignment with California’s ARL updates.** The new July 14 enforcement date brings the FTC’s timeline closer to the July 1, 2025, enforcement date for [California’s updated Automatic Renewal Law](#) (ARL). Businesses operating nationally will need to harmonize compliance strategies across overlapping federal and state regimes.

### What’s next?

According to the FTC’s statement, “[s]tarting July 14, 2025, regulated entities must be in compliance with the whole of the Rule because the Commission will begin enforcing it. Of course, if that enforcement experience exposes problems with the Rule, the Commission is open to amending the Rule to address any such Problems.” As neither house of Congress has introduced a resolution, it appears unlikely that the rule will be nullified under the Congressional Review Act, but the legal landscape remains fluid, and businesses should monitor the Eighth Circuit proceedings closely as a decision could alter the regulatory calculus.

For questions about how the amended Negative Option Rule, California’s ARL or other laws regulating automatic renewal offers may affect your business, please contact any member of the Cooley team listed below.

*Cooley special counsel Brett Weinstein also contributed to this alert.*

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our [legal notices](#).

---

## Key Contacts

Scott Dailard San Diego	sdailard@cooley.com +1 858 550 6062
Travis LeBlanc Washington, DC	tleblanc@cooley.com +1 202 728 7018
Obrea Poindexter Washington, DC	opoindexter@cooley.com +1 202 776 2997
Michelle L. Rogers Washington, DC	mrogers@cooley.com +1 202 776 2227
Brett R. Weinstein New York	bweinstein@cooley.com +1 212 479 6306
Dana N. Levin New York	dlevin@cooley.com +1 212 479 6192

---

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.

