



Arnold & Porter

CPSC DESK REFERENCE

SECTION 15 OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

Eric A. Rubel, Michelle F. Gillice, S. Michael Gentine, Jessica L. Wang,
Jessica D. Gilbert and Kelsie Sicinski

April 2026



Arnold & Porter has leading practices representing manufacturers, importers, and online and traditional retailers in matters before the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) and arising under state consumer protection laws, and in consumer class actions. Our experienced team, which includes a former CPSC General Counsel, a former CPSC compliance attorney, and a former political and legal advisor to two CPSC commissioners, regularly assists clients in matters covering the breadth of CPSC actions — recalls, enforcement actions, and regulatory matters — as well as in litigation that can arise from product safety matters. We work with clients throughout a product’s life cycle to minimize product safety risks and identify and address potential concerns at an early opportunity, starting before new and novel products go to market and continuing as feedback is received based on consumer use.

For more information, go to <https://www.arnoldporter.com/en/services/capabilities/practices/consumer-product-safety> or contact any of the people below.

Key Contacts



Michelle F. Gillice

Partner
Washington, D.C.
michelle.gillice@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.6589



Eric A. Rubel

Senior Counsel
Washington, D.C.
eric.rubel@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.5749



S. Michael Gentine

Counsel
Washington, D.C.
mike.gentine@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.5052



Jessica L. Wang

Senior Attorney
Washington, D.C.
jessica.wang@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.5792



Jessica D. Gilbert

Senior Associate
Washington, D.C.
jessica.gilbert@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.5091



Kelsie Sicinski

Associate
Washington, D.C.
kelsie.sicinski@arnoldporter.com
+1 202.942.6003

This Desk Reference is intended to be a general summary of the law and does not constitute legal advice. You should consult with counsel to determine applicable legal requirements in a specific fact situation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



Overview	1
Duty to Report to CPSC Under Section 15 of the CPSA	2
What Is a “Consumer Product”?	2
Reporting a Failure to Comply with a Rule, Regulation, Ban, or Standard Under Any Act Enforced by CPSC	3
Reporting a Defect That “Could Create” a “Substantial Product Hazard”	4
Reporting an “Unreasonable Risk of Serious Injury or Death”	6
Timing of the Reporting Obligation.....	7
Who Must Report to CPSC Under Section 15 and What to Report	7
Confidentiality	8
Objective Reporting Criteria: CPSC’s “Working Model” (Retailer Reporting Program)	9
Routes to a Recall	9
Preliminary Determination Process	9
Fast Track Program and Reporting and Recall Trends	15
Penalties and Injunctive Relief for Late Reporting... 16	
Civil Penalties	17
Factors in Size of Penalty	18
Civil Penalty Settlement Data and Trends	21
Litigated Section 15 Penalties	23
Injunctive Relief	25
Liquidated Damages.....	25
Other Section 15 Enforcers	26
Criminal Penalties	26
Conclusion	28

For an online version and future updates of this Desk Reference, visit <https://www.arnoldporter.com/en/services/capabilities/practices/consumer-product-safety>.

Overview

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or the Commission) is a small federal agency with a big job: protecting consumers from unreasonable risks of injury associated with the use of thousands of types of consumer products. The most recent appropriation for CPSC was for fiscal year (FY) 2024 for \$150.975 million, and since then the agency has been funded through Continuing Resolutions. While a current employee count is not available, the FY 2026 budget request calls for salaries for 459 full-time employees (FTEs),¹ down from about 545 employees in FY 2024.² CPSC is tiny by federal government standards in terms of budget and employees, and the agency uses safety data submitted by companies pursuant to the notification requirements under Section 15 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), detailed below, to help carry out the agency's mandate.³

The Commission has submitted for FY 2026 a budget request of \$135 million, which is almost \$16 million — or about 10% — lower than its FY 2025 funding level.⁴ CPSC's FY 2026 Performance Budget Request to Congress notes that the reduced funding level aligns with a proposal in President Trump's FY 2026 Budget to reorganize and transfer the functions of the CPSC to a division of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Transfer of CPSC's functions would take an act of Congress, and CPSC's Budget Request recognizes that transfer would be "[c]ontingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation."⁵ As of this writing, no full appropriations bill has been enacted for FY 2026, and most of the federal government, including CPSC, continues to be operating on a Continuing Resolution.

Congress created CPSC as an independent commission, which means that it does not report to the President either directly or through any department or agency of the federal government. By statute, the CPSC can have up to five Commissioners, one of whom serves as Chair, and only three of whom can be from the same political party. CPSC's Chair and Commissioners are appointed by the President for seven-year terms with the advice and consent of the Senate.⁶

At the time of this writing, the Commission has only one Commissioner, Acting Chairman Peter Feldman (Republican). In May 2025, President Trump removed CPSC's three Democratic Commissioners without citing cause.⁷ The remaining Commissioner, Republican Douglas Dziak, resigned in August 2025 after voting, with Feldman, to delegate virtually all Commission authority to the Chairman, thereby attempting to address the Commission's loss of a quorum.^{8,9} The legality of the delegation has not, to date, been addressed by a court. Feldman's term ends in October 2026, and he could serve for up to an additional year without being renominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

This Desk Reference first explains the reporting requirements imposed by Section 15 of the CPSA, including the broad scope of CPSC's jurisdiction, and then discusses routes to a product safety recall, reporting and recall trends, and civil and criminal penalties for late reporting.

Duty to Report to CPSC Under Section 15 of the CPSA

Under CPSA Section 15, a manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer of a product that is subject to CPSC’s jurisdiction and that is distributed in commerce must inform CPSC “immediately” upon the receipt of information that “reasonably supports the conclusion that such product —

- fails to comply with an applicable consumer product safety rule or with a voluntary consumer product safety standard upon which the Commission has relied under section 9 [15 U.S.C. § 2058];¹⁰
- fails to comply with any other rule, regulation, standard, or ban under [the CPSA] or any other Act enforced by the Commission;¹¹
- contains a defect which could create a substantial product hazard...; or
- creates an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death.”¹²

The only exception to the reporting requirement is if the “firm”¹³ “has actual knowledge that the Commission has been adequately informed” of such defect, failure to comply, or risk,¹⁴ though, as discussed below, CPSC has interpreted this provision narrowly. The statute and CPSC’s interpretive regulations with respect to subparts (3) and (4) above do not provide a “bright line” as to when a duty to notify CPSC arises. The thrust of CPSC’s regulations is to encourage companies to report early and often.¹⁵

What Is a “Consumer Product”?

The CPSA defines a “consumer product” as:

any article, or component part thereof, produced or distributed (i) for sale to a consumer for use in or around a permanent or temporary household or residence, a school, in recreation, or otherwise, or (ii) for the personal use, consumption or enjoyment of a consumer in or around a permanent or temporary household or residence, a school, in recreation, or otherwise....¹⁶

The CPSA excludes various products from the definition of a “consumer product,” including motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, aircraft, boats, pesticides, tobacco, firearms, food, drugs, cosmetics, and medical devices — the safety of most of which is regulated by other agencies.¹⁷ The CPSA also excludes “any article which is not customarily produced or distributed for sale to, or use or consumption by, or enjoyment of, a consumer.”¹⁸ In addition, buildings and structures are not “consumer products” under the statute.¹⁹

Companies rarely have challenged CPSC’s assertion of jurisdiction in court, and only a few decisions have addressed the meaning of the statutory term “consumer product.” In one case, an administrative law judge (ALJ) considered whether CPSC had jurisdiction over allegedly defective fire sprinkler heads.²⁰ The ALJ in *In re Central Sprinkler Corp.* found that CPSC had jurisdiction over the sprinkler heads even though they were installed in commercial and industrial buildings, they were marketed primarily to professional contractors, and consumers did not actively use the product.²¹

The ALJ focused on the fact that the sprinkler heads were produced and sold as distinct articles of commerce, and found that a “consumer product” need not be available “off the shelf” at the retail level or used in consumers’ homes.²² The ALJ further found that “products which are primarily or exclusively sold to industrial or individual buyers would

be included within the definition of consumer product so long as they were produced or distributed for use of the consumers.”²³ Finally, the ALJ found that the “weight of judicial opinion” determined that the “focus of the Act is directed towards consumers’ exposure to hazards associated with products.”²⁴ Similarly, courts have focused on the exposure of consumers to harm in finding that CPSC has jurisdiction over aluminum branch circuit wiring systems,²⁵ aerial tramways at state fairs,²⁶ refuse bins,²⁷ and amusement park rides.²⁸

The *Central Sprinkler* decision is consistent with CPSC’s historically broad interpretation of the term “consumer product” to include articles used by or for the enjoyment of consumers or having an effect on consumer safety. For example, CPSC has asserted jurisdiction over escalators and elevators, reasoning that consumers could be exposed to risks associated with those products. CPSC explained in a 1978 Advisory Opinion, “Congress’ overriding concern in enacting the CPSA was to provide one agency with jurisdiction over products which could expose consumers to unreasonable risks of injury, regardless of where that exposure occurred.”²⁹ Consistent with that logic, CPSC has asserted jurisdiction to reach many seemingly “commercial” products, such as:

- vending machines;³⁰
- cement-asbestos wallboard used in construction;³¹
- blown-in fiberglass insulation;³²
- fire alarm equipment;³³
- supermarket freezer cases;³⁴
- child-resistant packaging of drug products distributed for institutional use;³⁵ and
- stadium light poles at schools and municipal fields.³⁶

In practice, however, it can be difficult in some cases to predict where CPSC will draw the jurisdictional line, as CPSC has not articulated a bright-line test to rule out products that CPSC likely would agree are outside its jurisdiction but yet arguably are for the use or enjoyment of consumers or could affect their safety. Further, the scope of products that can expose consumers to potential harm is so broad that this fails to be a viable test for determining what is a consumer product. For example, defective equipment used in a chemical plant could explode, exposing consumers in the vicinity of the plant to harm. Yet such industrial equipment could not reasonably be viewed as a “consumer product” under the CPSA.

Reporting a Failure to Comply with a Rule, Regulation, Ban, or Standard Under Any Act Enforced by CPSC

The Section 15 reporting requirement is triggered upon the receipt of information that “reasonably supports the conclusion” that any product over which CPSC has jurisdiction and that is distributed in commerce fails to comply with “any ... rule, regulation, standard, or ban” under any Act enforced by the Commission, e.g., the CPSA, Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA), Flammable Fabrics Act (FFA), Poison Protection Packaging Act (PPPA), and Refrigerator Safety Act.³⁷ Thus, CPSC has pursued late-reporting penalties not only for consumer products, but also for drugs that lacked child-resistant packaging as required under the PPPA.³⁸

Reporting a Defect That “Could Create” a “Substantial Product Hazard”

Due to the lack of objective criteria to determine when information “*reasonably supports the conclusion*” that a product “contains a defect which *could* create a substantial product hazard,”³⁹ this reporting requirement, along with the duty to notify concerning “unreasonable risks” of serious injury or death (discussed in the next section), can present significant challenges for companies seeking to comply with the law. Thus, it is not surprising that most CPSC late-reporting penalty cases include allegations that the company should have reported earlier under either or both of those two provisions. Accordingly, as a company evaluates whether it has obtained reportable information, it may be helpful to consider the expression that hindsight is 20/20, which may come to mind when a company finds itself defending a late-reporting penalty investigation after conducting a recall, despite the company’s belief that it exercised good-faith judgment in real time.

Factors to Consider: The CPSA defines a “substantial product hazard,” in relevant part, as “a product defect” that “creates a substantial risk of injury to the public.”⁴⁰ The Act, as amplified by CPSC’s interpretive regulation on Section 15 reporting, identifies the following factors that the Commission and staff will consider in assessing whether a product defect (or noncompliance) “present[s] a substantial risk of injury”:⁴¹

- pattern of defect;⁴²
- number of defective products distributed in commerce;⁴³
- severity of the risk;⁴⁴ or
- other considerations.⁴⁵

These factors are “set forth in the disjunctive,” and CPSC has asserted that any one of them alone can result in a finding that a product defect (or noncompliance) creates a substantial product hazard.⁴⁶

CPSC’s regulations provide that, as in the product liability context, a product can be defective with respect to its design, manufacture, or warnings.⁴⁷ Factors to be considered in assessing whether a product is defective include, “as appropriate”:

- the utility of the product involved;
- the nature of the risk of injury that the product presents;
- the necessity for the product;
- the population exposed to the product and its risk of injury;
- the obviousness of such risk;
- the adequacy of warnings and instructions to mitigate such risk;
- the role of consumer misuse of the product and the foreseeability of such misuse;
- the Commission’s own experience and expertise;
- the case law in the area of products liability; and
- other factors relevant to the determination.⁴⁸

The Commission has cautioned companies that “[r]eliance on one factor alone cannot negate a reporting obligation if other factors, as applied, reasonably support the conclusion that a defect exists.”⁴⁹

CPSC instructs companies to consider all reasonably available information to determine “whether it suggests the existence” of a product defect or unreasonable risk.⁵⁰ Examples of such information include engineering, quality control, or production data; information about safety-related production or design changes; information from an independent testing laboratory; product liability suits and claims for personal injury or property damage; consumer complaints; information received from CPSC; and information received from other firms.⁵¹ Further, CPSC’s interpretive regulations provide that, if a company has information indicating that a defect in a consumer product “has caused, may have caused, or contributed to the causing, or could cause or contribute to the causing of a death or grievous bodily injury,” that information “must be reported, unless the subject firm has investigated and determined that the information is not reportable.”⁵²

In addition, when considering whether information “reasonably supports the conclusion” that a product contains a defect that “could create” a substantial product hazard, a company may not be able to rely on past experience with CPSC as a predictor of whether CPSC will claim there is a duty to notify under Section 15. In the *Spectrum Brands* litigation, the government sought civil penalties, in part, for alleged late reporting that certain coffeemakers contained a defect that presented a risk of burns and lacerations.⁵³ The court found that the threshold for reporting is “a lower standard than whether a substantial product hazard *actually* exists.”⁵⁴ Therefore, the court reasoned that the fact that CPSC had closed two prior investigations into other models of Spectrum’s coffeemakers without seeking recalls did not preclude a late-reporting penalty. According to the court, “even if multiple cases involve products of similar type or design or present similar risks of injury, a number of factors, including the nature of the defect, as well as the number and severity of injuries, could reasonably lead to different results in analogous cases.”⁵⁵ The court also found that the defendant could not point to an “established CPSC policy regarding a threshold for substantial product hazard involving defective coffeemakers” that would relieve the defendant from its reporting obligation concerning possible defects in the cafes’ handles.⁵⁶

Relevance of Voluntary and Mandatory Standards: CPSC has addressed the relevance of voluntary and mandatory standards in determining whether a product presents a substantial product hazard. CPSC may consider compliance or noncompliance with such standards as relevant factors in determining whether a substantial product hazard exists. However, the Commission does not view compliance with such standards as necessarily obviating the need to notify CPSC under Section 15.⁵⁷ Further, according to the Commission, “[c]ompliance with a voluntary standard does not preclude a determination that a substantial product hazard exists.”⁵⁸ With respect to hazards addressed by mandatory standards, the Commission strikes a somewhat softer tone, stating that, while compliance does not “provide [a] safe harbor for the failure to report, ... the Commission appreciates that it is generally inappropriate to hold firms to a higher standard for products retroactively.”⁵⁹

Non-U.S. Information: Neither Section 15 nor CPSC’s interpretive regulations specify the geographic scope of the information to be considered in determining whether there is a duty to notify. However, CPSC has asserted in a policy statement that firms should evaluate not only information about products sold in the United States, but also information about the same or substantially similar products sold outside of the United States “that may be relevant to defects and hazards associated with products distributed within the United States.”⁶⁰ Consistent with that policy statement, CPSC’s Section 15 online reporting portal

instructs reporting companies to “include those incidents and injuries that occurred outside the United States.”⁶¹

Substantial Product Hazard List: CPSA Section 15(j) authorizes CPSC to “specify, by rule, for any consumer product or class of consumer products, characteristics whose existence or absence shall be deemed a substantial product hazard,” if CPSC determines that:

- “such characteristics are readily observable and have been addressed by voluntary standards;” and
- “such standards have been effective in reducing the risk of injury from consumer products and that there is substantial compliance with such standards.”⁶²

CPSC has issued rules establishing that certain hairdryers, children’s upper outerwear with drawstrings at the hood or neck, seasonal and decorative lighting products, and extension cords are deemed to be substantial product hazards.⁶³ Most recently, CPSC has added stock and custom window coverings that fail to have certain “readily observable characteristics” to the 15(j) substantial product hazard list.⁶⁴ CPSC has explained its view of the impact of a 15(j) rule: “Although a 15(j) rule does not establish a consumer product safety standard, placing a consumer product on this substantial product hazard list has certain consequences. A product on the ‘substantial product hazard’ list is subject to the reporting requirements of Section 15(b) of the CPSA”⁶⁵ and “shall be refused entry into the United States.”⁶⁶

Reporting an “Unreasonable Risk of Serious Injury or Death”

With respect to reporting information that “reasonably supports the conclusion” that a product creates an “unreasonable risk of serious injury or death,” CPSC considers the term “serious injury” to include “grievous” injuries (e.g., mutilation, amputation, severe burns and/or electrical shock, loss of important bodily functions, and debilitating internal disorders),⁶⁷ as well as injuries requiring hospitalization for medical or surgical treatment, “fractures, lacerations requiring sutures, concussions, injuries to the eye, ear, or internal organs requiring medical treatment, and injuries necessitating absence from school or work of more than one day.”⁶⁸ In addition, CPSC advises that chronic or long-term health effects, as well as “immediate” injuries, should be considered.⁶⁹

CPSC’s regulations provide that the duty to notify is triggered by information that reasonably supports the conclusion that such a “risk” is presented, even if “no final determination of the risk is possible.”⁷⁰ Thus, “[t]he Commission expects firms to report if a reasonable person could conclude given the information available that a product creates an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death.”⁷¹ Moreover, CPSC has stated that companies “should not wait for such serious injury or death to actually occur before reporting.”⁷²

The issue of whether a risk is “unreasonable” involves a balancing of factors, including the product’s utility, the nature and extent of the risk, and the availability of alternative designs or products that could eliminate the risk.⁷³ Information that may indicate the presence of an unreasonable risk includes “reports from experts, test reports, product liability lawsuits or claims, consumer or customer complaints, quality control data, scientific or epidemiological studies, reports of injury, information from other firms or governmental entities, and other relevant information.”⁷⁴

Timing of the Reporting Obligation

Companies are required to notify CPSC “immediately” upon receiving information that triggers a reporting obligation. CPSC interprets “immediately” to be within 24 hours after a company obtains the requisite information.⁷⁵ If a company is uncertain about whether information is reportable, it may investigate the matter. CPSC presumes that 10 working days are sufficient to conduct “a reasonably expeditious investigation,” unless the company “can demonstrate that a longer period is reasonable.”⁷⁶ Moreover, according to the Commission, companies may not wait until a defect is established scientifically before reporting the potential issue under Section 15. Rather, CPSC “urge[s]” companies to “report if in doubt as to whether a defect could present a substantial product hazard” or as to “whether a defect exists.”⁷⁷

A company need not report if it has “actual knowledge that” CPSC “has been adequately informed” of a potential hazard.⁷⁸ However, CPSC has interpreted this exception narrowly.⁷⁹

Who Must Report to CPSC Under Section 15 and What to Report

The duty to notify CPSC under Section 15 applies to manufacturers, importers (which are included within the definition of “manufacturer” under the CPSA), distributors, and retailers⁸⁰ — in CPSC’s view, this covers essentially all persons in the chain of distribution.

CPSC’s interpretive regulation identifies information that should be included in an “Initial Report” under Section 15(b) — identification of the product; the name and address of the manufacturer, if known; the nature and extent of the possible defect; the nature and extent of the risk of injury; and the name and address of the person notifying the Commission.⁸¹ A more extensive list of information is then specified for a “Full Report” — e.g., how and when the company learned of the issue; the total number of units at issue; the number of units in possession of the manufacturer, distributors, retailers, and consumers; when the product was manufactured, imported, distributed, and sold at retail; any pertinent changes that have been or will be made to the product; details of any corrective action plan; and a description of how the product was marketed and distributed.⁸² Further, CPSC staff typically asks reporting companies for additional information, such as copies of all consumer complaints, claims, and lawsuits related to the reported issue; test reports, analyses and evaluations of the reported issue; relevant engineering drawings and change notices; product samples in their retail packaging; and samples of returned products that demonstrate the reported issue.⁸³ If a company does not propose to conduct a recall, the Full Report should explain why the company believes no corrective action is warranted.

Retailers and distributors may provide less information in Section 15 reports than is required of manufacturers and importers. A retailer or distributor that is not also the manufacturer or importer of a product may satisfy its Section 15 notification obligation by submitting to CPSC only the Initial Report information.⁸⁴ The Commission staff may then request additional information from the product’s manufacturer or importer, and in some cases may also request a Full Report from the retailer/distributor. However, as discussed further below, recent actions and statements by CPSC indicate an increased focus on enforcing Section 15 against large e-commerce platforms that facilitate distribution of consumer products by third-party sellers to consumers.⁸⁵

In practice, CPSC typically pursues recalls through a U.S. manufacturer or importer, rather than through a retailer or distributor that did not also import the product. However, retailers and distributors have recalled products when, for example, the manufacturer or importer

was insolvent, had ceased operations, or was not located in the United States.⁸⁶ Further, civil penalties have been assessed against retailers as well as manufacturers for alleged late reporting under Section 15.⁸⁷

Confidentiality

Under CPSA Section 6(b)(5), information submitted to the Commission under Section 15 is exempt from public disclosure by the agency under the Freedom of Information Act or otherwise, absent one of the following exceptions:

1. CPSC files an administrative complaint seeking to require a recall;
2. CPSC accepts “a remedial settlement” (i.e., a voluntary recall) in writing;
3. the person who submits the information agrees that it may be disclosed; or
4. CPSC “publishes a finding that the public health and safety requires public disclosure” with less than 15 days’ notice.⁸⁸

In addition, CPSA Section 6(b)(5) excludes from protection information pertaining to a product about which CPSC either (a) files a complaint in federal district court alleging that a consumer product presents an “imminent hazard” under Section 12 of the CPSA, or (b) has “reasonable cause to believe” violates a “consumer product safety rule or provision under [the CPSA] or similar rule or provision of any other Act enforced by the Commission.”⁸⁹

Thus, absent one of these exceptions or exclusions, a Section 15 report that does not result in a recall remains confidential. In addition, even if a recall is conducted, confidential trade secret, commercial, or financial information is exempt from disclosure under Section 6(a).⁹⁰

CPSC regularly applies the exclusion from Section 6(b)(5) protection for information about products that CPSC has “reasonable cause to believe” violate a mandatory standard. In particular, CPSC posts on its website information about products for which CPSC has sent Notices of Violation to such products’ importers or manufacturers, including identifying the firm, product, violation, and requested remedial action.⁹¹

Objective Reporting Criteria: CPSC’s “Working Model” (Retailer Reporting Program)

In early 2005, CPSC staff announced a “working model” (also referred to as the Retailer Reporting Program) through which companies seek to satisfy the Section 15 reporting requirements by reaching agreement with the staff on objective reporting criteria. By reporting specified information on an ongoing basis, participating companies have sought protection from late-reporting penalties for alleged failure to timely notify CPSC based upon information submitted under this program. A key objective of the program is to help CPSC, as a data-driven agency, to identify emerging product hazards sooner than would otherwise be possible.

Participating companies reached agreement with CPSC on the reporting triggers, the data to be submitted, the reporting format, and the frequency of reporting. Upon receiving information from retailers, CPSC may follow up through either the Office of Epidemiology, which tracks data for trends, and/or the Office of Compliance. Thus, for example, the Office of Compliance may investigate the reported issue, ask either the retailer or the manufacturer to submit a Full Report, and potentially seek a corrective action.

Currently, a handful of companies are in the program. It has been many years since CPSC admitted any additional companies into the program, notwithstanding requests by companies to participate. CPSC's FY 2022 Operating Plan included as a priority activity "continuing to implement agency approach to advanced analytics, including application to retailer reporting data," but did not otherwise indicate activity with this program.⁹² Similar language does not appear in CPSC's Operating Plans for FY 2023, 2024, 2025, or 2026, and we are not aware of any indications that CPSC will reopen the program in the near future to additional companies.

Routes to a Recall

Nearly all consumer product recalls are conducted "voluntarily" by companies in cooperation with CPSC. The two most common routes to a voluntary recall are through (a) CPSC's preliminary determination process, and (b) the agency's Fast Track Recall Program, both of which are described below. In addition, while exercised infrequently, CPSC has the authority to seek to compel recalls through administrative litigation and imminent hazard litigation, also discussed below.

Preliminary Determination Process

When a company notifies CPSC under Section 15, either at the company's initiative or in response to a request for information from the CPSC staff, the company may assert that a recall is not warranted. In such cases, the staff, acting under authority delegated by the Commission, conducts an investigation to assess the hazard and the need for a corrective action. CPSC classifies risks as follows:

- Class A Hazard:** Exists when a risk of death or grievous injury or illness is likely or very likely, or serious injury or illness is very likely.
- Class B Hazard:** Exists when a risk of death or grievous injury or illness is not likely to occur, but is possible, or when serious injury or illness is likely, or moderate injury or illness is very likely.
- Class C Hazard:** Exists when a risk of serious injury or illness is not likely, but is possible, or when moderate injury or illness is not necessarily likely, but is possible.⁹³

If the CPSC staff determines that the risk is a Class A, B, or C hazard, the staff then sends the company a letter stating the agency's "preliminary determination" that the product presents a substantial product hazard and requesting that the company conduct a recall.⁹⁴ The company may then agree "voluntarily" to do so, as occurs in most cases upon receipt of a preliminary determination letter, or may continue to oppose the need for a recall. If the staff concludes instead that no further action is required — because the staff concludes either that the product contains a defect that does not rise to the level of a substantial product hazard or that there is insufficient information to conclude a defect exists — the staff's practice is to send the company a letter, which typically states that, based on the available information, the staff is not taking action under Section 15 and will assess any new information to determine if further action should be taken to protect the public.

If the company agrees to conduct a voluntary recall, the company negotiates the terms of the corrective action plan with CPSC staff. The CPSC staff, acting under authority

delegated to the Executive Director by the Commission in 1981, may accept corrective action plans concerning Class B or C hazards, while the Commission retained its authority to accept corrective action plans for Class A hazards.⁹⁵ According to Commissioner Marietta Robinson, between 2000 and 2016, the staff did not determine that any hazards were Class A hazards.⁹⁶ Effective April 2016, the Commission further limited the delegation of authority to the staff, requiring any corrective action plan concerning a product that has been associated with a death to be voted on by the Commission, regardless of the hazard classification and even if the death is unrelated to the hazard for which the recall is being conducted.⁹⁷

Other Measures

The staff may try to persuade a company to conduct a “voluntary” recall by notifying the company that, absent agreement to do so, CPSC plans to issue a press release to warn the public of the alleged hazard through what is commonly referred to as a “unilateral” press release or “product safety warning.” CPSC’s use of these announcements has increased significantly in recent years, from just two such unilateral warnings in calendar year 2020 to 120 in calendar year 2025.

In some cases, companies voluntarily recall products after CPSC issues a public warning.⁹⁸ In other cases, however, particularly those involving smaller, less-conspicuous companies or non-U.S. manufacturers selling products on third-party internet platforms, CPSC’s unilateral warnings have not resulted in recalls.⁹⁹ In rare cases, a unilateral warning has been followed by CPSC’s filing an administrative complaint to compel a recall. The most recent example of this was in 2022, when, shortly after issuing a unilateral press release warning consumers about the risk of suffocation presented by Leachco infant loungers, CPSC filed an administrative complaint to compel Leachco to recall the infant loungers, as discussed further below.¹⁰⁰ In addition to unilateral press releases, the staff has on occasion, over the manufacturer’s objection, notified retailers of an alleged product hazard and requested that they stop selling the product.¹⁰¹

Before issuing a unilateral warning about a company’s product, CPSC must take “reasonable steps” to ensure that the information it discloses about a company’s product is “accurate,” “fair in the circumstances,” and reasonably related to effectuating the purposes of [the CPSA].¹⁰² CPSC must also provide advance notice to the company before issuing the statement and provide an opportunity to comment or object.¹⁰³ CPSC can reduce the statutory 15-day notice period if CPSC “publishes a finding that the public health and safety requires a lesser period of notice.”¹⁰⁴ A company can file a lawsuit to seek to block CPSC’s disclosure on grounds that CPSC has not taken the required “reasonable steps.”¹⁰⁵

Administrative Litigation to Require a Recall

Absent an agreement by a company to conduct a recall that is acceptable to the CPSC staff, the staff may seek Commission approval to initiate an administrative proceeding under Section 15 of the CPSA to seek to require a manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer to provide public notice that a product presents a substantial product hazard, and to require a company to repair, replace, or refund the purchase price of the item at issue — i.e., conduct a recall.¹⁰⁶ Such cases are initiated by the filing of an administrative complaint against the company. Notably, the confidentiality provisions of Section 6(b) do not apply to such complaints,¹⁰⁷ which thus are publicly available and typically announced by CPSC through issuance of a press release.¹⁰⁸ Once such an action has been filed, CPSC may also seek a preliminary injunction in federal district court to restrain the distribution of the

product pending completion of the administrative proceeding to require a recall.¹⁰⁹ The administrative proceeding is held before an ALJ, who serves as the Presiding Officer.¹¹⁰ Following discovery and the opportunity for a hearing in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 554, the ALJ files an Initial Decision with the Commission.¹¹¹

The Initial Decision becomes final 40 days after issuance absent either (a) an appeal to the Commission (which can be filed by either the company or CPSC Complaint Counsel), or (b) issuance of an order by the Commission to review the Initial Decision.¹¹² If the Commission then reviews the Initial Decision and orders a recall, the company can seek judicial review of the Commission's order by a federal district court, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).¹¹³

During the agency's history, CPSC staff has infrequently resorted to filing an administrative complaint to seek a recall, and litigation to judgment of such proceedings has been rarer still.¹¹⁴ Indeed, prior to 2021, the CPSC staff had filed only a single administrative complaint between 2013 and 2020. In addition, although the staff filed four administrative complaints in 2012 — concerning certain infant recliners and high-powered magnets — those 2012 actions were preceded by a gap of nearly 11 years since CPSC had filed another administrative complaint.

Two recent administrative litigation matters are discussed below.¹¹⁵

Leachco: In February 2022, the CPSC filed a complaint against Leachco, alleging that the company's "Podster" infant lounging pillows present a substantial product hazard, claiming that it is foreseeable that caregivers would allow infants to sleep unattended on the pillows and that their design can allow an infant to move into a position in which the infant's breathing is obstructed, potentially leading to suffocation.¹¹⁶ The Complaint alleged the Podsters had been associated with two fatalities.¹¹⁷ Leachco's Answer denied the Complaint's allegations of defect and substantial product hazard.¹¹⁸ In an Initial Order issued July 3, 2024, the ALJ dismissed the Complaint, finding that Complaint Counsel did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Podsters are defective, and that even if a defect were found to exist, Complaint Counsel failed to demonstrate that such defect "creates or has created a substantial risk of injury to the public."¹¹⁹ Notably, the ALJ found that although Complaint Counsel had put forward — through extensive expert testimony concerning potential for misuse — a "hypothesis" of how the Podster could create a substantial risk of injury to infants, Complaint Counsel "failed to address the real-world, experiential data invalidating its theories about the existence of a defect or a substantial product hazard."¹²⁰ Complaint Counsel appealed the decision, asking the Commission to set aside the ALJ's Memorandum Opinion and Initial Order in its entirety.¹²¹ Leachco filed a cross-appeal limited to the admission of certain evidence.¹²²

Following completion of the appeal briefing in November 2024, there was no movement on the matter until March 16, 2026, when the Commission (consisting of a single Commissioner, Acting Chairman Peter Feldman) issued an "Order Vacating [the] Initial Decision, Dismissing [the] Complaint, and Returning [the] Case to Adjudication to Close the Case."¹²³ In issuing the Order, Acting Chairman Feldman wrote that, "when circumstances change, the Commission may need to reassess its priorities and redeploy agency resources to higher-impact enforcement efforts or other emerging safety issues."¹²⁴ The referenced changed circumstances included:

- CPSC's 2024 adoption of a mandatory standard for the Podster and similar products that "mandates detailed performance requirements intended to address

the very types of suffocation and asphyxiation risks identified” in the *Leachco* matter;¹²⁵

- Leachco’s “ceas[ing] manufacturing the Podster” and the Commission’s view that “it would be illegal for the company to resume manufacturing a version of the Podster that does not comply with the [above-referenced] performance requirements;”¹²⁶
- The fact that any final recall order “would be limited in its practical effect to the approximately 180,000 Podsters manufactured by Respondent between 2009 and 2022,” a number the Order noted the Commission could not rely on “[g]iven the passage of time since those products were manufactured;”¹²⁷ and
- The CPSA provision that, “where a product has been in a consumer’s possession for one year or more, the Commission may require only a refund of the purchase price, less a reasonable allowance for use.”¹²⁸

The Order concluded that “the Commission finds that this proceeding is no longer in the public interest and that dismissal of this matter is appropriate,” noting, however, that “the Commission’s exercise of its enforcement discretion [in dismissing the matter] based on the particular circumstances presented here... does not constitute a determination on the merits of the allegations in the administrative complaint.”¹²⁹

Amazon: In its July 2021 Complaint against Amazon, CPSC staff alleged that certain products that were listed for sale by third-party sellers on Amazon.com through Amazon’s Fulfilled by Amazon (FBA) program (the “FBA Products”) are defective and pose a risk of serious injury or death to consumers. The Complaint further alleged that, because Amazon “acts as a distributor” of the FBA products, Amazon is legally responsible to recall them.¹³⁰ The Complaint alleged that Amazon acts as a “distributor” of its FBA products by:

- a) receiving delivery of FBA consumer products from a merchant with the intent to further distribute the product;
- b) holding, storing, sorting, and preparing for shipment FBA products in its warehouses and fulfillment centers; and
- c) distributing FBA consumer products into commerce by delivering FBA products directly to consumers or to common carriers for delivery to consumers.¹³¹

In response, Amazon argued that it is a “third-party logistics provider” and not a “distributor” of FBA products, as those terms are defined in the CPSA, because it does not take title to, manufacture, or sell such products.¹³² The CPSA defines “third-party logistics provider” as an entity that “solely receives, holds, or otherwise transports a consumer product in the ordinary course of business but who does not take title to the product,” and expressly excludes third-party logistics providers from the definition of “distributor.”¹³³ The CPSC argued, however, that “[b]y controlling and directing the entire customer relationship from the sale of an FBA product through its potential return, Amazon does far more than ‘solely’ transport products.”¹³⁴

The Complaint further alleged that although Amazon took a number of unilateral actions after CPSC staff notified Amazon of the hazards presented by the specified products — including stopping the sale of certain products, and notifying and offering refunds to

consumers who purchased certain of the specified products — those actions “are insufficient to remediate the hazards posed by the Subject Products and do not constitute a fully effectuated Section 15 mandatory corrective action ordered by” CPSC.¹³⁵ The Complaint alleged that “[a] Section 15 order requiring Amazon to take additional actions in conjunction with the CPSC as a distributor is necessary for public safety,” and asked the Commission to order Amazon to take specific actions pursuant to Sections 15(c)(1) and 15(d)(1), including, among others: to provide public notice in consultation with CPSC and offer adequate remedies to consumers, facilitate the return and destruction of recalled products from consumers, and submit monthly progress reports.¹³⁶

Amazon, in turn, argued that the Complaint is moot based on the actions Amazon has already taken to stop sales of the products in question and provide direct notice and full refunds to all affected purchasers.¹³⁷ Amazon maintained that those remedial actions were sufficient, and that the CPSA does not require that all corrective actions or consumer notifications be pre-approved by the CPSC, because the Commission has the power to issue mandatory remedial orders only under certain conditions — i.e., if the Commission determines that a product “presents a substantial product hazard and ... notification is required in order to adequately protect the public,” or that ordering a specific remedy would be “in the public interest.”¹³⁸

In orders dated January 19, 2022, and July 10, 2023, the presiding ALJ found that Amazon meets the statutory definition of the term “distributor” for products sold through Amazon’s FBA program,¹³⁹ and required Amazon to take many of the actions requested by Complaint Counsel, including issuing consumer notifications and refunds conditioned on verification of product destruction, and submitting monthly progress reports to CPSC.¹⁴⁰ Both parties appealed elements of the decision to the Commission.

On July 29, 2024, the Commission issued a Decision and Order unanimously finding that the FBA products (comprising approximately 400,000 items) presented “substantial product hazards” as defined by the CPSA and that Amazon was a “distributor” for purposes of the CPSA.¹⁴¹ The Commission also determined that notices and refunds that Amazon had unilaterally provided to purchasers were not sufficient to protect the public from the potential hazards presented by the products, including because Amazon notified only direct purchasers and did not issue a public announcement; the notices to purchasers “downplayed the severity of the hazard” and did not include the term recall; and did not incentivize consumers to stop using the products and remove them from their homes.¹⁴² Accordingly, the Commission ordered Amazon to take certain notification and corrective actions.¹⁴³

A significant aspect of the Decision and Order is the Commission’s finding that Amazon acted as a “distributor” within the meaning of the CPSA and thus was subject to the CPSA’s requirements when it received, stored, and delivered the products through the FBA program. The CPSA defines a “distributor” as a “person to whom a consumer product is delivered or sold for purposes of distribution in commerce, except that such term does not include a manufacturer or retailer of such products,”¹⁴⁴ and the Commission found that Amazon “fit squarely within” the CPSA’s definition with respect to the products at issue because FBA participants delivered their products to Amazon for the purposes of distribution to customers who ordered through Amazon.com.¹⁴⁵ Amazon received, stored, and delivered the products sold through the FBA program.¹⁴⁶ Further, the Commission emphasized the “far-reaching control Amazon exercises in its Fulfilled by Amazon program,” including control over: product eligibility; pricing and payments; customer

communications and support; approval of returns and exchanges; and disposition of returned merchandise.¹⁴⁷

On January 17, 2025, the Commission voted unanimously to issue a Final Decision and Order regarding the steps the agency was directing Amazon to take to address the alleged hazards.¹⁴⁸ The Commission's Order requires that Amazon:

- Post press releases for each of the recalls on its own site “on the date that CPSC publishes the recall releases on [the agency’s] website;”
- Send one round of direct email notifications to purchasers;
- Post recall information on purchasers’ “Your Orders” pages;
- Send one round of notice to the FBA participants that sold the recalled products;
- Keep the recall releases posted for at least five years;
- Provide a full refund to any consumer who provides proof of having destroyed or disposed of one of the recalled products; and
- Submit monthly progress reports on recall activity and keep pertinent records for a minimum of five years.¹⁴⁹

Notably, given that one of the central issues in the litigation was whether Amazon is a “distributor” of products sold through Amazon’s FBA program, the Decision specifies “that the recall releases must identify Amazon as the recalling firm and distributor of the products.”¹⁵⁰

On March 14, 2025, Amazon filed a Complaint in federal district court¹⁵¹ asking that the Order be vacated. Amazon and CPSC have both moved for summary judgment. Amazon’s motion contended that Amazon is not a distributor of products through the FBA program and that CPSC’s action violates the CPSA, the APA, and the Constitution.¹⁵² Amazon’s constitutional argument challenged the Commission’s structure as an independent agency, and cites the Supreme Court’s decision allowing President Trump’s termination of the three Democratic commissioners to stand.¹⁵³

In its motion, CPSC argued that the Commission acted appropriately and within its authority in issuing the Final Decision and Order. Regarding the argument that the Commission is unconstitutionally structured, CPSC — through DOJ, which is itself making that same argument in the proceeding Amazon quoted in its memorandum¹⁵⁴ — responded that, “[a]t most, the proper remedy is severance of the removal protection,” not vacating the Commission’s Order.¹⁵⁵

On November 5, 2025, Amazon filed a memorandum opposing CPSC’s motion for summary judgment and supporting Amazon’s own motion. Per the court’s Scheduling Order, CPSC had been due to file a similar memorandum on December 10. However, on December 8, the parties jointly moved to extend the deadline for that memorandum to February 11, 2026, stating that “the parties are discussing whether it might be possible to resolve this matter without further litigation.”¹⁵⁶ The court granted that motion on December 9. The parties filed a similar motion on January 22, 2026, to further extend the deadline to April 1, and the case remained pending before the District Court as of this writing.

Imminent Hazard Litigation to Require a Recall

In lieu of filing an administrative complaint, CPSC also has authority to proceed directly to a federal district court under Section 12 of the CPSA to seek such “temporary or permanent relief as may be necessary to protect the public” with respect to a product that the court determines presents an “imminent and unreasonable risk of death, serious illness, or severe personal injury.”¹⁵⁷ In addition, through the Consumer Product Safety Act of 2008 (CPSIA), Congress expanded CPSC’s power to address imminent hazards: if CPSC determines that a product presents an imminent hazard and files an action under Section 12, the Commission may order the product’s manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer to cease distribution and provide public notification of the hazard.¹⁵⁸

CPSC has not exercised this expanded authority and indeed has not filed any Section 12 action since the 1980s.¹⁵⁹ However, in its FY 2024 Operating Plan, CPSC unanimously adopted an amendment offered by Commissioner Feldman “[d]irecting timely assessment for actions against imminently hazardous consumer products.”¹⁶⁰ Further, in its FY 2026 Operating Plan, CPSC indicates that it “will pursue litigation and imminent hazard actions where appropriate, particularly in cases involving firms unwilling to conduct a voluntary recall” as a priority activity.¹⁶¹

Fast Track Program and Reporting and Recall Trends

Under CPSC’s Fast Track program, companies agree to announce publicly a corrective action plan acceptable to the staff within 20 business days after notifying CPSC. In exchange, CPSC does not send the company a “preliminary determination” letter, as described above.¹⁶² Reporting companies benefit by avoiding receipt of a preliminary determination letter, which plaintiffs would seek to use in product liability or consumer protection litigation, as well as by having a means to implement recalls more quickly and efficiently. CPSC benefits by not having to devote its limited resources to conducting a more detailed investigation of a potential safety hazard.

Chart: Section 15 Reporting and Recall Trends

On November 6, 2025, Acting Chairman Peter Feldman announced that CPSC had set an agency record for most recalls and product safety warnings announced in a single calendar year.¹⁶³ According to publicly available data on CPSC’s website, as of December 31, 2025, CPSC announced 422 voluntary recalls and 120 unilateral safety warnings in 2025.¹⁶⁴ The previous record had been set in 2007 when CPSC announced 458 voluntary recalls. Approximately 204 of the recalls announced in calendar year 2025 were due to violations of a federal safety standard.¹⁶⁵

By fiscal year, approximately 140 out of 333 recalls in FY 2025 and 166 out of 357 recalls in FY 2024 were conducted under the Fast-Track program.¹⁶⁶


Previously, in November 2023, Commissioner Feldman announced that there had been over 300 recalls in FY 2023, and provided a breakdown of the recalls by category, including FYs 2022 and 2023.¹⁶⁷

Fiscal Year	Defect Recalls	Regulatory Recalls	Fast Track Recalls	Total Recalls
2023	62	83	167	312
2022	36	69	155	260

Available recall and reporting data for the period FY 2013 to FY 2021 is shown below.¹⁶⁸

Fiscal Year	Section 15 Reports			Total Recalls
	Total	Non-Fast Track	Fast Track	
2021	388	221	167	235
2020	375	209	166	240
2019	546	329	217	261
2018	632	393	239	264
2017	508	296	212	285
2016	569	305	264	329
2015	554	302	252	287
2014	505	293	212	301
2013	546	330	216	305

As of February 2, 2026 CPSC’s live chart for Top Recall Hazards indicates that fire, burn and heat-related explosions were the most common reasons for product recalls over the last five years.¹⁶⁹



Penalties and Injunctive Relief for Late Reporting

Late reporting under Section 15(b) presents a risk of civil and criminal penalties as well as injunctive relief, as discussed below.

Civil Penalties

The CPSA provides for civil penalties against manufacturers (defined to include importers), distributors, and retailers who “knowingly” fail to notify CPSC under Section 15(b).¹⁷⁰ The policy and purposes behind civil penalties include: deterring violations; providing just punishment; promoting respect for the law; promoting full compliance with the law; reflecting the seriousness of the violation; and protecting the public.¹⁷¹

What Is a “Knowing” Violation?

The CPSA defines “knowingly” as either “actual knowledge”¹⁷² or “presumed ... knowledge deemed to be possessed by a reasonable man who acts in the circumstances, including knowledge obtainable upon the exercise of due care to ascertain the truth of representations.”¹⁷³ Particularly when this definition of “knowingly” is combined with the language in Section 15 requiring notification upon receipt of information that “*reasonably supports the conclusion*” that a product “contains a defect which *could* present a substantial product hazard,”¹⁷⁴ the government has ample opportunity to second-guess decisions about whether, and if so, when, a duty to notify arises under Section 15. In practice, CPSC staff make such judgments after the product has been recalled for a specified hazard, which staff can seize upon to claim with hindsight that the company should have notified CPSC sooner about the safety issue.

Maximum Civil Penalty Amount: Effective August 14, 2009, the maximum civil penalty increased dramatically from \$8,000 per violation and \$1.825 million for a related series of violations,¹⁷⁵ to \$100,000 per violation and \$15 million for a related series of violations.¹⁷⁶ CPSC has since applied statutory cost-of-living adjustments, the most recent of which increased the maximum penalty to \$120,000 per violation and \$17.15 million for a related series of violations that occur after January 1, 2022.¹⁷⁷ CPSC has treated each unit of a product as a separate violation, so the potential penalty for a related series of violations can easily reach the statutory maximum.

Statute of Limitations: A five-year statute of limitations applies to actions seeking a civil penalty for failure to timely report to CPSC under Section 15(b).¹⁷⁸ The law states, in relevant part, that a government enforcement action for civil penalties “shall not be entertained unless commenced within five years from the date when the claim first accrued.”¹⁷⁹ The Supreme Court has interpreted this same statute of limitations provision in the context of an enforcement action by another government agency and held that “a claim accrues ‘when the plaintiff has a complete and present cause of action.’”¹⁸⁰ However, courts in two CPSC timeliness cases have ruled in favor of the government on this issue, finding that the statute of limitations begins to run only when a firm gains actual knowledge that the government is “adequately” informed of the risk.¹⁸¹

In *United States v. Michaels Stores, Inc.*, Michaels moved to dismiss, as time-barred, the government’s claim that the defendant had failed to timely notify CPSC of a risk of cuts from a glass vase that reportedly shattered while being handled. The defendant argued

that, because the government alleged that the duty to notify arose in 2008, the five-year period had expired by the time the lawsuit was filed in 2015.¹⁸² Instead, the court denied the motion, finding that there was a continuing violation of Section 15(b), which “began when Michaels obtained information regarding the vases’ defect in the expert report and continued until Michaels obtained actual knowledge that the Commission was adequately informed of the defect or risk of injury.”¹⁸³ On February 9, 2018, the parties settled the case for \$1.5 million, thereby avoiding trial and appeal of the statute of limitations decision.¹⁸⁴

Similarly, in *United States v. Spectrum Brands*, the court found that the reporting violation accrues “not when the company fails to report, but rather when its reporting obligation ends — that is, when it eventually reports or gains actual knowledge that the government is adequately informed.”¹⁸⁵ Accordingly, the court found that the government’s claim was timely, notwithstanding that it was filed more than five years after the government asserted that the duty to report first arose.¹⁸⁶ On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit affirmed the District Court’s judgment, holding that “the duty to report a potentially dangerous defect in a product so that the Commission can take appropriate action to protect consumers is necessarily an ongoing duty which, by the terms of Section 15(b), does not end until such time as the product’s maker, distributor, or seller either makes a report or actually knows the Commission has been properly informed.”¹⁸⁷

Factors in Size of Penalty

The CPSA requires the Commission to consider the following factors in determining the amount of a civil penalty to seek:

the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation, including the nature of the product defect, the severity of the risk of injury, the occurrence or absence of injury, the number of defective products distributed, the appropriateness of such penalty in relation to the size of the business of the person charged, including how to mitigate undue adverse economic impacts on small businesses, and such other factors as appropriate.¹⁸⁸

On March 31, 2010, CPSC published a Final Rule, effective on publication, interpreting the civil penalty factors.¹⁸⁹ CPSC explained the factors relevant to late-reporting penalties as follows:

Nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation: CPSC will consider “the totality of the circumstances surrounding a violation while recognizing that depending upon the case, the significance and importance of each factor may vary.”¹⁹⁰ Further, CPSC found that, unlike other factors discussed below, this factor permits consideration of “the seriousness and extent of a particular violation.”¹⁹¹

Nature of the product defect: CPSC will consider “the nature of the product defect associated with a CPSA violation ... [including] conditions or circumstances in which the defect arises” or the “nature of the substance associated with an FHSA violation.”¹⁹² In addition, the Final Rule acknowledges that a “product defect” may not be relevant for certain violations of the CPSA (for example, failing to supply a required certificate that a product complies with an applicable product safety rule), and that other factors would be considered in that circumstance.¹⁹³

Severity of the risk of injury: CPSC will consider “the potential for serious injury, illness or death (and whether any injury or illness required medical treatment including hospitalization or surgery),”¹⁹⁴ but rejected a proposal to forgo penalties where a risk is limited to a minor or moderate injury.¹⁹⁵ CPSC will also consider “the likelihood of injury; the intended or reasonably foreseeable use or misuse of the product; and the population at risk (including vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, or those with disabilities).”¹⁹⁶

The occurrence or absence of injury: CPSC “will consider whether injuries, illnesses, or death have or have not occurred with respect to any product or substance associated with a violation, and if so,” their number and nature.¹⁹⁷ CPSC declined to adopt a proposal to forgo penalties where there have been only minor injuries or no injuries at all. CPSC reasoned that a product could present a serious risk to consumers even if injuries have not occurred.¹⁹⁸

The number of defective products distributed: CPSC will consider “the number of defective products or amount of substance distributed in commerce.”¹⁹⁹ CPSC declined to draw a distinction under this factor based on whether consumers received such defective products, reasoning that this distinction is not set forth in the statute.²⁰⁰ However, while not addressed in the regulations or preamble, the extent to which products at issue were distributed to consumers or were identified and segregated before they could pose any risk could arguably be relevant to the “totality of the circumstances” or the “severity of the risk” in a given case. The Final Rule clarifies that this factor “will not be used to penalize a person’s decision to conduct a wider-than-necessary recall out of an abundance of caution,” including “situations where such a recall is conducted due to a person’s uncertainty concerning how many or which products may need to be recalled.”²⁰¹

The appropriateness of such penalty in relation to the size of the business of the person charged, including how to mitigate undue adverse economic impacts on small businesses: In evaluating a company’s size, CPSC will consider the “firm’s number of employees, net worth, and annual sales.”²⁰² In determining whether a small business can pay a proposed penalty, CPSC may consider any “relevant financial factors,” including liquidity factors (ability to pay short-term obligations); solvency factors (ability to pay long-term obligations); and profitability factors (return on investment).²⁰³ CPSC also noted that it is required to mitigate only “undue” impacts on small businesses, and the factors CPSC considers in determining whether impacts are undue “may include ... the business’s size and financial factors relating to its ability to pay.”²⁰⁴

In addition to discussing the statutory factors, CPSC identified the following nonexclusive list of factors that it may consider on a case-by-case basis:

Safety and compliance program or system: CPSC may consider whether, “at the time of the violation,” the company had in place “a reasonable and effective program or system for collecting and analyzing information related to safety issues,” including, for example, “incident reports, lawsuits, warranty claims, and safety-related issues related to repairs or returns.”²⁰⁵ CPSC also may consider whether the company “conducted adequate and relevant premarket and production testing of the product at issue; had a program in place for continued compliance with all relevant mandatory and voluntary safety standards”; and other appropriate factors.²⁰⁶ This emphasis on the internal controls in place at the time of an alleged violation is consistent with the staff’s position in the past that a company’s

actions in enhancing internal controls in response to an alleged violation are less important in assessing a civil penalty than the adequacy of internal controls that were in place at the time of the alleged violation.

History of noncompliance: CPSC “may consider whether or not a person’s history of noncompliance with” the laws or regulations enforced by CPSC “should increase the amount of the penalty.”²⁰⁷

Economic gain from noncompliance: CPSC “may consider whether a person benefitted economically from a failure to comply, including a delay in complying” with statutory and regulatory requirements.²⁰⁸

Failure to respond in a timely and complete fashion to the Commission’s requests for information or remedial action: CPSC “may consider whether a person’s failure to respond in a timely and complete fashion to requests from the Commission for information or for remedial action should increase a penalty.”²⁰⁹ The Final Rule clarifies that this factor “is intended to address a person’s dilatory and egregious conduct in responding to requests for information or remedial action sought by the Commission, but not to impede any person’s lawful rights.”²¹⁰ Again, this is consistent with the staff’s position in prior civil penalty negotiations that a company’s alleged failure to supply complete information to the staff in connection with a product safety investigation is relevant to the size of any penalty for late reporting. Moreover, there are separate enumerated offenses for misrepresenting the scope of products subject to an action required under Section 15 of the CPSA or making a material misrepresentation in the course of a CPSC investigation.²¹¹ CPSC leaves open which of these factors it may consider in a given case, and whether it may also consider other factors that are not listed in the regulation.

Just as important as the civil penalty factors that CPSC cites in the 2010 final regulations are the proposals that CPSC explicitly rejected. First, CPSC declined to adopt a proposal to seek civil penalties only in cases of “actual knowledge.” The Commission noted that while civil penalties are available under the CPSA only for violations committed “knowingly,” the statute defines “knowingly” to include both actual knowledge and “presumed” knowledge based on “knowledge deemed to be possessed by a reasonable man who acts in the circumstances, including knowledge obtainable upon the exercise of due care to ascertain the truth of representations.”²¹² Thus, in CPSC’s view, civil penalties may be appropriate even absent actual knowledge.

Second, CPSC declined to adopt a matrix or formula to set fines for various offenses and instead adopted a non-exhaustive list of factors that it will consider on a case-by-case basis in calculating civil penalties.²¹³

CPSC commissioners long have debated whether the Commission’s decision-making process on penalties should be enhanced. Commissioners Adler and Kaye, for their part, disputed criticisms that the civil penalty process lacks transparency or is indifferent to due process.²¹⁴ In particular, they rejected assertions that CPSC should “share more information about the facts and factors that enter into our valuations of civil penalties in order to permit the regulated community to understand the agency’s rationale in penalty cases,” arguing that the CPSA Section 6(b) protection against disclosure of certain information submitted pursuant to Section 15(b) makes it too onerous for CPSC to do so.²¹⁵ In addition, Commissioners Adler and Kaye argued against criticisms that firms in “cases

in which products associated with few injuries or relatively minor injuries have paid penalties substantially similar to those assessed against firms with products that have caused numerous injuries or relatively serious injuries.”²¹⁶ Commissioners Adler and Kaye noted that CPSC considers other factors in addition to the injury pattern, and that they were disinclined to consider the absence of injuries in penalty decisions:

We often see firms vigorously contesting timeliness claims by arguing that, notwithstanding the serious risks posed by a product’s defect, hindsight reveals that few injuries resulted from the defect, thereby removing any reason for a civil penalty. While we rejoice at the lack of injuries or fatalities in these cases, we find it hard to see why a civil penalty should be reduced simply because good fortune smiled on a company’s dangerous product.²¹⁷

Instead, Commissioners Adler and Kaye would have given greater weight to the severity of the risk of injury, regardless of whether that risk has materialized.²¹⁸

Civil Penalty Settlement Data and Trends

Historically, alleged failure to timely report under Section 15 of the CPSA has been the violation most frequently penalized by CPSC. As discussed below, recent negotiated settlements have included requirements for companies to review and report on compliance programs and internal controls, including internal audit requirements. Further, monetary penalties have increased substantially in recent years, including multiple settlements exceeding \$10 million and/or approaching the statutory maximum. The escalation reflects both increased maximum penalties authorized by the CPSIA and a push by CPSC leadership.²¹⁹ In 2021, in connection with resolution of criminal charges of willful failure to timely report to CPSC as required by Section 15, then-Chair Alexander Hoehn-Saric stated that “CPSC will use its authority to the fullest to keep American families safe,” and that “[f]ailing to report dangerous products puts consumers at an unnecessary risk and will not be tolerated.”^{220,221} Acting Chair Peter Feldman has also supported more aggressive use of the agency’s penalty authority, including criticizing a \$12 million settlement as “fall[ing] short of the maximum civil penalty that would have been appropriate in [that] case”²²² and directing CPSC staff to “require[] evidence of the financial condition of any firm asserting an inability-to-pay defense against civil penalty assessments and other obligations.”²²³

Between FY 2021 and January 2026, the median civil penalty settlement with CPSC for allegations of late reporting was \$12 million. In contrast, during FYs 2014-2019, the median such penalty settlement was \$3.5 million. Indeed, seven of the eight CPSC settlements from January 2023 to January 2026 have surpassed \$10 million. Further, almost all CPSC settlements for alleged late reporting since 2017 have well exceeded the penalties for late reporting in two of the three litigated penalty cases during that time: *Spectrum* case (\$821,675 - DOJ litigated verdict in 2017); *Michaels* case (\$1.5 million - settled with DOJ during litigation in 2018); *SunSetter* case (\$9.25 million - settled with DOJ during litigation in 2025).²²⁴

Fiscal Year	Late-Reporting Settlements in FY	FY Total	FY Median Settlement	FY Average Settlement
2026 (partial year)	2	\$25,650,000	\$12,825,000	\$12,825,000
2025	2	\$28,275,000	\$14,137,500	\$14,137,500
2024	1	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000
2023	4	\$52,325,000	\$13,650,000	\$13,081,250
2022	3	\$20,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$6,666,667
2021	2	\$19,950,000	\$9,975,000	\$9,975,000
2020	0	0	---	---
2019	2	\$4,850,000	\$2,425,000	\$2,425,000
2018	1	\$27,250,000	\$27,250,000	\$27,250,000
2017	4	\$19,900,000	\$4,925,000	\$4,975,000
2016	5	\$31,250,000	\$4,500,000	\$6,250,000
2015	9	\$24,400,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,711,111
2014	4	\$5,175,000	\$737,500	\$1,293,750

On January 27, 2026, CPSC published notice in the Federal Register of its first civil penalty settlement during the second Trump administration. The agency provisionally accepted a civil penalty settlement with The Clorox Company (“Clorox”) regarding a “Pine Sol”-brand liquid surface cleaning product Clorox had manufactured, imported, and sold between 2009 and 2022.^{225,226} The settlement includes CPSC staff’s allegations that company testing from among about 37 million units produced between January 2021 and September 2022 identified the bacteria *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, which CPSC staff alleges poses “a risk of serious infection that may require medical treatment” for “persons with weakened immune systems or external medical devices.”²²⁷ Specifically, CPSC staff alleges that, “[i]n early 2019, Clorox microbiologists issued a written report documenting bacterial contamination in storage tanks and finished product” and, sometime later, “Clorox received reports of cloudiness in products in certain retail stores, and a report from a distributor regarding cloudy products that had been distributed in multiple locations.”²²⁸ Staff further alleges that “Clorox took steps to mitigate the potential for bacterial contamination [but] did not immediately report to the Commission.” Instead, CPSC alleges that “Clorox did not report the defect or risk to the Commission until September 2022.”²²⁹ The following month, on October 25, 2022, CPSC announced a voluntary recall of the potentially affected product.²³⁰ Under the settlement, Clorox agrees to pay a civil monetary penalty of \$14.15 million, to maintain a compliance program that meets specified standards, and to conduct annual audits of that compliance program and report the results of those audits to CPSC staff for three years after the settlement, as well as make quarterly reports to CPSC staff regarding any changes to Clorox’s compliance program.²³¹

Notably, the recall press release indicates that no incidents or injuries had been reported,²³² and no incidents or injuries are referenced in the settlement agreement. This

settlement underscores that, in CPSC’s view, a Section 15 reporting obligation can arise even absent incidents or injuries.²³³

As discussed below, late-reporting settlement agreements are not limited to monetary penalties. CPSC has long required companies put in place compliance programs and internal controls to ensure compliance with the CPSA. In addition, starting in mid-2022, a new trend emerged: an annual reporting requirement.²³⁴ CPSC’s previous practice was to only require that a company provide staff with written documentation of its CPSA compliance upon request.

Litigated Section 15 Penalties

Historically, virtually all CPSC civil penalty assessments for alleged reporting violations have been resolved through settlement rather than litigation. Prior to the CPSIA, only one late-reporting case was decided by a court on the merits. In that case, *United States v. Mirama Enterprises, Inc.*, the court granted the government’s motion for summary judgment, holding that, as a matter of law, the defendant manufacturer had a duty to notify CPSC after receiving the first three (of 23 total) reports that a juice extractor’s filter basket had “exploded” while in use, posing a risk to consumers of being cut by sharp pieces of plastic and metal.²³⁵ The court imposed a civil penalty of \$300,000 at a time when the maximum civil penalty was \$1.5 million. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed, finding that a penalty for late reporting may be assessed even if the product ultimately is determined not to be defective and that each unit of a product (rather than each model or product line) constitutes a separate violation.²³⁶

Since *Mirama*, only four Section 15 late-reporting civil penalty lawsuits have been filed without a contemporaneous settlement. In 2018, Michaels Stores paid a \$1.5 million civil penalty to settle DOJ allegations of failure to timely report safety issues related to a glass vase, after nearly three years of litigation.²³⁷ In April 2025, SunSetter Products LP agreed to pay a \$9.25 million penalty to settle late-reporting allegations involving covers for retractable awnings associated with multiple injuries and a fatality.²³⁸ Only one case — *United States v. Spectrum Brands* — has been litigated to judgment following *Mirama*. In *United States v. Spectrum Brands*, the court granted the government’s motion for summary judgment, finding that, by May 2009, the defendant had information “supporting the conclusion that a defect in coffeemaker carafe handles constituted a substantial product hazard” upon the receipt of 60 reports of broken handles, including four reported burns, and had implemented design changes to remedy the issue.²³⁹ According to the court, if that information did not suffice, “no reasonable jury” would conclude that a reporting obligation had not arisen by June 30, 2010, upon the defendant’s receipt of 714 reports of coffeemaker carafe handle failures and 35 reported injuries, including one that required medical attention.²⁴⁰

The government contended that the maximum penalty for the two series of violations in *Spectrum Brands* was a total of \$30.3 million (\$15.15 million each for late reporting and post-recall sales), and sought a penalty of \$12 to \$15 million.²⁴¹ Following an evidentiary hearing to determine the appropriate amount of civil penalties and injunctive relief, the court assessed civil penalties of \$821,675 for late reporting and \$1.115 million for the “inadvertent” sale of 641 recalled carafes after the recall was announced, in violation of the CPSA, for a total civil penalty of \$1,936,675.²⁴² The court stated that “the fact that there were few reports of severe injuries ... does weigh in defendant’s favor with respect

to determining an appropriate civil penalty” for late reporting,²⁴³ but that the defendant’s failure to notify CPSC was “increasingly” “egregious as time went on and complaints mounted.”²⁴⁴ The court calculated the late-reporting penalty on a per-complaint basis, with the penalty per complaint increasing in each six-month period, ranging from \$10 to \$2,400 per complaint, for a total of \$821,675.²⁴⁵ The court noted that this penalty “is well below the ballpark of *Mirama*, ... the only other CPSA failure-to-report case litigated to this point. *Mirama* involved a much more serious defect — ‘exploding’ juicers.”²⁴⁶ The penalty in *Mirama* was “20% of the \$1.5 million penalty cap that was in place at the time,” and the *Spectrum* court imposed a penalty “approximately 5.4% of [the] \$15.15 million maximum,” which “having considered all of the [civil penalty] factors,” the court found to be “an appropriate civil penalty for defendant’s failure to report timely.”²⁴⁷ The *Spectrum* court also imposed penalties for post-recall sales, assessing \$1,000 per unit sold from the first of two shipments and \$2,000 per unit sold from the second shipment.²⁴⁸

Most recently, in December 2025, DOJ filed a complaint against Stanley Black & Decker (U.S.), Inc. (Black & Decker) alleging Black & Decker “knowingly failed to immediately inform” CPSC that two of its products contained “a defect or defects that could create a substantial product hazard.”²⁴⁹ The government seeks two civil penalties, as well as injunctive relief, against Black & Decker for alleged late reporting related to certain utility bars and miter saws.²⁵⁰ DOJ alleges that, shortly after the company started manufacturing the utility bars in December 2015, Black & Decker began receiving reports that the utility bars were breaking during use, leading to lacerations, knee injury, and contusion.²⁵¹ The Complaint alleges that Black & Decker received certain of the broken utility bars back from consumers for testing and determined that the bars did not meet specifications,²⁵² and further that Black & Decker had also received information from a national retailer that consumers had returned 393 utility bars between May 2016 and May 2017 due to “manufacturing defects.”²⁵³ According to the Complaint, Black & Decker did not report the utility bars to CPSC until May 9, 2019.²⁵⁴ Black & Decker voluntarily recalled the utility bars on September 26, 2019.²⁵⁵ According to the CPSC recall press release, Black & Decker had received at least 56 reports of the utility bars breaking, including four reports of injury.²⁵⁶

With respect to the miter saws, the Complaint alleges that Black & Decker received “hundreds of complaints” by February 2021 related to the rear guard and plastic deflector, including reports of injuries to consumers.²⁵⁷ DOJ alleges that it was not until workers discovered broken rear guards on unused miter saws in December 2021 that Black & Decker investigated the defects, and it was not until February 21, 2022, that Black & Decker reported the miter saws to CPSC.²⁵⁸ According to the Complaint, at that point, Black & Decker “was aware of three serious laceration injuries ..., 148 [consumer] complaints ..., and a high rate of returns ... to national retailers.”²⁵⁹ Black & Decker voluntarily recalled the miter saws on August 4, 2022.²⁶⁰

Finally, the Complaint against Black & Decker references the company’s “History of Noncompliance,”²⁶¹ citing five late reporting penalties against the company between November 1991 and April 2015.²⁶² DOJ alleges that, as part of the April 2015 civil penalty settlement, Black & Decker was required to maintain a compliance program and system of internal controls to ensure compliance with CPSC requirements.²⁶³

Injunctive Relief

As noted above, nonmonetary provisions of CPSC settlements have grown more frequent. Since March 2013, each settlement agreement and consent decree to resolve a late-reporting claim has included provisions through which the company agreed to (a) implement and maintain a compliance program designed to ensure compliance with the safety statutes and regulations enforced by CPSC, (b) maintain and enforce internal controls and procedures to help record and identify information required to be disclosed to CPSC and ensure timely and accurate reporting to CPSC, and (c) cooperate and provide information and documents to the CPSC staff.²⁶⁴

On April 9, 2018, the District Court in *United States v. Spectrum Brands* issued an amended order and final judgment and entered a permanent injunction against Spectrum requiring it to “(A) ... maintain sufficient systems, programs, and internal controls to ensure compliance with the CPSA and the regulations enforced by the CPSC including, without limitation, the Section 15(b) reporting requirement ... and the prohibition of the sale of recalled products ..., (B) ... disseminate copies of both the civil penalty and the summary judgment opinions and orders ... to each of its directors, officers, management-level employees, and in-house attorneys involved in the sale, offering for sale, manufacture, distribution in commerce, or importation into the United States of ‘consumer products,’ [and] (C) ... implement improvements to its compliance programs as required under subsection A ...”.²⁶⁵ The permanent injunction sets forth various improvements that *Spectrum* was required to implement to its compliance program, most of which the court noted *Spectrum* had represented were already in place.

On April 12, 2018, Spectrum filed a notice of appeal of the final and amended judgments (and preceding orders, opinions, or rulings that merged into the judgments) to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.²⁶⁶ Spectrum challenged the District Court’s holding that the government’s claims were not barred by the statute of limitations and the award of injunctive relief, particularly with respect to the requirement that Spectrum retain an independent expert.²⁶⁷ On May 9, 2019, the Seventh Circuit affirmed the District Court’s judgment against Spectrum.²⁶⁸

Liquidated Damages

In January 2021, DOJ settled a case in which CPSC had alleged that Walter Kidde Portable Equipment Inc. (Kidde) had “failed to timely inform [CPSC] about problems with fire extinguishers manufactured by the company,”²⁶⁹ following a November 2017 recall of nearly 40 million Kidde fire extinguishers to address the alleged hazard that they “can become clogged or require excessive force to discharge and can fail to activate during a fire emergency.”²⁷⁰ The Consent Decree entered against Kidde, in addition to the financial penalty and the injunctive relief discussed above, subjects the company to liquidated damages of \$5,000 “per violation for each day that Kidde fails to comply with the Decree.”²⁷¹ Similarly, in 2015, two DOJ Consent Decrees for late reporting included liquidated damage provisions, requiring the companies to pay \$1,000 “for each day that [the company] fails to comply with the Decree.”²⁷² Liquidated damages have not been a feature of settlements by CPSC or of all DOJ settlements for late reporting.

Other Section 15 Enforcers

Courts generally have rejected efforts by private litigants to pursue actions for late reporting under Section 15. The only Circuit Courts of Appeal that have addressed the issue have held that there is no private right of action to enforce Section 15 reporting violations.²⁷³ In addition, although the CPSIA granted state attorneys general authority to enforce certain provisions of the CPSA, that authority does not include enforcement of the Section 15 reporting obligation.²⁷⁴

Criminal Penalties

Prior to the 2008 amendments to the CPSA, criminal penalties were available under the Act only if a person willfully violated the statute after having received notice of noncompliance from CPSC.²⁷⁵ Thus, for all practical purposes, the failure to timely notify CPSC of potential safety hazards carried only civil penalties. However, the CPSIA removed the prior notice requirement as a prerequisite for criminal penalties and allowed for felony prosecutions.²⁷⁶ Accordingly, if DOJ concludes that the facts of a case are particularly egregious, the government could seek criminal sanctions against companies for late-reporting violations, or against any director, officer, or agent of a corporation who “knowingly and willfully authorizes, orders, or performs” such violations of Section 15.²⁷⁷

Criminal penalties available under the CPSA include imprisonment for not more than five years (a felony) and a fine to be determined in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3571.²⁷⁸ Further, the penalties available for a “criminal violation” of the CPSA (or other Acts enforced by the Commission) include the “forfeiture of assets associated with the violation.”²⁷⁹ To date, as discussed below, there have been criminal plea agreements for late reporting by the Gree Appliance Companies (Gree) and Royal Sovereign International, Inc. (Royal Sovereign), as well as criminal convictions of two executives related to the Gree matter.

Gree Appliance Companies

On October 29, 2021, DOJ announced the resolution of criminal charges against Gree Zhuhai, Gree Hong Kong, and Gree USA, Inc. (Gree USA) (collectively, the Gree Appliance Companies) in the first ever corporate criminal enforcement action brought under the CPSA, which resulted in a plea agreement from Gree USA, a deferred prosecution agreement (DPA) for Gree Zhuhai and Gree Hong Kong, and \$91 million in monetary penalties and forfeitures.²⁸⁰ DOJ charged in a criminal information that the Gree Appliance Companies had information by September 2012 that their dehumidifiers were defective, creating a substantial product hazard, and created an unreasonable risk of serious injury and death to consumers, but that the companies “knowingly and willfully failed to inform” CPSC until June 2013.²⁸¹

In connection with the DPA and plea agreement, the Gree Appliance Companies admitted the existence of internal communications about reports of fire hazards as early as July 2012, as well as subsequent internal communications about concerns over the costs of addressing the overheating defect and reporting it to the CPSC.²⁸² The companies also admitted that their initial reports to the CPSC in early 2013 failed to disclose the extent of the safety issues, and that consumers have reported more than 2,000 incidents involving the dehumidifiers, including 450 fires and more than \$19 million in property damage.²⁸³

The DPA and plea agreement require the Gree Appliance Companies to pay \$91.2 million (\$52.2 million monetary penalty and \$39 million forfeiture representing the assets associated with their violation — from the distribution of both defective and non-defective Gree dehumidifiers) and to provide restitution to any uncompensated consumers whose Gree dehumidifier subject to recall caused physical injury or financial loss through a fire or overheating.²⁸⁴ The prior \$15.45 million civil penalty the Gree Appliance Companies paid was credited against the new amount owed.²⁸⁵

The DPA and plea agreement also impose compliance-related audit and review obligations, including:

- establishing (or updating) a compliance program with standards, policies, and procedures for investigating and documenting allegations of potential product hazards and CPSA violations;
- creating (or updating) a confidential non-retaliation employee reporting program for product safety concerns;
- requiring compliance program training for directors, officers, and employees;
- retaining an outside compliance expert for a three-year term to advise the companies on product safety and regulatory compliance issues; and
- submitting annual reports and certifications to the government regarding remediation and implementation of the compliance program.²⁸⁶

Gree Corporate Executives

In June 2025, two U.S.-based Gree corporate executives were sentenced to federal prison terms after a jury convicted them in November 2023 of conspiracy and failure to report information concerning a potential product safety hazard as required by Section 15(b) of the CPSA. U.S. District Court Judge Dale Fischer in the Central District of California sentenced defendants Simon Chu and Charley Loh to terms of incarceration following their November 2023 convictions for (1) conspiracy to defraud the United States by obstructing the CPSC, and (2) failure to report product defects and hazards to the CPSC in connection with their conduct in *United States v. Gree* (2:19-cr-00193-DSF, C.D. Cal.). Judge Fischer sentenced Chu to 38 months of incarceration, three years of supervised release, and a \$5,000 fine, and sentenced Loh to 40 months of incarceration, three years of supervised release, and a \$12,000 fine. The indictment alleged that: (1) Chu tested the plastic used in the dehumidifiers and found it was able to burn, (2) Loh sent an email that stated the dehumidifiers caught fire during testing and the material used in the products apparently did not meet UL safety standards, and (3) Loh and Chu discussed with other Gree employees delaying a recall to avoid losing dehumidifier sales and to reduce the costs and effect of a recall.²⁸⁷

Royal Sovereign

More recently, on August 5, 2025, DOJ announced a corporate criminal plea agreement with Royal Sovereign. The company pleaded guilty to a criminal information stating that it knowingly and willfully failed to report immediately to CPSC that the company's portable air conditioners contained a defect that could create a substantial product hazard and

presented an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death, as required under Section 15(b) of the CPSA. In connection with the guilty plea, Royal Sovereign agreed to a civil settlement that included a \$16,025,000 civil penalty — the maximum civil penalty authorized by the CPSA — although all but \$100,000 was suspended for inability to pay. Royal Sovereign was also required to pay nearly \$400,000 in restitution to victims. That matter stemmed from a December 2021 recall of certain air conditioners associated with at least 42 reports of fires, including a 2016 fire which resulted in the death of a 36-year-old mother and injuries to her two young children. Unlike the Gree case, the Royal Sovereign case has not included prosecution of an individual officer, and the former CEO of the now-defunct company died in 2023.

Conclusion

Helping to protect consumers and guarding a company's brand reputation and product liability risks remain powerful incentives for companies to identify and address potential safety issues quickly and effectively. Further, particularly given the risk of substantial civil and even criminal penalties for late reporting, and CPSC's ongoing trend of aggressive enforcement, it is important for companies to ensure that they understand the scope of Section 15; have internal controls in place to capture, track, and analyze complaints and other information that may trigger a duty to notify CPSC; and timely and accurately notify CPSC when the need arises.

1 CPSC, Fiscal Year 2026 Performance Budget Request to Congress (May 30, 2025) at 2, https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/FY-2026-Budget-Request.pdf?VersionId=VduKUJr.mXskIMpl_I8jEQLYNeL8g2Xwk.

2 CPSC, Fiscal Year 2025 Operating Plan (Nov. 6, 2024) at 1, <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/FY-2025-Op-Plan-revised-02-25-25.pdf?VersionId=eoC76aLTUB8Bq.If8WV6gezKjm9klj.1>.

3 Pub. L. No. 92-573, 86 Stat. 1207 (1972), codified at 15 U.S.C. §§ 2051-2089.

4 CPSC, Fiscal Year 2026 Performance Budget Request to Congress (May 30, 2025) at 1-2.

5 *Id.*

6 15 U.S.C. § 2053.

7 The three fired Commissioners, Alexander Hoehn-Saric, Richard Trumka, Jr., and Mary Boyle, sued to have their firings declared unlawful under the CPSA’s removal protections, and were reinstated by the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. *Trump et. al. v. Boyle et. al.*, No. 8:25-cv-01628, ECF Doc. 25 (June 13, 2025). The Commissioners temporarily returned to work at the Commission, but were removed again on July 23, 2025, when the Supreme Court granted the Trump administration’s emergency application for a stay of the district court order pending appeal. *Trump et. al. v. Boyle et. al.*, Docket No. 25A11, 606 U. S. ____ (2025), https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/25a11_2cp3.pdf.

8 CPSC, Record of Commission Action: Interim Delegations in Furtherance of the Commission’s Adjudicatory Enforcement Authorities (Aug. 22, 2025), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/RCA-Vote-8-22-Adjudicatory.pdf?VersionId=7_1FSO2fSjoYJy0a6aUGJYWTEP2JXVuc; CPSC, Record of Commission Action: Interim Delegations in Furtherance of the Commission’s Regulatory Authorities (Aug. 22, 2025), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/RCA-Vote-8-22-Regulatory.pdf?VersionId=3kxw7wiLWFFotxWl165ooYKlXmNcfgFo>; CPSC, Record of Commission Action: Interim Delegations in Furtherance of the Commission’s Civil and Criminal Enforcement Authorities (Aug. 22, 2025), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/RCA-Vote-8-22-Enforcement.pdf?VersionId=IM.RCzAOWFf8BHAYTURAgCCWA8qeFX7w>.

9 Under the CPSA, three members serving on the Commission constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. 15 U.S.C. § 2053(d). If there are only two members serving on the Commission because of vacancies, the two members shall constitute a quorum for up to a six month period beginning on the date of the last vacancy. *Id.*

10 The only voluntary standards upon which CPSC has so relied are provisions of (i) ANSI B175.1 (gasoline-powered chainsaws), and (ii) ANSI Z21.11.2 (gas-fired room heaters). See 16 C.F.R. Part 1115, App.

11 This provision was added by the CPSIA. Pub. L. No. 110-314, § 214(a)(2), 122 Stat. 3016, 3054, codified at 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b).

12 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b). The “unreasonable risk” clause was added to the CPSA in 1990. Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-608, § 112(a)(2), (3), 104 Stat. 3110, 3115.

13 CPSC uses the term “firm” or “subject firm” to mean any manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer of a consumer product. See 16 C.F.R. § 1115.3(f).

14 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b).

15 Two other notification requirements are beyond the scope of this desk reference but should not be ignored: (i) manufacturers of consumer products must notify CPSC upon settling or receiving adverse judgments in three or more lawsuits in state or federal court alleging “death or grievous bodily injury” from the same model of a consumer product during designated 24-month periods (e.g., 1/1/2025 through 12/31/2026), see 15 U.S.C. § 2084; 16 C.F.R. §§ 1116.3(b)-(c); and (ii) manufacturers, importers, distributors, and retailers must notify CPSC within 24 hours of receiving a report that a child (a) choked on a marble, small ball, latex balloon, or small part contained in a toy or game, and (b) died, suffered serious injury, ceased breathing for any length of time, or was treated by a medical professional, see Child Safety Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 103-267, 108 Stat. 722 (1994); 16 C.F.R. Part 1117.

16 15 U.S.C. § 2052(a)(5).

17 *Id.* While “motor vehicles,” as defined in Section 102(3) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (49 U.S.C. § 30102(a)(7)), are outside CPSC’s jurisdiction, CPSC has jurisdiction over off-road vehicles. See, e.g., 15 U.S.C. § 2089; 16 C.F.R. Part 1420; Press Release, CPSC, Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles Recalled by American Honda Due to Crash and Injury Hazards (Recall Alert) (Dec. 3, 2020), <https://cpsc.gov/Recalls/2021/Recreational-Off-Highway-Vehicles-Recalled-by-American-Honda-Due-to-Crash-and-Injury-Hazards-Recall-Alert>; Press Release, CPSC, John Deere Recalls Crossover Gator Utility Vehicles Due to Crash Hazard (Dec. 21, 2017), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2018/John-Deere-Recalls-Crossover-Gator-Utility-Vehicles-Due-to-Crash-Hazard-Recall-Alert>. In addition, although “motor vehicle equipment,” as defined in 49 U.S.C. § 30102(a)(8), is also excluded from the definition of “consumer product,” CPSC has exercised jurisdiction over products that can be used in both motor vehicles and the home, to the extent that the hazard presented does not arise from use in the motor vehicle, such as infant seats that can be used in an automobile or in a stroller frame. See, e.g., Press Release, CPSC, Combi USA Recalls Stroller and Car Seat Combos Due to Fall Hazard (May 4, 2017), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2017/Combi-USA-Recalls-Stroller-and-Car-Seat-Combos>.

18 15 U.S.C. § 2052(a)(5).
19 See *CPSC v. Anaconda Co.*, 593 F.2d 1314, 1320 n.19 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (CPSC concedes that it lacks jurisdiction over housing).
20 *In re Central Sprinkler Corp.*, CPSC Docket No. 98-2 (June 4, 1998).
21 *Id.* at 11-12.
22 *Id.* at 10-12, discussing *Anaconda*, 593 F.2d at 1319, and *Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Corp. v. CPSC*, 574 F.2d 178 (3d Cir. 1978).
23 *Id.* at 14 (quoting *Anaconda*, 593 F.2d at 1322).
24 *Id.* at 14.
25 *Kaiser Aluminum*, 574 F.2d at 181-82 (finding that CPSC has jurisdiction over aluminum branch circuit wiring systems); but see *Anaconda*, 593 F.2d at 1320 (explaining that the term “consumer product” was designed to include the various ways “through which consumers acquire products and are exposed to the risks of injury associated with those products,” but remanding for a determination of whether CPSC has jurisdiction over aluminum branch circuit wiring systems).
26 See *State Fair of Tex. v. CPSC*, 650 F.2d 1324, 1329 (5th Cir. 1981) (holding that aerial tramway was a “consumer product” within the meaning of the CPSA, and CPSC was authorized to enter state fairgrounds to inspect aerial tramway and relevant documents), *vacated as moot*, 454 U.S. 1026 (1981).
27 See *United States v. One Hazardous Prod. Consisting of a Refuse Bin*, 487 F. Supp. 581, 584 (D.N.J. 1980).
28 See *CPSC v. Chance Mfg. Co.*, 441 F. Supp. 228, 231, 233 (D.D.C. 1977) (jurisdiction depends upon the extent to which consumers were exposed to the risks associated with the product); but see *Robert K. Bell Enters. v. CPSC*, 645 F.2d 26 (10th Cir. 1981). Following these decisions, Congress expressly provided that CPSC’s jurisdiction does not include fixed-site amusement rides. Pub. L. No. 97-35, § 1213, 95 Stat. 703, 724 (Aug. 13, 1981).
29 See Adv. Op. No. 262 (Feb. 27, 1978), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_media_Elevators.pdf.
30 See Adv. Op. No. 125 (Oct. 23, 1973), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_media_125.pdf.
31 See Adv. Op. No. 55 (Dec. 21, 1973), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_media_55.pdf.
32 See Adv. Op. No. 205 (May 21, 1975), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_media_205.pdf. See also 16 C.F.R. § 1209 (interim standard for cellulose insulation).
33 See Adv. Op. No. 181 (Feb. 12, 1975), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/blk_media_181.pdf.
34 See Press Release, CPSC, Commercial Frozen Food Merchandisers Recalled by Tyler Refrigeration Due to Fire Hazard (Dec. 11, 2008), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2008/commercial-frozen-food-merchandisers-recalled-by-tyler-refrigeration-due-to-fire-hazard>.
35 See CPSC Guidance (Feb. 18, 2002), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/PPPA-Updated-Guidance-on-Substances-Not-Intended-for-Household-Use.pdf?VersionId=kw_4n0prUwl6BX2JxQG0vMIRdW47cKHh.
36 See CPSC Alert: Whitco Co. LP Stadium Light Poles Can Fall Over, Posing Risk of Serious Injury and Death (Aug. 24, 2009), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2009/CPSC-Alert-Whitco-Co-LP-Stadium-Light-Poles-Can-Fall-Over-Posing-Risk-of-Serious-Injury-and-Death>.
37 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b)(2); see Pub. L. No. 110-314, § 214(a)(2), 122 Stat. 3016, 3054 (2008). See, e.g., Consent Decree of Civil Penalty, *United States v. LM Import-Export, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-20765 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 30, 2012) (agreeing to a \$287,500 civil penalty for allegedly knowingly (1) importing, offering for sale, selling, and distributing in commerce toys and other children’s articles in violation of CPSA and FHSA standards; (2) failing to timely notify CPSC under Section 15; and (3) violating requirements under CPSA Section 14 (15 U.S.C. § 2063(a)) to certify the compliance of products and provide tracking labels on products); Schylling Assocs., Inc., *Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order*, 75 Fed. Reg. 30784 (June 2, 2010) (agreeing to a \$400,000 civil penalty for allegedly knowingly (1) importing, offering for sale, selling, and distributing in commerce toys that do not comply with lead paint limits, and (2) failing to timely notify CPSC under Section 15).
38 See Consent Decree of Civil Penalty and Permanent Injunction, *United States v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Inc.*, No. 17-cv-13219 (D.N.J. Jan. 18, 2018) (agreeing to a \$5 million civil penalty and permanent injunction requiring compliance program for allegedly knowingly (1) importing and distributing household oral prescription drugs packaged in non-child-resistant blister packs that failed to comply with the PPPA; (2) failing to timely notify CPSC under Section 15; and (3) failing to certify compliance with applicable standards under CPSA Section 14).
39 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b)(3) (emphasis added).
40 *Id.* § 2064(a).
41 16 C.F.R. § 1115.12(g).
42 See *Id.* § 1115.12(g)(1)(i) (“The Commission and the staff will consider whether the defect arises from the design, composition, contents, construction, finish, packaging, warnings, or instructions of the product or from some other cause and will consider the conditions under which the defect manifests itself.”).
43 See *Id.* § 1115.12(g)(1)(ii) (“Even one defective product can present a substantial risk of injury and provide a basis for a substantial product hazard determination ... if the injury which might occur is serious and/ or if the injury is likely to occur. However, a few defective products with no potential for causing serious injury and little likelihood of injuring even

in a minor way will not ordinarily provide a proper basis for a substantial product hazard determination. The Commission also recognizes that the number of products remaining with consumers is a relevant consideration.”). CPSC’s July 2006 amendments to the interpretive regulations sought to clarify that it is the number of units “remaining with consumers,” rather than the number initially distributed, that may be relevant to determining the severity of the risk. See 71 Fed. Reg. 42,028, at 42,030 (July 25, 2006). However, the Commission cautioned that in its view a company “may still have a reporting obligation” even if “the number of products being used by consumers decreases” over time. *Id.* According to the Commission, firms that delay reporting “in anticipation of, or because of, a decrease in the number of products in use ... will be subject to civil penalties.” *Id.*

44 See 16 C.F.R. § 1115.12(g)(1)(iii) (“A risk is severe if the injury which might occur is serious and/or if the injury is likely to occur. In considering the likelihood of any injury the Commission and the staff will consider the number of injuries reported to have occurred, the intended or reasonably foreseeable use or misuse of the product, and the population group exposed to the product (e.g., children, elderly, handicapped).”); see also *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, 218 F. Supp. 3d 794, 820-21 (W.D. Wis. 2016) (rejecting defendant’s argument that no duty to report arose because “none of the reported injuries rose to any particular level of seriousness”), *aff’d*, 924 F.3d 337 (7th Cir. 2019).

45 16 C.F.R. § 1115.12(g)(1)(iv) (“The Commission and the staff will consider all other relevant factors.”).

46 *Id.* § 1115.12(g)(1); see also *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 821 (“CPSC’s interpretive regulations explain that a significant degree of exposure of the possibly defective product to the public, or the likelihood that it will cause injury, can give rise to a substantial product hazard regardless of whether there is a risk of a serious injury.”).

47 See 16 C.F.R. § 1115.4; see also, e.g., Restatement (Third) of Torts: Prod. Liab. § 2 (1998).

48 16 C.F.R. § 1115.4. See also Final Decision and Order at 46-47, *In re Zen Magnets, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 12-2 (Oct. 26, 2017), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/163--2017-10-26%20Final%20Decision%20and%20Order.pdf?Tme8u5fRF2.29_B.i4lx7pPwb_whKng2 (holding that, under 16 C.F.R. § 1115.4, a design defect can arise solely as a result of product misuse).

49 71 Fed. Reg. at 42,030.

50 16 C.F.R. § 1115.12(f).

51 *Id.*

52 *Id.* § 1115.12(d).

53 *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d 794.

54 *Id.* at 812 (emphasis in original).

55 *Id.* at 813.

56 *Id.* at 814.

57 16 C.F.R. § 1115.8.

58 71 Fed. Reg. at 42,030.

59 *Id.* CPSC has not uniformly treated compliance with a mandatory standard as a bar to late-reporting penalties. For example, in 2004, Battat, Inc. agreed to pay a civil penalty to settle allegations that it failed timely to notify CPSC about a choking risk associated with a toy drum set. Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *Battat Inc.*, 69 Fed. Reg. 56,202, 56,202-03 (Sept. 20, 2004). CPSC acknowledged that the product complied with the small parts standard in testing but alleged that Battat failed to timely notify the agency that the product could produce small parts in actual use. *Id.*

60 66 Fed. Reg. 30,715, 30,717 (June 7, 2001). See also Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *The West Bend Company, a Subsidiary of Illinois Tool Works, Inc.*, 66 Fed. Reg. 11565 (Feb. 26, 2001) (alleging late reporting under Section 15 where West Bend received incident reports in Taiwan concerning its water distiller (two fires, one melting), recalled the product in Taiwan, and then notified CPSC approximately four months later after receiving six additional reports in the United States); Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *phil&teds USA, Inc.*, 80 Fed. Reg. 54,769, 57,771 (Sept. 11, 2015) (agreeing to implement and maintain a compliance program that includes “procedures for collecting information from phil&teds USA’s affiliates on incidents and injuries occurring outside the United States”). And, as a practical matter, CPSC’s online Section 15 reporting portal instructs that reported incidents and injuries “should include those that occurred outside the United States.” See <https://www.saferproducts.gov/section15/>.

61 Report, <https://www.saferproducts.gov/section15/>.

62 This provision was added by the CPSIA. Pub. L. No. 110-314, § 223, 122 Stat. 3016, 3068 (2008).

63 16 C.F.R. part 1120.

64 See 87 Fed. Reg. 72873 (Nov. 28, 2022).

65 See CPSC, Seasonal Lighting (Holiday Lights and Decorative Outfits), Business Guidance, <https://www.cpsc.gov/Business--Manufacturing/Business-Education/Business-Guidance/Household-Electrical-Products/Seasonal-and-Decorative-Lighting-Products>.

66 16 C.F.R. § 1120.1.

67 See *Id.* § 1115.12(d).

68 *Id.* § 1115.6(c).

69 See *id.*
70 *Id.* § 1115.6(a).
71 *Id.* § 1115.6(b); see also *United States v. Mirama Enters., Inc.*, 185 F. Supp. 2d 1148, 1158-59 (S.D. Cal. 2002) (stating that “[t]he standard is a ‘reasonable person’ standard, not a ‘reasonable expert’ standard” and finding that, based on the evidence Aroma had received, “a reasonable person could conclude that the juicer contained a defect which created a substantial risk to the public ... and ... ‘an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death’”), *aff’d*, 387 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 2004).
72 16 C.F.R. § 1115.6(a); see also *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 820-21 (rejecting the defendant’s argument that no duty to report arose where “none of the reported injuries rose to any particular level of seriousness”).
73 16 C.F.R. § 1115.6(b).
74 *Id.* § 1115.6(a).
75 *Id.* § 1115.14(e).
76 *Id.* §§ 1115.14(c), (d). CPSC’s regulations also provide that 5 working days is “the maximum reasonable time for information” to go from an employee “capable of appreciating the significance of the information” to “the official or employee responsible for complying with the reporting requirements of section 15(b) of the CPSA.” *Id.* § 1115.14(b).
77 *Id.* § 1115.4; see also *Mirama Enters.*, 387 F.3d at 988 (“[i]nformation about a possible defect triggers the duty to report, which in turn allows the Commission either to conclude that no defect exists or to require appropriate corrective action”).
78 16 C.F.R. § 1115.10(f).
79 See *id.* §§ 1115.3(a), 1115.10(f); see also *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 818 (CPSC is adequately informed if “the company and CPSC have the same material information”); *Mirama Enters.*, 185 F. Supp. 2d at 1163 (finding that CPSC was not adequately informed under Section 15 when the agency knew of seven of 23 incidents of which the company had knowledge and the company had actual knowledge that CPSC was informed of only seven of the 23 incidents).
80 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b).
81 See 16 C.F.R. § 1115.13(c).
82 See *id.* § 1115.13(d).
83 Further, as discussed below, Commission approval is required for any corrective action plan involving a consumer product that has been associated with a fatality to meet this requirement, CPSC staff includes in every Full Report request a question seeking information regarding any fatality involving the product regardless of whether the death is related to the reported issue.
84 See *id.* § 1115.13(b).
85 See *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (July 21, 2021) (seeking a determination that Amazon is a distributor of consumer products in commerce, as those terms are defined in the CPSA, and to compel Amazon to recall specified productions that allegedly create substantial product hazards); see also Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Sues Amazon to Force Recall of Hazardous Products Sold on Amazon.com (July 14, 2021), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2021/CPSC-Sues-Amazon-to-Force-Recall-of-Hazardous-Products-Sold-on-Amazon-com> (Acting Chairman Robert Adler stating, “We must grapple with how to deal with these massive third-party platforms more efficiently, and how best to protect the American consumers who rely on them.”); CPSC, Statement of Commissioner Peter Feldman, New Penalty Caps May Provide Insufficient Deterrence Against the Largest E-Commerce Platforms (Nov. 23, 2021), <https://cpsc-d8-media-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Civil%20Penalties%20Adjustment%20Nov%2023%202021.pdf?VersionId=QHEBFJVj4Hn7.m0o.5QWG5eCaJ16zo.v2>.
86 See, e.g., Press Release, CPSC, Four Retailers Agree to Stop Sale and Voluntarily Recall Nap Nanny Recliners Due to Five Infant Deaths (Dec. 27, 2012), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2012/four-retailers-agree-to-stop-sale-and-voluntarily-recall-nap-nanny-recliners-due-to> (manufacturer unable or unwilling to participate in the recall); Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *Consolidated Electrical Distributors, Inc.*, 64 Fed. Reg. 43,990 (Aug. 12, 1999) (distributor of a recalled heater paid \$1.5 million under a Consent Agreement with CPSC to help fund a recall where the manufacturer had declared bankruptcy after negotiating a corrective action plan with CPSC).
87 See, e.g., Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *B.J.’s Wholesale Club, Inc.*, 888 Fed. Reg. 68,589 (October 4, 2023) (\$9 million civil penalty settlements for alleged late reporting under Section 15 concerning certain portable air conditioners for which B.J.’s was not an exclusive retailer); Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *Office Depot, Inc.*, 80 Fed. Reg. 31,576 (June 3, 2015) (\$3.4 million civil penalty settlement for alleged late reporting under Section 15 concerning two office chair models for which Office Depot was the exclusive retailer, one of which it also imported); Stipulated Judgment and Order, *United States v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. PJM 01-1521 (D. Md. Apr. 23, 2003) (\$750,000 civil penalty settlement for alleged late reporting under Section 15 concerning exercise equipment for which Wal-Mart was neither the importer nor the private labeler), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/CivilPenalty03118.pdf?F2CjR6rUvKHtBla1mXUagbJ6ti9_FTb.
88 15 U.S.C. § 2055(b)(5). The fourth of these exceptions was added by the CPSIA, thereby expanding CPSC’s ability to disclose publicly information about a potential safety hazard that a company reports under Section 15(b). See Pub. L.

No. 110-314, § 21, 122 Stat. 3018, 3048 (2008).

⁸⁹ *Id.* The CPSIA expanded this exception to cover acts other than the CPSCA.

⁹⁰ See 15 U.S.C. § 2055(a)(2); 16 C.F.R. § 1015.18(d). See also *Food Marketing Institute v. Argus Leader Media*, 139 S. Ct. 2356, 2366 (2019) (protecting from disclosure as “confidential” financial or commercial information that “is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner and provided to the government under an assurance of privacy”); *Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (*en banc*) (protecting from disclosure information submitted voluntarily to the government). Further, before disclosing information through which the product’s manufacturer or private labeler “may be readily ascertained,” CPSC must take reasonable steps to ensure that the information “is accurate, and that such disclosure is fair in the circumstances and reasonably related to effectuating the purposes of this Act.” See 15 U.S.C. § 2055(b)(1); 16 C.F.R. §§ 1101.31-1101.34.

⁹¹ See CPSC, Violations, <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/violations>.

⁹² CPSC, Fiscal Year 2022 Operating Plan at 55 (Sept. 24, 2021), <https://www.cpsc.gov/content/FY-2022-Operating-Plan>.

⁹³ See Product Safety Planning, Reporting, and Recall Handbook at 13-14 (Aug. 2021), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/RecallHandbookFINAL9_2technicalrevision_3052025.pdf.

⁹⁴ The determination is “preliminary” because the Commissioners will not yet have made a formal, “final” determination, through the administrative litigation process described below, that the product presents a substantial product hazard. See 15 U.S.C. §§ 2064(c), (d).

⁹⁵ See Marietta Robinson, The Robinson Report #17: ICPHSO & Changing the CPSC’s Delegation for a Safer Tomorrow! (Mar. 1, 2016), <https://leadership.cpsc.gov/robinson/2016/03/01/the-robinson-report-17-icphso-changing-the-cpsc-delegation-for-a-safer-tomorrow/> (discussing CPSC Order No. 0310.14).

⁹⁶ See *id.*

⁹⁷ See CPSC, Record of Commission Action: Revised Delegation of Authority: Authority to Accept Certain Voluntary Corrective Action Plans (Feb. 23, 2016), <https://www.cpsc.gov/content/rca-revised-delegation-of-authority-authority-to-accept-certain-voluntary-corrective-action>; CPSC, Revised Draft Delegation of Authority (approved by the Commission), <https://cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/DelegationsOfAuthorityRegulatory.pdf>. The delegation of authority was revised at the impetus of Commissioner Marietta Robinson and approved 4-1 by the Commission, with Commissioner Ann Marie Buerkle opposing. Commissioner Robinson explained that she had analyzed five years of recall press releases and had become “concerned that some voluntary CAPs, many of which involved the deaths of small children, were simply inadequate [and] these CAPs would have been stronger had they been submitted to the Commission for approval.” The Robinson Report #17. She further explained that the “Commission would review and ultimately approve, reject, or take other action on those voluntary CAPs for cases where a death has occurred,” and that the “goal of this change is not to directly affect the preliminary determination of a hazard classification or the negotiation of the voluntary CAP,” but the revision would “lead to more appropriate and comprehensive voluntary CAPs and an overall safer marketplace for tomorrow’s consumer.” *Id.* Commissioner Buerkle argued against the more restrictive delegation as “violat[ing] the principle of risk-based decision making.” CPSC, Statement of Commissioner Ann Marie Buerkle on the Commission’s Withdrawal of Authority to Approve Corrective Action Plans in Cases Where a Death Has Occurred (Mar. 31, 2016), <https://www.cpsc.gov/about-cpsc/commissioner/ann-marie-buerkle/statements/statement-of-commissioner-ann-marie-buerkle-on>. She also questioned the assertion that the change was not intended to affect the negotiation of the voluntary CAP, indicating that only through negotiating the terms could “CAPs become ‘more appropriate and comprehensive.’” *Id.* Further, she reasoned that requiring Commission approval would “delay voluntary recalls in these cases,” including potentially extended delays for renegotiation or litigation of CAPs. *Id.*

⁹⁸ See, e.g., Press Release, CPSC, CPSC and Peloton Announce: Recall of Tread+ Treadmills After One Child Death and 70 Incidents; Recall of Tread Treadmills Due to Risk of Injury (May 5, 2021), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2021/CPSC-and-Peloton-Announce-Recall-of-Tread-Plus-Treadmills-After-One-Child-Death-and-70-Incidents-Recall-of-Tread-Treadmills-Due-to-Risk-of-Injury>; Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warns Consumers of Serious Tip-Over Hazard Posed by Hodedah HI4DR 4-Drawer Dressers (Jan. 8, 2020), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2020/CPSC-Warns-Consumers-of-Serious-Tip-Over-Hazard-Posed-by-Hodedah-HI4DR-4-Drawer-Dressers>, followed by Press Release, CPSC, Hodedah Recalls HI4DR 4-Drawer Chests Due to Tip-Over and Entrapment Hazards; Remedies May Be Delayed Due to COVID-19 Restrictions; Keep Product Away from Children (May 13, 2020), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2020/hodedah-recalls-hi4dr-4-drawer-chests-due-to-tip-over-and-entrapment-hazards-remedies>; and Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warns Consumers to Stop Using Summer Infant (USA), Inc.’s SwaddleMe By Your Bed Sleeper (Jan. 16, 2020), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Warnings/2020/CPSC-Warns-Consumers-to-Stop-Using-Summer-Infant-USA-Inc-s-SwaddleMe-By-Your-Bed-Sleeper>, followed by Press Release, CPSC, Summer Infant Recalls SwaddleMe By Your Bed Inclined Sleepers to Prevent Risk of Suffocation (Jan. 29, 2020), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2020/Summer-Infant-Recalls-SwaddleMe-By-Your-Bed-Inclined-Sleepers-to-Prevent-Risk-of-Suffocation>; Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warns Consumers to Stop Using Onewheel Self-Balancing Electric Skateboards Due to Ejection Hazard; At Least Four Deaths and Multiple Injuries Reported (Nov. 16, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2023/CPSC-Warns-Consumers-to-Stop-Using-Onewheel-Self-Balancing-Electric-Skateboards-Due-to-Ejection-Hazard-At-Least-Four-Deaths-and-Multiple-Injuries-Reported> and

Press Release, CPSC, Future Motion Recalls Onewheel Self-Balancing Electric Skateboards Due to Crash Hazard; Four Deaths Reported (Sept. 29, 2023), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2023/Future-Motion-Recalls-Onewheel-Self-Balancing-Electric-Skateboards-Due-to-Crash-Hazard-Four-Deaths-Reported>.

99 See, e.g., Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warning: Stop Using Otteroo LUMI and MINI Infant Flotation Rings Due to Drowning Hazard; One Infant Death Reported (Nov. 22, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2023/CPSC-Warning-Stop-Using-Otteroo-LUMI-and-MINI-Infant-Flotation-Rings-Due-to-Drowning-Hazard-One-Infant-Death-Reported>, and CBS News, *Otteroo baby neck floats still on sale despite reports of injury and one infant death* (Aug. 2, 2023), <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/otteroo-baby-neck-pillow-warning-cpsc-fda/>; Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warns Consumers to Immediately Stop Using King Song Electric Unicycles Due to Fire Hazard; Fire and Injuries Reported (July 12, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2022/CPSC-Warns-Consumers-to-Immediately-Stop-Using-King-Song-Electric-Unicycles-Due-to-Fire-Hazard-Fire-and-Injuries-Reported>; Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Warns Consumers to Stop Using Toos Elite Electric Scooters Due to Fire Hazard; Two Deaths Reported (Oct. 23, 2023), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Warnings/2024/CPSC-Warns-Consumers-to-Stop-Using-Toos-Elite-Electric-Scooters-Due-to-Fire-Hazard-Two-Deaths-Reported#:~:text=%2De.com,-.CPSC%20urges%20consumers%20to%20immediately%20stop%20using%20their%20Toos%20Elite,Toos%20Elite%2060%2Dvolt%20scooter>.

100 See *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1, 87 Fed. Reg. 8,804 (Feb. 16, 2022), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/001-Complaint--In-the-Matter-of-Leachco-Inc-CPSC-Docket-No-22-1.pdf?VersionId=3WKMODTUGoNJPXYZM_VpsS8a.mtPRT5x.

101 See, e.g., Answer of Respondent Maxfield and Oberton Holdings, LLC ¶ 52, *In re Maxfield & Oberton Holdings, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 12-1 (Aug. 14, 2012), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/lawsuit_maxfield2.pdf (alleging that, without prior notice to Maxfield, the staff notified retailers identified through confidential information Maxfield had provided and requested that they stop selling the product, in violation of Section 6(b)(5)). This practice has not been without criticism. See *generally*, e.g., Jerry Brito, “Agency Threats’ and the Rule of Law: An Offer You Can’t Refuse,” 37 Harv. J. L. and Pub. Pol. 553 (2014) (arguing that agencies’ use of such tactics is coercive).

102 15 U.S.C. § 2055(b)(1).

103 *Id.*

104 *Id.*

105 *Id.*

106 See *id.* §§ 2064(c), (d).

107 See *id.* § 2055(b)(5)(A).

108 See, e.g., Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Sues Zen Magnets Over Hazardous, High-Powered Magnetic Balls Action Prompted by Ongoing Harm to Children from Ingested Magnets (Aug. 7, 2012), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2012/cpsc-sues-zen-magnets-over-hazardous-high-powered-magnetic-balls-action-prompted-by-ongoing>.

109 15 U.S.C. § 2064(g).

110 See 16 C.F.R. § 1025 (CPSC rules of practice for adjudicative proceedings).

111 See *id.* § 1025.51(a).

112 See *id.* §§ 1025.51-1025.54.

113 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706.

114 Including the *Central Sprinkler* case, discussed *supra* at nn.20-24 and accompanying text, the CPSC staff filed four administrative complaints from 1998 through 2001. See *In re Daisy Mfg. Co.*, CPSC Docket No. 02-2, 66 Fed. Reg. 56,082 (Nov. 6, 2001) (air rifles); *In re Chemetron Corp.*, CPSC Docket No. 02-1 (Oct. 9, 2001) (sprinkler systems); *In re Cadet Mfg. Co.*, CPSC Docket No. 99-1, 64 Fed. Reg. 3,932 (Jan. 26, 1999) (heaters). After a gap of nearly 11 years, the CPSC staff filed four administrative complaints in 2012 — one concerning certain Nap Nanny® infant recliners (see *In re Baby Matters, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 13-1, 77 Fed. Reg. 73,621 (Dec. 11, 2012)), and three concerning high-powered magnets. See *In re Star Networks USA, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 13-2, 77 Fed. Reg. 76,006 (Dec. 26, 2012); *In re Zen Magnets, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 12-2, 77 Fed. Reg. 47,823 (Aug. 10, 2012); *In re Maxfield & Oberton Holdings, LLC*, CPSC Docket No. 12-1, 77 Fed. Reg. 45,342 (July 31, 2012). After another litigation gap spanning more than five years, on February 16, 2018, CPSC filed an administrative complaint against Britax Child Safety, Inc. See Press Release, CPSC, CPSC Sues Britax Over Hazardous Jogging Strollers; Action Prompted by Ongoing Harm to Children and Adults from Stroller Wheel Detachment (Feb. 16, 2018), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2018/cpsc-sues-britax-over-hazardous-jogging-strollers-action-prompted-by-ongoing-harm-to>.

115 See *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1, 87 Fed. Reg. 8,804 (Feb. 16, 2022), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/001-Complaint--In-the-Matter-of-Leachco-Inc-CPSC-Docket-No-22-1.pdf?VersionId=3WKMODTUGoNJPXYZM_VpsS8a.mtPRT5x.

116 See *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1, *supra* n.115, ¶¶ 50-52.

117 See *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1, *supra* n.115, ¶¶ 35-37.

118 See Respondent Leachco, Inc.’s Answer to Complaint, *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1, ¶¶ 47-51 (Mar. 2, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/002-Respondent-Leachco-Incs-Answer-To->

[Complaint.pdf?VersionId=saWRLT8wowxdIY6q6CN9upUky6LR.Lv.](#)

119 See Memorandum Opinion and Initial Order Denying Relief Sought in the Complaint at 65, *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1 (July 3, 2024), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/148-CPSC_Docket_No_22-1_In_the_Matter_of_Leachco_Inc_ALJ_Decision.pdf?VersionId=JEkmoJldEmla7L4KwYWwn11jqGJJ8Oi1.

120 *Id.* at 64.

121 See Complaint Counsel's Appeal Brief and [Proposed] Order, *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1 (Aug. 30, 2024), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/153-Leachco_Dkt_22-1-CCs-Appeal_Brief_and_Proposed_Order.pdf?VersionId=2NJamcMSRsn44qLsYuGkNjXr.Kb1cQa.

122 See Respondent *Leachco, Inc.*'s Answering Brief and Cross Appeal Brief, *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1 (Oct. 17, 2024), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/159-LEACHCO-ANSWERING-BRIEFCROSS-APPEALBRIEF-2024-10-17_PDF-A.pdf?VersionId=B.nBpgkXneqLpKDaH2nl1VvNM8vhNRgw.

123 Order Vacating Initial Decision, Dismissing Complaint and Returning Case to Adjudication to Close the Case, *In re Leachco, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 22-1 (March 16, 2026), [162 Dkt22_1IntheMatterofLeachcoIncOrderVacatingInitialDecisionDismissingComplaintandReturningCasetoAdjudicationCloseTheCase20260316.pdf](https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/162-Dkt22_1IntheMatterofLeachcoIncOrderVacatingInitialDecisionDismissingComplaintandReturningCasetoAdjudicationCloseTheCase20260316.pdf).

124 *Id.*, ¶ 5.

125 *Id.*

126 *Id.*, ¶ 6.

127 *Id.*, ¶ 6.

128 *Id.*, ¶ 6.

129 *Id.*, ¶ 7.

130 Complaint, *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2, *supra* n.85, ¶¶ 19, 52-74.

131 *Id.*

132 Amazon's Opposition to Complaint Counsel's Motion for Partial Summary Decision and Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Cross-Motion for Summary Decision at 9-11, *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (Nov. 2, 2021), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/015-Respondent-Amazons-Opposition-to-Complaint-Counsels-Motion-for-Partial-Summary-Decision-and-Memo-in-Support-of-Motion-to-Dismiss-or-in-the-Alternative-Cross-Motion-for-Summary.pdf?VersionId=Vi.KrbSnb0hjSd_i0O7UOUeBc3kU7nHI.

133 15 U.S.C. § 2052(a)(16), (b).

134 Complaint Counsel's Motion for Partial Summary Decision and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Decision at 3, *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (Oct. 13, 2021), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/009-Motion-for-Partial-Summary-Decision-In-the-Matter-of-Amazon.pdf?VersionId=jn.bObBol5YBSoEZHK8xRLW83MEWeT1>.

135 Complaint, *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2, *supra* n.85, ¶¶ 47-51.

136 *Id.* at ¶¶ XI.3, XI.4.

137 Amazon's Opposition to Complaint Counsel's Motion for Partial Summary Decision and Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Cross-Motion for Summary Decision, *supra* n.125, at 35.

138 Amazon's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss at 20, *In re Amazon.com, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (Dec. 7, 2021) (citing 15 U.S.C. § 2064(c)-(d)), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/025-In-the-Matter-of-Amazon-com-CPSC-Docket-21-2-Amazons-Reply-in-Support-of-Motion-to-Dismiss.pdf?VersionId=92LhgPa6WW_jc6xhpug07ms0BO0ggMNY.

139 See Order on Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Summary Decision at ¶ 27, *In re Amazon.com Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (Jan. 19, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/027-Order-on-Motion-to-Dismiss-and-Motion-for-Summary-Judgement.pdf?VersionId=fgW05hge.c7FvPZZOijVWVapvJBQKudZ>.

140 See In the Matter of Amazon.com, Inc. Initial Decision and Order on Remedies, at ¶¶ 13-17, *In re Amazon.com Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (July 10, 2023), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/119-Initial-Decision-and-Order-on-Remedies.pdf?VersionId=VCX.J7PqooaChMDhINQ6dKYJzc_K7nuP.

141 See In the Matter of Amazon.com, Inc. Decision and Order at pp. 72-73, *In re Amazon.com Inc.*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (July 29, 2024), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/142%20-%20In%20the%20Matter%20of%20Amazon.com%20Inc.%20Decision%20and%20Order.pdf?VersionId=gZi7dJTIImK6FiWMpknAaW5.NECGX6NCR>.

142 *Id.* at 49-51.

143 *Id.* at 72-73.

144 15 U.S.C., § 2052(a)(8).

145 In the Matter of Amazon.com, Inc. Decision and Order at pp. 26-27.

146 *Id.*

147 *Id.* at 27-36.

148 Press Release, CPSC Issues Final Order to Amazon.com Outlining Remediation Plans for Hazardous Products (Jan. 17, 2025), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2024/CPSC-Issues-Final-Order-to-Amazon-com-Outlining>

[Remediation-Plans-for-Hazardous-Products](#). See also Decision and Order Approving Notification and Action Plan, *In re Amazon.com*, CPSC Docket No. 21-2 (Jan. 17, 2025), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/pdfs/recall/lawsuits/abc/154-Decision-and-Order-Approving-Notification-and-Action-Plan.pdf?VersionId=zpyM9XYwITrt2NdD9nhYG7C8GCzj2FnV>.

149 *Id.* at 51-52.
150 *Id.* at 20.

151 Complaint, *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Consumer Prod. Safety Comm'n*, No. 8:25-cv-00853-LKG, Dkt. No. 1 (D. Md. Mar. 14, 2025).

152 P. Motion for Summary Judgment, *Amazon*, Dkt. 22 (Aug. 20, 2025); P. Memo. in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, *Amazon*, Dkt. 22-1 (Aug. 20, 2025).

153 See Note 6, *supra*, and accompanying text.
154 See generally Application to Stay, *Trump v. Boyle* (July 2, 2025).

155 D. Memo. in Opposition to P. Motion for Summary Judgment, *Amazon*, Dkt 24-1 (Oct. 1, 2025) at 43.

156 See Joint Motion for Extension of Time to File Defendants' Reply in Support of Their Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and the Joint Appendix, *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Consumer Prod. Safety Comm'n*, No. 8:25-cv-00853-LKG, Dkt. No. 28 (D. Md. Dec. 8, 2025).

157 See 15 U.S.C. § 2061(b)(1).
158 See *Id.* §§ 2064(c), (d).
159 See, e.g., Memorandum and Order, *U.S. v. Polaris Indus., L.P.*, No. 87-3525 (D.D.C. Apr. 27, 1988) (consent decree under Section 12, including a ban of three-wheel ATVs) (*reproduced in U.S. v. Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, 143 F.R.D. 1, App. A (D.D.C. 1992)); Order, *CPSC v. A.K. Electric Corp.*, No. 74-1206 (D.D.C. Sept. 9, 1974) (granting injunction under Section 12 barring manufacture, distribution, and sale, and ordering recall, of a "mechanic's light" that was found to pose an imminent danger of serious or fatal electric shock).

160 See Minutes of Commission Meeting, Decisional Matter: Fiscal Year 2024 Operating Plan, 4 (Nov. 8, 2023), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Comm-Mtg-Min-FY-2024-Operating-Plan-Decisional.pdf?VersionId=GDwWSUy29P7SN9MpqVVWdX5Nn9xe36Vm#page=8>.

161 CPSC, Fiscal Year 2026 Operating Plan (Jan. 6, 2026), https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/FY-2026-Operating-Plan_Approved-1-6-2026.pdf?VersionId=v5fCaRGmvCe_Q3bjSbqYoOIRa2HklaV1.

162 See 62 Fed. Reg. 39,827, 39,828 (July 24, 1997).
163 Peter Feldman, LinkedIn (Nov. 6, 2025), https://www.linkedin.com/posts/peter-feldman-ba50554_this-week-the-us-consumer-product-safety-activity-7392227466343518210-7Ucc?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAwr4BMBz9Y4wQJPPpAtFq9KbS4hQOkW1Fs

164 Peter Feldman, *Acting Chairman Feldman Highlights Key Safety Accomplishments of President Trump's CPSC* (Jan. 20, 2026); CPSC, *Recalls & Product Safety Warnings*, <https://www.cpsc.gov/About-CPSC/Chairman/Peter-A-Feldman/Statement/Acting-Chairman-Feldman-Highlights-Key-Safety-Accomplishments-of-President-Trumps-CPSC>.

165 Approximation based on a review of recall headlines, as reflected on CPSC.gov as of January 16, 2026, posted between January 1, 2025, and December 31, 2025.

166 Email from CPSC to Mike Gentine, January 21, 2026 (data for fiscal years 2024-2025); CPSC, *Recalls & Product Safety Warnings*, <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls> (data current as of Jan. 26, 2026).

167 Statement of Commissioner Peter A. Feldman: Record Recall Numbers Reflect Return on Investment for American Consumers (Nov. 1, 2023), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/COPF-Statement-on-Record-Recall-Numbers.pdf>.

168 Email from CPSC staff to Eric Rubel Nov. 19, 2021 (data for fiscal years 2013 -2021).

169 Consumer Prod. Safety Commission, *Recalls & Product Safety Warnings – Recall Data Visualized*, <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls>, last accessed Feb. 2, 2026.

170 See 15 U.S.C. §§ 2068(a)(4), 2069(a)(1).
171 16 C.F.R. § 1119.1.
172 15 U.S.C. § 2069(d); see also *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 822 ("Since defendant had actual knowledge of the information that required a report, it 'knowingly' failed to do so, and no reasonable jury could find otherwise.")
173 *Id.*
174 15 U.S.C. § 2064(b) (emphases added).
175 See 69 Fed. Reg. 68,884 (Nov. 26, 2004).
176 See Pub. L. No. 110-314, §§ 217(a)(1), (4), 122 Stat. 3016, 3058 (2008). See also Civil Penalty Factors, Interim Final Interpretive Rule, 74 Fed. Reg. 45,101, 45,102 (Sept. 1, 2009) ("new penalty amounts specified in [the CPSIA] take effect on the date that is the earlier of the date on which a final rule providing the Commission's interpretation of penalty factors is issued or on August 14, 2009 (one year after the date of enactment of the CPSIA)").
177 See 86 Fed. Reg. 68,244 (Dec. 1, 2021).
178 See 28 U.S.C. §2462; see also *Mirama Enters.*, 387 F.3d at 987 (interpreting the provision of 15 U.S.C. § 2069(a)(1) that "violations 'shall constitute a separate offense with respect to each consumer product involved'" as meaning that "a company commits a separate offense for every potentially dangerous unit it fails to report"); see also *United States v. Spectrum Brands*, No. 15-cv-00371-wmc, 2017 WL 4339677, at *1 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 29, 2017) (quoting *Mirama*).

179 28 U.S.C. § 2462.
180 *Gabelli v. SEC*, 568 U.S. 442, 448 (2013).
181 *See United States v. Michaels Stores, Inc.*, No. 3:15-cv-1203, 2016 WL 1090666, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 21, 2016);
182 *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 817, *aff'd*, 924 F.3d 337 (7th Cir. 2019).
183 *Michaels Stores*, 2016 WL 1090666, at *2.
184 *Id.*
185 Consent Decree and Permanent Injunction, *Michaels Stores*, No. 3:15-cv-1203 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2018).
186 *Spectrum Brands*, 218 F. Supp. 3d at 817.
187 *Id.*
188 Order at 34, *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 18-1785 (7th Cir. May. 9, 2019).
189 15 U.S.C. § 2069(b).
190 16 C.F.R. Part 1119, *published in* 75 Fed. Reg. 15,993 (Mar. 31, 2010).
191 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,996.
192 *Id.*; *see also* 16 C.F.R. § 1119.4(a)(2).
193 *Id.* § 1119.4(a)(3).
194 *Id.*
195 *Id.* § 1119.4(a)(4).
196 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,996-97.
197 16 C.F.R. § 1119.4(a)(4).
198 *Id.* § 1119.4(a)(5).
199 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,997.
200 16 C.F.R. § 1119.4(a)(6).
201 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,997.
202 *Id.*
203 *Id.* § 1119.4(a)(7)(i).
204 *Id.*; *see* 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,997.
205 16 C.F.R. § 1119.4(a)(7)(ii).
206 *Id.* at § 1119.4(b)(1).
207 *Id.*
208 *Id.* at § 1119.4(b)(2).
209 *Id.* at § 1119.4(b)(3).
210 *Id.* at § 1119.4(b)(4).
211 *Id.*
212 *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2068(a)(13).
213 75 Fed. Reg. at 15,995-96.
214 CPSC summarized the comments that it received against a penalty matrix: Commenters opposed to such a matrix or
215 formula highlighted the difficulty of applying any formula in a particular circumstance as too rigid an approach that would
216 not take into consideration information that might be important to consider in one instance of a penalty but not in another.
217 One commenter suggested that if the Commission reduced its penalty formulation to a matrix, it would encourage
218 regulated parties to calculate the cost and risk of prohibited conduct and not to follow the statutory requirements. 74 Fed.
219 Reg. 45,101, 45,104 (Sept. 1, 2009).
220 *See* CPSC, Joint Statement of Chairman Elliot F. Kaye and Commissioner Robert S. Adler On Civil Penalties (July 20,
221 2016), <https://www.cpsc.gov/about-cpsc/commissioner/robert-bob-adler/statements/joint-statement-of-chairman-elliott-f-kaye-and>.
222 *Id.*
223 *Id.*
224 *Id.*
225 *Id.* at n.31.
226 Effective January 1, 2022, for most violations of the CPSA, the maximum civil penalty allowed by law is \$120,000 for each
227 violation and \$17.15 million for any related series of violations. *Civil Penalties; Notice of Adjusted Maximum Amounts*, 86
228 C.F.R. 68244 (Dec. 1, 2021).
229 Press Release, Department of Justice, Gree Appliance Companies Charged with Failure to Report Dangerous
230 Dehumidifiers and Agree to \$91 Million Resolution (Oct. 29, 2021), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/gree-appliance-companies-charged-failure-report-dangerous-dehumidifiers-and-agree-91-million>.
231 Alexander D. Hoehn-Saric, Remarks of Chair Alexander D. Hoehn-Saric International Consumer Product Health and
232 Safety Organization (ICPHSO) 2024 Annual Symposium, ¶ 5 (Feb. 20, 2024), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Remarks-of-CPSC-Chair-Alex-Hoehn-Saric-International-Consumer-Product-Health-and-Safety-Organization-ICPHSO-2024-Annual-Sumposium.pdf?VersionId=Slx9gHnS5osaQDf4eNGL43IWZLJD88xx> (“Some changes that you
233 may have noticed include: . . . aggressively pursuing civil penalties against companies that fail to report potential safety

defects. During my time as Chair, we have assessed nearly \$110 million in civil penalties – a massive increase over the previous years.”).

222 Statement of Commissioner Peter A. Feldman on *Kidde, Inc.*, Civil Penalty (Jan. 5, 2021), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/COPF%20Statement%20on%20Kidde%2C%20Inc. 1.pdf>.

223 Statement of Commissioners Feldman and Dziak on the Fiscal Year 2025 Operating Plan, ¶ 4 (Nov. 6, 2024), <https://www.cpsc.gov/About-CPSC/Commissioner/Peter-A-Feldman/Statement/Statement-of-Commissioners-Feldman-and-Dziak-on-the-Fiscal-Year-2025-Operating-Plan>.

224 *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 15-cv-371-wmc, 2017 WL 4339677, at *6 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 29, 2017); Press Release, Department of Justice, Michaels Stores Agrees to Pay \$1.5 Million to Settle CPSC Delayed Reporting Claim (Feb. 13, 2018), <https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/pr/michaels-stores-agrees-pay-15-million-settle-cpsc-delayed-reporting-claim>.

225 Proposed Settlement Agreement Stipulation, Order and Judgement, etc.; The Clorox Company, 91 Fed. Reg. 3441 (Jan. 27, 2026).

226 Under CPSC’s rules, when the agency reaches an agreement to resolve charges of violations of the CPSA, that agreement is deemed provisionally accepted and is then published in the Federal Register for public comment. If, within 15 calendar days, no person asks the Commission not to accept the agreement, the settlement is deemed finally accepted and the Commission will order the agreement’s execution. See 16 C.F.R. § 1118.20 (d)-(f).

227 91 Fed. Reg. at 3442.

228 *Id.*

229 *Id.*

230 Press Release, Clorox® Recalls Pine-Sol® Scented Multi-Surface Cleaners, CloroxPro® Pine-Sol® All Purpose Cleaners, and Clorox® Professional™ Pine-Sol® Lemon Fresh Cleaners Due to Risk of Exposure to Bacteria (Oct. 25, 2022), <https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2023/Clorox-Recalls-Pine-Sol-Scented-Multi-Surface-Cleaners-CloroxPro-Pine-Sol-All-Purpose-Cleaners-and-Clorox-ProfessionalTM-Pine-Sol-Lemon-Fresh-Cleaners-Due-to-Risk-of-Exposure-to-Bacteria-1>

231 91 Fed. Reg. at 3443-44.

232 See Press Release “Clorox Recalls” at para. 8.

233 See 16 C.F.R. § 1115.6(a)(“[f]irms that obtain information indicating that their products present an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death should not wait for such serious injury or death to actually occur before reporting.”)

234 See, e.g., Settlement Agreement and Order, *In re Peloton Interactive, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No.: 23-C0001, ¶ 35 (Dec. 28, 2022) (requiring an annual report on Peloton’s compliance program for each of the first five years following acceptance of the settlement), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/PelotonInteractiveIncProvSettlementAgreementandOrder23C0001p.pdf>; Settlement Agreement and Order, *In re Generac Power Systems, Inc.*, CPSC Docket No.: 23-C0002, ¶ 27 (May 3, 2023) (requiring an annual report on Generac’s compliance program for each of the first three years following acceptance of the settlement and annual internal audits), <https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/23-C0002-Generac-Order-and-Settlement-Agreement.pdf>.

235 *Mirama Enters.*, 185 F. Supp. at 1159.

236 *Mirama Enters.*, 387 F.3d at 986-89.

237 See Press Release, Department of Justice, Michaels Stores Agrees to Pay \$1.5 Million to Settle CPSC Delayed Reporting Claim (Feb. 13, 2018), [https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/michaels-stores-agrees-pay-15-million-settle-cpsc-delayed-reporting-claim#:~:text=\(Michaels\)%20agreed%20to%20enter%20into,consumers%20between%202007%20and%202009](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/michaels-stores-agrees-pay-15-million-settle-cpsc-delayed-reporting-claim#:~:text=(Michaels)%20agreed%20to%20enter%20into,consumers%20between%202007%20and%202009).

238 See Press Release, Department of Justice, Federal Court Orders SunSetter to Pay \$9.25M in Connection with Alleged Failure to Timely Report Defective Awning Covers to the CPSC (April 1, 2025), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/federal-court-orders-sunsetter-pay-925m-connection-alleged-failure-timely-report-defective>. *United States v. Stanley Black & Decker (Us) Inc.*, No. 1:25-cv-04224-CJC (D. Md.) was filed December 22, 2025. See Press Release, Department of Justice, United States Files Complaint Against Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. Alleging Delay in Reporting Hazardous Utility Bars and Miter Saws (Dec. 22, 2025), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/united-states-files-complaint-against-stanley-black-decker-inc-alleging-delay-reporting>.

239 218 F. Supp. 3d at 821.

240 218 F. Supp. 3d at 822.

241 Memorandum of Law in Support of Proposed Order of Civil Penalties and Permanent Injunction, *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00371-wmc (W.D. Wis. Jan. 17, 2017).

242 *Spectrum Brands, supra* n.171, at *6-7.

243 *Id.* at *4.

244 *Id.* at *6 & n.14.

245 See *id.* at *6. The court used a “starting point of \$10 per complaint received on or before June 30, 2009, representing the rough profit on the sale of those defective products; then \$75, representing the product’s purchase price; and doubling the penalty for each 6-month period thereafter” until Spectrum notified CPSC. *Id.*

246 *Id.*
247 *Id.*
248 See *id.* at *7.
249 Complaint, *United States v. Stanley Black & Decker (US) Inc.*, No. 1:25-cv-04224-GLR (D. Md. Dec. 22, 2025), at ¶ 78.
250 *Id.* at ¶¶ 3-4.
251 *Id.* at ¶ 5.
252 *Id.* at ¶¶ 34-35.
253 *Id.* at ¶ 5.
254 *Id.* at ¶ 7.
255 *Id.* at ¶ 45.
256 Press Release, CPSC, DEWALT Recalls Utility Bars Due to Injury Hazard (Sept. 26, 2019),
<https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2019/DEWALT-Recalls-Utility-Bars-Due-to-Injury-Hazard>.
257 *Id.* at ¶ 10.
258 Complaint, *Stanley Black & Decker*, at ¶ 10
259 *Id.*
260 *Id.* at ¶ 66.
261 Complaint, *Stanley Black & Decker*, at p. 12.
262 *Id.* at ¶¶ 70-73.
263 *Id.* at ¶¶ 73-75.
264 See Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order, *Kolcraft Enterprises, Inc.*, 78 Fed. Reg. 14,080
(Mar. 4, 2013). See also, e.g., Consent Decree, *United States v. Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc.*, No. 1:20CV208,
4-7 (M.D.N.C. Jan. 4, 2021); Consent Decree, *U.S. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs.*, *supra* n.38; Provisional Acceptance of a
Settlement Agreement and Order, *Kawasaki Heavy Industries*, 82 Fed. Reg. 25,779 (June 5, 2017).
265 Opinion and Order at 4, *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 3:15-cv-00371 (W.D. Wis. Apr. 9, 2018).
266 Notice of Appeal, *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 3:15-cv-00371 (W.D. Wis. Apr. 12, 2018).
267 Opening Brief and Circuit Rule 30(a) Appendix of Appellant *Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, *United States v. Spectrum Brands,*
Inc., No. 18-1785 (7th Cir. June 22, 2018).
268 *United States v. Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, No. 18-1785 (7th Cir. May 9, 2019).
269 Press Release, Department of Justice, Fire Extinguisher Manufacturer Ordered to Pay \$12 Million Penalty for Delay and
Misrepresentations in Reporting Product Defects (Jan. 4, 2021), [https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/fire-extinguisher-](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/fire-extinguisher-manufacturer-ordered-pay-12-million-penalty-delay-and-misrepresentations)
[manufacturer-ordered-pay-12-million-penalty-delay-and-misrepresentations](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/fire-extinguisher-manufacturer-ordered-pay-12-million-penalty-delay-and-misrepresentations).
270 Press Release, Kidde Recalls Fire Extinguishers with Plastic Handles Due to Failure to Discharge and Nozzle
Detachment: One Death Reported (Nov. 2, 2017), [https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2018/Kidde-Recalls-Fire-Extinguishers-](https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2018/Kidde-Recalls-Fire-Extinguishers-with-Plastic-Handles-Due-to-Failure-to-Discharge-and-Nozzle-Detachment-One-Death-Reported)
[with-Plastic-Handles-Due-to-Failure-to-Discharge-and-Nozzle-Detachment-One-Death-Reported](https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2018/Kidde-Recalls-Fire-Extinguishers-with-Plastic-Handles-Due-to-Failure-to-Discharge-and-Nozzle-Detachment-One-Death-Reported).
271 See Consent Decree, *United States v. Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc.*, *supra* n.257.
272 See Consent Decree of Civil Penalty and Permanent Injunction, *U.S. v. Gerber Legendary Blades, a division*
of Fiskars Brands Inc., No. 3:14-cv-2061 (D. Or. Jan. 6, 2015), [https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-](https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/FiskarsConsentDecreeUpdate.pdf)
[public/FiskarsConsentDecreeUpdate.pdf](https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/FiskarsConsentDecreeUpdate.pdf); Consent Decree of Civil Penalty and Permanent Injunction, *United States v.*
Black & Decker (U.S.) Inc., No. GLR-15-1239 (D. Md. Apr. 29, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/media/465041/dl>. DOJ
also sought liquidated damages in *Michaels* and *Spectrum*, but such damages ultimately were not included in the
Consent Decree in *Michaels* or ordered by the court in *Spectrum*. See Amended Complaint, *Michaels Stores, supra*
n.177; Complaint, *Spectrum Brands, supra* n.177; Consent Decree, *Michaels Stores, Inc.*, *supra* n.180; Opinion and
Order, *Spectrum Brands, Inc.*, *supra* n.254.
273 See *Daniels v. Am. Honda Motor Co.*, 980 F.2d 729, 1992 WL 361271, at *4 (6th Cir. 1992); *In re All Terrain Vehicle Litig.*,
979 F.2d 755, 757-58 (9th Cir. 1992); *Kloepfer v. Honda Motor Co., Ltd.*, 898 F.2d 1452, 1457 (10th Cir. 1990); *Benitez-*
Allende v. Alcan Aluminio do Brasil, S.A., 857 F.2d 26, 34-35 (1st Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 489 U.S. 1018 (1989); *Zepik v.*
Tidewater Midwest, Inc., 856 F.2d 936, 942 (7th Cir. 1988); *Copley v. Heil Quaker Corp.*, 818 F.2d 866, 1987 WL 37429,
at *2 (6th Cir. 1987); *Drake v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 797 F.2d 603, 609-10 (8th Cir. 1986). Some trial courts have
held that a private right of action may exist. See *Berry v. Mega Brands, Inc.*, No. 08-1750, 2009 WL 233508, at *6
(D.N.J. Jan. 30, 2009) (allowing a private right of action for violation of Section 15); *Butcher v. Robertshaw Controls Co.*,
550 F. Supp. 692, 694, 700 (D. Md. 1981) (same); *Young v. Robertshaw Controls Co.*, 560 F. Supp. 288 (N.D.N.Y. 1983)
(same); *Swenson v. Emerson Elec. Co.*, 374 N.W.2d 690, 698-99 (Minn. 1985) (same). Further, the Second Circuit has
found that even if there is a private right of action, plaintiff would have to establish causation between non-disclosure and
the alleged injury. *Kelsey v. Muskin Inc.*, 848 F.2d 39, 42 (2d Cir. 1988). The speculative nature of establishing such a
causal link was key to the Seventh Circuit's holding that there is no private right of action for alleged violations of Section
15. *Zepik*, 856 F.2d at 942.
274 See Pub. L. No. 110-314, § 218, 122 Stat. 3016, 3060 (2008).
275 15 U.S.C. § 2070 (2008).
276 See Pub. L. No. 110-314, § 217(c), 122 Stat. 3016, 3060.

277 15 U.S.C. § 2070(b).
278 See 15 U.S.C. § 2070(a) (providing criminal penalties for violations of Section 19 of the CPSA); 15 U.S.C. § 2068(a)(4)
(failure to furnish information required by Section 15(b) is a violation of Section 19).
279 15 U.S.C. § 2070(c)(1). See, e.g., Judgment in a Criminal Case, *United States v. Hung Lam*, No. 12-cr-20048-KMW
(S.D. Fla. June 11, 2013). Lam and three companies he owned and operated pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to
traffic and smuggle in banned children’s products that contained lead and small parts in violation of the CPSA and
FHSA and one count of trafficking in counterfeit goods, and Lam agreed to a criminal forfeiture of \$862,500, 22 months
incarceration in federal prison, three years of supervised release, and a \$10,000 fine. The government alleged that
Customs and Border Protection seized 35 importation shipments by Lam’s company LM Import-Export, Inc. (LM) for
violations, including 16 shipments for CPSC violations during 2010, and LM received at least six notices of
noncompliance from CPSC advising of excess lead content or a choking hazard found during CPSC lab testing. See
Criminal Complaint, *United States v. Hung Lam*, No. 12-cr-20048-KMW (S.D. Fla. Feb. 11, 2011).
280 Press Release, Department of Justice, *supra* n.267.
281 Information, *United States v. Gree Electric Appliances, Inc. of Zhuhai*, No. 2:21-cr-00498 MCS (C.D. Cal. Oct. 26,
2021).
282 Plea Agreement for Defendant Gree USA, Inc., Exhibit B: Statement of Facts, *United States v. Gree USA, Inc.*, No.
2:21-cr-00498 MCS (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2021); Deferred Prosecution Agreement for Defendants Gree Electric
Appliances, Inc. of Zhuhai, and Hong Kong Gree Electric Appliances Sales Co., Ltd., Exhibit B: Statement of Facts,
United States v. Gree Electric Appliances, Inc. of Zhuhai, No. 2:21-cr-00498 MCS (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2021).
283 See *id.*
284 See *id.*
285 See *id.*
286 See *id.*
287 Indictment, *United States v. Chu*, No. 2:19-cv-00193-DSF (C.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2019).

AMSTERDAM

Strawinskylaan 385
1077 XX Amsterdam, Netherlands

BOSTON

200 Clarendon Street -
The Hancock Building
53rd Floor
Boston, MA 02116

BRUSSELS

1, Rue du Marquis -
Markiesstraat, 1
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium

CHICAGO

300 N. LaSalle Dr.
Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60654

DENVER

1144 Fifteenth Street
Suite 3100
Denver, CO 80202-2848

HOUSTON

811 Main Street
Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77002-2755

LONDON

Tower 42
25 Old Broad Street
EC2N 1HQ
United Kingdom

LOS ANGELES

777 South Figueroa Street
44th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5844

NEWARK

One Gateway Center
Suite 1025
Newark, NJ 07102-5322

NEW YORK

250 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019-9710

SAN FRANCISCO

Three Embarcadero Center
10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4024

SEATTLE

U.S. Bank Center
1420 5th Avenue, Suite 1400
Seattle, WA 98101

SEOUL

20F, Concordian
76 Saemunan-ro, Jongro-gu
Seoul, Korea (03185)

SHANGHAI

Plaza 66 Building 2, #4306-4313
1266 Nanjing Xi Rd
Shanghai 200041
People's Republic of China

SILICON VALLEY

3000 El Camino Real
Five Palo Alto Square, Suite 500
Palo Alto, CA 94306-3807

WASHINGTON, D.C.

601 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20001-3743