1023160

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS: Jon Leibowitz, Chairman

William E. Kovadc J. Thomas Rosb Edith Ramirez Julie Brill

In the Matter of) DOCKET NO. C-T eh a de dle e rFōT fc as rome hma a i vtslio si n ai don e

("respondent") has violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and it appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges:

- 1. Respondent Ceridian Corporation ("Ceridian") is a Delaware corporation with its principal office or place of business at 3311 East Old Shakopee Road, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55425.
- 2. The acts and practices of respondent as alleged in this complaint have be in or affecting commere, as commere is defined in Section 4 of the deal Trade Commission Act.
- Respondent is a service provider that, among other things, provides payroll processing, payroll-related tax filing, benefits administration, and other human resource services to business customers.
- 4. Among other things, responded operates Powerpa, a web-basel payroll processing service in the United States under the name "Powerpay." Respondent's small business customers letter their employees' personal information on to the Powerpawebsite, which they use as a repository to collect, track, and store employee payroll data and to automate paroll processing for their employees.

When customers enterheir employees' personal information on to the Powerpa website, the information is sent to computers on responting ecomputer nework for the purpose of computing paroll amounts and precessing payroll checks and direct deposits. This personal in

- 10. Through the means decribed in Pargraphs 6 and 7, responding represented, represslyor by implication, that it implemented reasonable and appropriate measures to protect personal information against unauthorized access.
- 11. In truth and in fatic respondent did not implement sea able ad appropriate measures to protect personal information against unauthorized aecs. Therefore, the representations set forth in Paragraphs 6 and 7 were, and are, false or misleading.
- As set forth in Paragraph 8, respondent failed to employ reasonable and appropriate measure to prevent unathorized access to personhanformation. Respondents' portaices causel, or an likely to cause substantial injury to consumers that is not offstey countervailing benefits to consumers competition and is not reasonly avoidable by consumers. This portaice was, and is, an unafir act or practice.
- 13. The acts and practices of responded as alleged in this complaint constitute unfair or deceptive acts or parctices in or affecting commere in violation of Section 5(ad) the Federal TradeCommission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

THEREFORE, the Federal TradeCommission this____ dayof _____, 2011, has issued this complaint against respondent.

By the Commisison.

Donald S. Clark Secreary