This study aims to contribute towards the discussion of the role of impoliteness, from an interactional perspective, in a conflict situation: conciliation hearings between consumers (complainants) and furnishers of goods or services (respondents). This type of activity has as a constitutive element the dispute over different versions about the "factual truth" that originated the complaint. The hearing is coordinated by a third party whose institutional goal is to lead the parties to an agreement, although dealing with conflicting interests: The consumer-complainant wishes to charge the respondent with damage/loss caused; and the latter usually tries to exempt from any attribution of guilt/responsibility. For an empirical discussion of the impoliteness phenomenon, we used data generated in conciliation hearings at a PROCON (a Bureau of Consumer Protection) in the Brazilian state of Minas Gerais, recorded in audio and transcribed according to the methodological orientation of Conversation Analysis. Our analysis seeks to show which impolite strategies the participants themselves make relevant in their talk and how they are interpreted at each turn, locally, considering the specificities of this type of activity. The results obtained suggest that the conflict resolution, considering the participants’ face wants, depends mainly on the capacity of the parts to find the best strategies to save face and to put the opponent in the wrong face by claiming, for instance, credibility to their own arguments and trying to disqualify the other’s arguments. However, when the attack on the other’s face turn into verbal aggression, the conflict resolution is often frustrated.