

Complaint.

9 F. T. C.

IN THE MATTER OF
JOSEPH S. WEINSTOCK.

COMPLAINT, FINDINGS AND ORDER IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION
OF SECTION 5 OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 26, 1914.

Docket 1094—May 5, 1925.

SYLLABUS.

Where it had been long known that the City of Sheffield, England, and its vicinity constituted that country's largest producing area of silverware and silverplated ware, and the center of its silver industry, and such products there made had come to be highly regarded by the trade and public, and the words "Sheffield Silver", "Sheffield Plate", and "Sheffield Silverplated Ware", when applied to such products had come to denote to a substantial portion of the public that the products so designated had been manufactured in Sheffield, England, and were of the quality which had become associated with that name and industry; and thereafter an American dealer in silverplated ware made by the electroplating process sold the same with the words "Sheffield", "Sheffield Plate", and other combinations of words including the word "Sheffield" impressed thereon, and in his catalogues and other trade literature dominated and listed the same as Sheffield Plate, notwithstanding the fact that the same were of domestic origin and not of that quality associated with the term Sheffield as above set forth; with the effect of inducing the purchase of the afore-said products thus misrepresented as to origin and quality, by a substantial portion of the trade and public in preference to the products of competitors dealing in silverplated ware manufactured in Sheffield, England and of those dealing in products not there manufactured and not so designated: *Held*, That the sale of products misbranded as above set forth, constituted an unfair method of competition.

Mr. John R. Dowlan for the Commission.

COMPLAINT.¹

Acting in the public interest pursuant to the provisions of an Act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, entitled "An Act To create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," the Federal Trade Commission charges that Joseph S. Weinstock, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has been and is using unfair methods of competition in commerce in violation of the provisions of Section 5 of said Act, and states its charges in that respect as follows:

COUNT I.

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent is an individual transacting business under the name of Joseph S. Weinstock, with his principal office

¹ As amended.

and place of business in the City and State of New York. He is engaged in buying silver-plated ware and in the sale thereof to wholesale and retail dealers located at points in various States of the United States. He causes said ware, when so sold, to be transported from his said principal place of business in the City and State of New York into and through other States of the United States to said purchasers at their respective points of location. In the course and conduct of his said business respondent is in competition with other individuals, partnerships and corporations engaged in the manufacture and/or sale and transportation of silver-plated ware in interstate commerce between and among various States of the United States.

PAR. 2. Competitors of respondent and the manufacturer of respondent's ware use, in the manufacture of their products, the electroplating process, which is the covering of a form of base metal with an adherent coating of silver by the electrolysis of silver salts. The plated silverware thus produced varies in quality and value according to the composition of the base metal, the workmanship upon its form and the decoration, the amount and fineness of the silver deposited upon it and left upon it after the finishing process, and the protection of the surfaces exposed to wear and abrasion. There is no fixed standard for the composition of base metal, nor for the fineness or quantity of silver to be applied generally or to wearing surfaces, so that the purchasing public is obliged to depend upon the reputation of the maker of such plated silverware, or the reputation of the trade name or brand attached thereto, or the representations of the maker or seller thereof, in purchasing said silverware, since the quality of the ware can not be determined except by laboratory tests.

PAR. 3. About the year 1742 there was originated in Sheffield, England, a process for the production of silver-plated ware, which process involved the welding of a silver plate to one or both sides of a sheet or bar of copper so as to form one thoroughly coherent mass which was rolled to the desired gauge and subsequently worked into the desired form. The ware produced by this process was properly known as "copper rolled plate," though this name was not used as a trade name or designation. The copper rolled plate of Sheffield, England, acquired a very considerable reputation for excellence in quality, workmanship and design, and though the name "Sheffield" was not generally impressed upon or affixed to the ware itself, which was identified by the maker's registered marks, the copper rolled plate came to be generally known and is still known as "Sheffield."

Complaint.

9 F. T. C.

While the cheaper, electroplating process displaced copper rolled plate, which practically went out of production, there have been and still are, from time to time, importations of the copper rolled plate into the United States, and there is a considerable trade in copper rolled plate in this country at prices which reflect not only its value as plated ware, but its artistic and historic value as well. The name "Sheffield" as applied to silverware at the present time implies a quality and a value peculiar to the copper rolled plate process as well as the process itself, and its use is a representation thereof.

PAR. 4. In the conduct of his business during a period of more than a year past, respondent has sold, and continues so to do, electroplated ware coated with silver upon which has been stamped or impressed the words "Sheffield Plate" and other combinations of words including the word "Sheffield," and such ware carrying the word "Sheffield" upon it is ultimately offered for sale in that form to the consuming public.

Respondent in the course of his aforesaid business has offered and advertised electroplated ware to the trade through catalogs and other trade literature wherein respondent has caused said ware to be denominated and listed as "Sheffield Plate."

PAR. 5. There are competitors of respondent in the manufacture and sale of electroplated ware who are not endeavoring to induce the preferment or purchase of their products by the public by representing them as "Sheffield," either with reference to process of manufacture, or quality, but, recognizing that there is no fixed standard by which the value and quality of electroplated ware can be represented to the purchasing public, have adopted and are following the practice of identifying their products by a firm or house name, or by a nondescriptive trade name, the standard for which they severally fix and determine or in unison agree upon and maintain. The competitive operations of such manufacturers and merchandisers fairly and truthfully representing their products to the public are seriously injured by the methods and practices of the respondent misrepresenting the process and quality of his products as aforesaid.

PAR. 6. The above alleged acts and things done by respondent are all to the prejudice of the public and respondent's competitors, and constitute unfair methods of competition in commerce within the intent and meaning of Section 5 of an Act of Congress entitled "An Act To create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914.

COUNT II.

PARAGRAPH 1. That paragraphs numbered 1, 2, and 4 of Count I are hereby made a part of this Count II, and are as fully and completely charged as though set out herein verbatim.

PAR. 2. Many years prior to the use of the word "Sheffield" by the respondent as hereinbefore alleged, the silversmiths of the city of Sheffield, England, and vicinity, adopted the comparatively new electroplating process in lieu of the old copper rolled plate process which was practically abandoned, and maintained, through the use of the electroplating process, the high reputation for quality which they had acquired in the older process. The city of Sheffield, England, and its vicinity have been continuously, since many years prior to the said use of the word "Sheffield" by respondent, and are still, and have been and are still quite generally known to be, the largest producing area of silverware and silver-plated ware in England, and the center of and predominant place in the silver industry of that country. Silverware and silver-plated ware made by the silversmiths of Sheffield, England, have been since many years prior to the use of the word "Sheffield" by the respondent, and still are, highly regarded by the trade and public in the United States, England, and other countries, as of uniform, reliable, and dependable quality, and the words "Sheffield Silver," "Sheffield Plate," and "Sheffield Silver Plated Ware," when used in connection with silverware or silver-plated ware, have signified and denoted and now signify and denote, to a substantial portion of the public, that such silverware and silver-plated ware were manufactured in Sheffield, England, and are of the quality which has become associated with that name and industry.

PAR. 3. The use by respondent of the terms "Sheffield" and "Sheffield Plate," and other similar designations containing the name "Sheffield" as set out herein, has the capacity and tendency to create the impression among a substantial portion of the trade and public that the silver-plated ware in connection with which such terms are used was manufactured in Sheffield, England, and is of the quality which has been and still is associated with the terms "Sheffield Silver" and "Sheffield Plate," and the silver industry of Sheffield, England; whereas, in truth and in fact the silver-plated ware sold by respondent with said terms marked or stamped thereon is not manufactured in Sheffield, England, or in its vicinity, or in England, and is not of the quality which has been and still is associated with the terms "Sheffield Silver" and "Sheffield Plate" and the silver industry of Sheffield, England; and the use of these

Findings.

9 F. T. C.

terms by respondent is a misrepresentation of the origin and quality of respondent's wares and is confusing and misleading and tends to create and does create an undue preference for such silver-plated ware among, and tends to induce and does induce the purchase of such silver-plated ware by, a substantial portion of the trade and public in preference to silver-plated ware manufactured and sold by respondent's competitors, some of whom deal in wares which are manufactured in Sheffield, England, and others of whom refrain from the use of such terms in connection with wares not manufactured in Sheffield, England.

PAR. 4. The above alleged acts and things done by respondent are all to the prejudice of the public and respondent's competitors, and constitute unfair methods of competition in commerce within the intent and meaning of Section 5 of an Act of Congress entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914.

REPORT, FINDINGS AS TO THE FACTS, AND ORDER.

Pursuant to the provisions of an Act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, the Federal Trade Commission issued and served an amended complaint upon the respondent, Joseph S. Weinstock, charging him with the use of unfair methods of competition in commerce in violation of the provisions of said act.

The respondent, having entered his appearance, an agreed statement of the facts was signed by the respondent and by counsel for the Federal Trade Commission, in which agreed statement of facts it was stipulated that the Commission might take the facts as stated in lieu of testimony before the Commission, and might proceed upon said statement of facts to make its report in said proceeding, stating its findings as to the facts and conclusion and entering such order as would dispose of the proceeding, the respondent waiving any right to file brief or make an oral argument before the Commission.

This proceeding coming on for final determination the Commission, having duly considered the record and being fully advised in the premises, makes this its findings as to the facts and its conclusion drawn therefrom:

FINDINGS AS TO THE FACTS.

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent, Joseph S. Weinstock, is an individual with his principal office and place of business in the City and State of New York. He is engaged in buying silver-plated ware and in the

sale thereof to wholesale and retail dealers located at points in various States of the United States. He causes said ware when so sold to be transported from his said place of business in the City and State of New York into and through other States of the United States to said purchasers at their respective points of location. In the course and conduct of his said business, respondent is in competition with other individuals, partnerships, and corporations engaged in the manufacture and/or sale and transportation of silver-plated ware in interstate commerce between and among various States of the United States.

PAR. 2. The manufacturer of respondent's wares, and competitors of respondent, use in the manufacture of their products the electroplating process, which is the covering of a form of base metal with an adherent coating of silver by the electrolysis of silver salts. The plated silverware thus produced varies in quality and value according to the composition of the base metal, the workmanship upon its form and the decoration, the amount and fineness of the silver deposited upon it and left upon it after the finishing process, and the protection of the surfaces exposed to wear and abrasion. There is no fixed standard for the composition of the base metal nor for the fineness or quantity of silver to be applied generally or to wearing surfaces, so that the purchasing public is obliged to depend upon the reputation of the maker of such plated silverware or the reputation of the trade name or brand attached thereto or the representation of the maker or seller thereof, in purchasing said silverware since the quality of the ware can not be determined except by laboratory tests.

PAR. 3. About the year 1742 there was originated in Sheffield, England, a process for the production of silver-plated ware, which process involves the welding of a silver plate to one or both sides of a sheet or bar of copper so as to form one thoroughly coherent mass which was rolled to the desired gauge and subsequently worked into the desired form. The ware produced by this process was properly known as "Copper Rolled Plate" though this name was not used as a trade name or designation. The copper-rolled plate of Sheffield, England, acquired a very considerable reputation for excellence in quality, workmanship, and design, and though the name "Sheffield" was not generally impressed upon or affixed to the ware itself, which was identified by the maker's registered mark, the copper-rolled plate came to be generally known and is still known as "Sheffield." While the cheaper electroplating process displaced copper-rolled plate which practically went out of production, there have been and still are from time to time importations of the

Findings.

9 F. T. C.

copper-rolled plate into the United States and there is a considerable trade in copper-rolled plate in this country at prices which reflect not only its value as plated ware, but its artistic and historic value as well. The name "Sheffield" as applied to silverware at the present time, implies a quality and a value peculiar to the copper-rolled process as well as the process itself, and its use is a representation thereof.

PAR. 4. In the conduct of his business during a period of more than a year past, respondent has sold electroplated ware, coated with silver upon which has been stamped or impressed the words "Sheffield," "Sheffield Plate," and other combinations of words including the word "Sheffield" and such ware carrying the word "Sheffield" upon it, is ultimately offered for sale in that form to the consuming public. Respondent during that said time and in the course of his business has also offered and advertised his said silverware to the trade through catalogs and other trade literature wherein respondent has caused said ware to be denominated and listed as "Sheffield Plate."

PAR. 5. There are competitors of respondent in the manufacture and sale of electroplated ware, who are not endeavoring to induce the preferment or purchase of their products by the public by representing them as "Sheffield" either with reference to process of manufacture or quality, but, recognizing that there is no fixed standard by which the value and quality of electroplated ware can be represented to the purchasing public, have adopted and are following the practice of identifying their products by a firm or house name or by a nondescriptive trade name, the standard for which they severally fixed and determined or in unison agreed upon and maintain. The competitive operation of such manufacturers and merchandisers fairly and truthfully representing their products to the public, are seriously injured by the methods and practices of the respondent misrepresenting the process and quality of his products as aforesaid.

PAR. 6. Many years prior to the use of the word "Sheffield" by the respondent as hereinbefore stated, the silversmiths of the city of Sheffield, England, and vicinity, adopted the comparatively new electroplating process, in lieu of the older copper-rolled plate process which was practically abandoned, and maintained through the use of the electroplating process and high reputation for quality which they had acquired in the older process. The city of Sheffield, England, and its vicinity, have been continuously since many years prior to the said use of the word "Sheffield" by respondent, and are still and have been and are still quite generally known to be, the largest producing area of silverware and silver-plated ware in England, and

the center of and predominant place in the silver industry of that country. Silverware and silver-plated ware made by the silversmiths of Sheffield, England, have been since many years prior to the use of the word "Sheffield" by respondent, and still are, highly regarded by the trade and public in the United States, England, and other countries, as of uniform, reliable, and dependable quality; and the words "Sheffield Silver," "Sheffield Plate" and "Sheffield Silver-plated Ware," when used in connection with silverware or silver-plated ware have signified and denoted, and now signify and denote, to a substantial portion of the public, that such silverware and silver-plated ware were manufactured in Sheffield, England, and are of the quality which has become associated with that name and industry.

PAR. 7. The use by respondent of the terms "Sheffield," "Sheffield Plate," and other similar designations containing the name "Sheffield," as set out herein, has the capacity and tendency to create the impression among a substantial portion of the trade and public, that the silver-plated ware upon which [such] terms appear was manufactured in Sheffield, England, and is of a quality which has been and still is associated with the terms "Sheffield Silver" and "Sheffield Plate" and the silver industry of Sheffield, England; whereas in truth and in fact the silver-plated ware sold by respondent with said terms marked or stamped thereon is not manufactured in Sheffield, England, or in its vicinity, and is not of the quality which has been and still is associated with the terms "Sheffield Silver," and "Sheffield Plate" and the silver industry of Sheffield, England; and the use of these terms by respondent is a misrepresentation of the origin and quality of respondent's wares, and is confusing and misleading, and tends to create and does create an undue preference for such silver-plated ware among, and tends to induce and does induce the purchase of such silver-plated ware by, a substantial portion of the trade and public in preference to silver-plated ware manufactured and sold by respondent's competitors, some of whom deal in wares which are manufactured in Sheffield, England, and others of whom refrain from the use of such terms in connection with wares not manufactured in Sheffield, England.

CONCLUSION.

The practices of the said respondent under the conditions and circumstances described in the foregoing findings are unfair methods of competition in interstate commerce, and constitute a violation of the Act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, entitled "An Act To create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes."

Order.

9 F. T. C.

ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST.

This proceeding having been heard by the Federal Trade Commission upon the complaint of the Commission and the stipulation as to the facts entered into by counsel for the Commission and by the respondent, and the Commission having made its findings as to the facts, with its conclusion that the respondent has violated the provisions of the Act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes,"

It is now ordered, That respondent, his agents, servants, and employees, and representatives, do cease and desist—

From employing or using in connection with the sale of silverware which has not been made in Sheffield, England, the name "Sheffield" alone or in combination with any other name or with any word, sign, symbol, or device, to describe or designate such silverware either by stamping or impressing the name "Sheffield" thereon or in any other manner.

It is further ordered, That respondent within thirty days from notice hereof, file with the Commission a report in writing setting out in detail the manner and form in which he has complied with the order of the Commission herein set forth.

Complaint.

IN THE MATTER OF
WESTERN SILVER WORKS, INCORPORATED.

COMPLAINT, FINDINGS AND ORDER IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION
OF SECTION 5 OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 26, 1914.

Docket 1155—May 5, 1925.

SYLLABUS.

Where it had been long known that the city of Sheffield, England, and its vicinity constituted that country's largest producing area of silverware and silver-plated ware, and the center of its silver industry, and such products there made had come to be highly regarded by the trade and public, and the words "Sheffield Silver," "Sheffield Plate," and "Sheffield Silverplated Ware," when applied to such products had come to denote to a substantial portion of the public that the products so designated had been manufactured in Sheffield, England, and were of the quality which had become associated with that name and industry; and thereafter an American manufacturer of silver-plated ware by the electroplating process, caused the words "Sheffield Plate," and other combinations containing the word "Sheffield" to be impressed upon its products, notwithstanding the fact that the same were of domestic origin and not of that quality associated with the term Sheffield as above set forth, with the effect of inducing the purchase of the aforesaid products thus misrepresented as to origin and quality, by a substantial portion of the trade and public in preference to the products of competitors dealing in silver-plated ware manufactured in Sheffield, England, and of those dealing in products not there manufactured and not so designated:

Held, That the sale of products misbranded as above set forth, constituted an unfair method of competition.

Mr. John R. Dowlan for the Commission.

COMPLAINT.¹

Acting in the public interest pursuant to the provisions of an Act of Congress approved September 26, 1914, entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," the Federal Trade Commission charges that the Western Silver Works, Inc., hereinafter referred to as respondent, has been and is using unfair methods of competition in commerce in violation of the provisions of Section 5 of said Act, and states its charges in that respect as follows:

COUNT I.

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York with its principal office and place of business in the city of New York in said State. It is engaged in

¹As amended.