

Decision

IN THE MATTER OF
THE B. P. COOLEY COMPANY ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE WOOL PRODUCTS LABELING ACTS

Docket 7230. Complaint, Aug. 7, 1958—Decision, Sept. 11, 1958

Consent order requiring manufacturers in Stafford Springs, Conn., to disclose the fiber content and manufacturer's identification number on labels attached to woolen waste products, and to cease misrepresenting the fiber content on invoices or shipping memoranda.

Mr. Charles W. O'Connell for the Commission.
No appearance for the respondents.

INITIAL DECISION BY WILLIAM L. PACK, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this matter charges the respondents with misbranding certain wool products in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and the Federal Trade Commission Act. An agreement has now been entered into by respondents and counsel supporting the complaint which provides, among other things, that respondents admit all of the jurisdictional allegations in the complaint; that the record on which the initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and agreement; that the inclusion of findings of fact and conclusions of law in the decision disposing of this matter is waived, together with any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; that the order hereinafter set forth may be entered in disposition of the proceeding, such order to have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing, respondents specifically waiving any and all rights to challenge or contest the validity of such order; that the order may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided for other orders of the Commission; that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; and that the agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

The hearing examiner having considered the agreement and proposed order and being of the opinion that they provide an adequate basis for appropriate disposition of the proceeding, the

Order

55 F.T.C.

agreement is hereby accepted, the following jurisdictional findings made, and the following order issued:

1. Respondent The B. P. Cooley Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under the laws of the State of Connecticut. Respondents W. Craig Leuthner and Frank Leuthner are president-secretary and treasurer, respectively, of said corporate respondent. The office and place of business of all the respondents is in Stafford Springs, Conn.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

ORDER

It is ordered, That the respondents The B. P. Cooley Company, a corporation, and its officers, and W. Craig Leuthner and Frank Leuthner, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction or manufacture for introduction into commerce, or the offering for sale, sale, transportation, or distribution in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, of woolen wastes or other wool products as "wool products" are defined in, and subject to, the Wool Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding such products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively tagging, labeling or otherwise identifying such products as to the character or amount of the constituent fibers contained therein;

2. Failing to securely affix to, or place on, each such product, a stamp, tag or label or other means of identification showing in a clear and conspicuous manner:

(a) The percentage of the total fiber weight of such wool product exclusive of ornamentation, not exceeding five percentum of said total fiber weight, of (1) wool, (2) reprocessed wool, (3) reused wool, (4) each fiber other than wool where said percentage by weight of such fiber is five percentum or more, and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers;

(b) The maximum percentage of the total weight of such wool product of any non-fibrous loading, filling or adulterating matter;

(c) The name or the registered identification number of the manufacturer of such wool product or of one or more persons

339

Decision

engaged in introducing such wool product into commerce, or in the offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution or delivery for shipment thereof in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

It is further ordered, That the respondents The B. P. Cooley Company, a corporation, and its officers, and W. Craig Leuthner and Frank Leuthner, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale, or distribution of woolen wastes or any other products in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misrepresenting the character or amount of the constituent fibers contained in such products, on invoices or shipping memoranda applicable thereto, or in any other manner.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision of the hearing examiner did on the 11th day of September 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

It is ordered, That respondents The B. P. Cooley Company, a corporation, and W. Craig Leuthner and Frank Leuthner, individually and as officers of said corporation, shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

IN THE MATTER OF
A. CAPLAN DUSTING MILL, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE WOOL PRODUCTS LABELING ACTS

Docket 7231. Complaint, Aug. 7, 1958—Decision, Sept. 11, 1958

Consent order requiring manufacturers in Newport, N.H., to disclose the fiber content and manufacturer's identification number on labels attached to woolen waste products, and to cease misrepresenting the fiber content on invoices or shipping memoranda.

Mr. Charles W. O'Connell for the Commission.

No appearance for the respondents.

INITIAL DECISION BY WILLIAM L. PACK, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this matter charges the respondents with misbranding certain wool products in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and the Federal Trade Commission Act. An agreement has now been entered into by respondents and counsel supporting the complaint which provides, among other things, that respondents admit all of the jurisdictional allegations in the complaint; that the record on which the initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and agreement; that the inclusion of findings of fact and conclusions of law in the decision disposing of this matter is waived, together with any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; that the order hereinafter set forth may be entered in disposition of the proceeding, such order to have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing, respondents specifically waiving any and all rights to challenge or contest the validity of such order; that the order may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided for other orders of the Commission; that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; and that the agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

The hearing examiner having considered the agreement and proposed order and being of the opinion that they provide an adequate basis for appropriate disposition of the proceeding, the