

the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

IN THE MATTER OF
LEO ROBBINS

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

Docket 7556. Complaint, July 24, 1959—Decision, Feb. 13, 1960

Consent order requiring a Philadelphia, Pa., furrier to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by advertising which failed to disclose the names of animals producing certain furs, the country of origin of imported furs, or the fact that some fur products contained artificially colored fur, and represented prices of fur products falsely as "wholesale."

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

Mr. Maurice Pollon, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the respondent.

INITIAL DECISION BY WALTER R. JOHNSON, HEARING EXAMINER

In the complaint dated July 24, 1959, the respondent is charged with violating the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations made pursuant thereto.

On December 7, 1959 the respondent and his attorney entered into an agreement with counsel in support of the complaint for a consent order.

Under the foregoing agreement, the respondent admits the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint. The parties agree, among other things, that the cease and desist order there set forth may be entered without further notice and have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing and the document includes a waiver by the respondent of all rights to challenge or contest the validity of the order issuing in accordance therewith. The agreement further recites that it is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by the respondent that he has violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

The hearing examiner finds that the content of the agreement meets all of the requirements of Section 3.25(b) of the Rules of the Commission.

The hearing examiner being of the opinion that the agreement and the proposed order provide an appropriate basis for disposition of

Decision

56 F.T.C.

this proceeding as to all of the parties, the agreement is hereby accepted and it is ordered that the agreement shall not become a part of the official record of the proceeding unless and until it becomes a part of the decision of the Commission. The following jurisdictional findings are made and the following order issued.

1. Respondent Leo Robbins is an individual with his office and principal place of business located at 8th and Walnut Streets, in the City of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania.

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

ORDER

It is ordered. That respondent Leo Robbins, an individual, and respondent's representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising, offering for sale, the transportation or distribution, in commerce, of fur products; or in connection with the sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation, or distribution of fur products which are made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce, as "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Falsely or deceptively advertising fur products through the use of any advertisement, representation, public announcement or notice which is intended to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale, or offering for sale of fur products, and which:

A. Fails to disclose:

(1) The name or names of the animal or animals producing the fur or furs contained in the fur product, and as prescribed under the Rules and Regulations:

(2) That the fur product contains or is composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such is the fact:

(3) The name of the country of origin of any imported furs contained in the fur product.

B. Represents directly or by implication that the prices of fur products are wholesale prices, when such is not the fact.

C. Misrepresents in any manner the savings available to purchasers of respondent's fur products.

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 shall, on the 13th day of

SOUTHERN FRUIT DISTRIBUTORS, INC.

915

913

Decision

February, 1960, become the decision of the Commission; and, ac-