

it of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied with the order to cease and desist.

IN THE MATTER OF
BERNARD GOLDMAN TRADING AS BERNARD GOLDMAN

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

Docket 7843. Complaint, Mar. 24, 1960—Decision, July 16, 1960

Consent order requiring a Cincinnati, Ohio, furrier to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing to label fur products with the name of the animal producing the fur, and by failing in other respects to comply with labeling and invoicing requirements.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Bernard Goldman, an individual trading as Bernard Goldman, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has violated the provisions of said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Bernard Goldman is an individual trading as Bernard Goldman with his office and principal place of business located at 205 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondent has been and is now engaged in the introduction into commerce and in the sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation and distribution, in commerce, of fur products; and has sold, advertised, offered for sale, transported and distributed fur products which have been made in whole or in part of fur which had been shipped and received in commerce, as the terms "commerce", "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely and deceptively identified with respect to the name or names of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) Labels affixed to fur products did not comply with the minimum size requirements of one and three-quarter inches by two and three-quarter inches in violation of Rule 27 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was mingled with nonrequired information, in violation of Rule 29(a) of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth in the required sequence, in violation of Rule 30 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth separately on labels with respect to each section of fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs, in violation of Rule 36 of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) Required item numbers were not set forth on labels, in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by respondent in that they were not invoiced as required by Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act, and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 7. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, are in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Mr. William A. Somers for the Commission.

Respondent, *pro se*.

INITIAL DECISION BY LOREN H. LAUGHLIN, HEARING EXAMINER

The Federal Trade Commission (sometimes also hereinafter referred to as the Commission) on March 24, 1960, issued its complaint herein, charging the above-named respondent with having violated the provisions of both the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, together with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and the respondent was duly served with process.

On May 20, 1960, there was submitted to the undersigned hearing examiner of the Commission for his consideration and approval an "Agreement Containing Consent Order To Cease And Desist," which had been entered into by and between respondent and counsel supporting the complaint, under date of May 9, 1960, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Litigation of the Commission, which had subsequently duly approved the same.

On due consideration of such agreement, the hearing examiner finds that said agreement, both in form and in content, is in accord with § 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings, and that by said agreement the parties have specifically agreed to the following matters:

1. Respondent Bernard Goldman is an individual trading as Bernard Goldman with his office and principal place of business located at 205 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

2. Respondent admits all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint and agrees that the record may be taken as if findings of jurisdictional facts had been duly made in accordance with such allegations.

140

Order

3. This agreement disposes of all of this proceeding as to all parties.

4. Respondent waives:

a. Any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission;

b. The making of findings of fact or conclusions of law; and

c. All of the rights he may have to challenge or contest the validity of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with this agreement.

5. The record on which the initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and this agreement.

6. This agreement shall not become a part of the official record unless and until it becomes a part of the decision of the Commission.

7. This agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondent that he has violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

8. The following order to cease and desist may be entered in this proceeding by the Commission without further notice to respondent. When so entered it shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing. It may be altered, modified or set aside in the manner provided for other orders. The complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order.

Upon due consideration of the complaint filed herein and the said "Agreement Containing Consent Order To Cease And Desist," the latter is hereby approved, accepted and ordered filed, the same not to become a part of the record herein, however, unless and until it becomes a part of the decision of the Commission. The hearing examiner finds from the complaint and the said "Agreement Containing Consent Order To Cease And Desist" that the Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondent herein; that the complaint states a legal cause for complaint under the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated by the Commission under the latter Act, against the respondent both generally and in each of the particulars alleged therein; that this proceeding is in the interest of the public; that the following order as proposed in said agreement is appropriate for the just disposition of all of the issues in this proceeding as to all of the parties hereto; and that said order therefore should be, and hereby is, entered as follows:

It is ordered, That Bernard Goldman, an individual trading as Bernard Goldman, or under any other name, and respondent's repre-

sentatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising, or offering for sale in commerce, or 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. Misbranding fur products by:

A. Failing to affix labels to fur products showing in letters and figures plainly legible all of the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act;

B. Falsely or deceptively labeling or otherwise identifying any such product as to the name or names of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which such product was manufactured;

C. Setting forth on labels affixed to fur products information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder mingled with non-required information;

D. Affixed to fur products labels that do not comply with the minimum size requirements of one and three-quarter inches by two and three-quarter inches;

E. Failing to set forth the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the required sequence;

F. Failing to set forth separately on labels attached to fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder with respect to the fur comprising each section;

G. Failing to set forth on labels the item number or mark assigned to a fur product.

2. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

Failing to furnish to purchasers of fur products an invoice showing all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

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 16th day of July 1960, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

WITKOWER PRESS, INC., ET AL.

Decision