

IN THE MATTER OF
JEROME KRAMER TRADING AS J. C. KRAMER FURRIER

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

Docket C-5. Complaint, Oct. 17, 1961—Decision, Oct. 17, 1961

Consent order requiring an Erie, Pa., furrier to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing, in labeling, invoicing, and advertising fur products, to show the true name of the fur and the country of origin of imported furs; failing to show, in labeling and advertising, when a fur product was composed of cheap or waste fur, and to disclose in invoicing when fur was dyed; and failing in other respects to comply with requirements of the Act.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, and by virtue of the authority

Complaint

59 F.T.C.

vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Jerome Kramer, an individual trading as J. C. Kramer Furrier, 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. Jerome Kramer is an individual trading as J. C. Kramer Furrier with his office and principal place of business located at 11 West 8th Street, Erie, Pennsylvania.

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 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.

Among such misbranded fur products but not limited thereto were fur products with labels which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.
2. To show that the fur product was composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies or waste fur when such was the fact.
3. To show the name or other identification issued and registered by the Commission of one or more of the persons who manufactured such fur product for introduction into commerce, introduced it into commerce, sold it in commerce, advertised or offered it for sale, in commerce, or transported or distributed it in commerce.
4. To show the name of the country of origin of the imported furs used in the fur products.

PAR. 4. 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) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products

Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) 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.

(c) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was mingled with non-required information in violation of Rule 29(a) 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 completely set out on one side of labels, in violation of Rule 29(a) of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth in handwriting on labels, in violation of Rule 29(b) of said Rules and Regulations.

(f) 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.

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

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the 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.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were invoices which failed:

1. To show the true name of the fur used in the fur product.
2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was dyed when such was the fact.
3. To show the name of the country of origin of the imported furs used in the fur product.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not invoiced in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects.

(a) Information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated there-

under was set forth in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

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

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that respondent caused the dissemination in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in said Act, of certain newspaper advertisements, concerning said products, which were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder; and which advertisements were intended to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of said fur products.

PAR. 8. Among and included in the advertisements as aforesaid, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondent which appeared in issues of the Times News, a newspaper published in the city of Erie, State of Pennsylvania and having a wide circulation in said State and various other States of the United States.

By means of said advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements:

(a) Failed to disclose the name or names of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide, in violation of Section 5(a)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(b) Failed to disclose that fur products contained or were composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such was the fact, in violation of Section 5(a)(3) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

(c) Failed to disclose the name of the country of origin of the imported furs contained in the fur products, in violation of Section 5(a)(6) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 9. 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.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission having heretofore determined to issue its complaint charging the respondent named in the caption hereof with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, and the respondent having been served with notice of said deter-

857

Order

mination and with a copy of the complaint the Commission intended to issue, together with a proposed form of order; and

The respondent and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondent of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the complaint, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondent that the law has been violated as set forth in the complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreement, hereby accepts same, issues its complaint in the form contemplated by said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Jerome Kramer is an individual trading as J. C. Kramer Furrier, with his office and principal place of business located at 11 West 8th Street, Erie, 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 Jerome Kramer, an individual trading as J. C. Kramer Furrier, or under any other trade name 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, 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 words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

B. Setting forth on labels affixed to fur products:

1. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form.

2. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder mingled with nonrequired information.

Order

59 F.T.C.

3. Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in handwriting.

C. Affixing 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.

D. Failing to set forth all the information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder on one side of such labels.

E. Failing to set forth separately on labels affixed 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.

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

2. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

A. Failing to furnish invoices to purchasers of fur products showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Product Labeling Act.

B. Setting forth information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form.

C. Failing to set forth on invoices the item number or mark assigned to a fur product.

3. 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 as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide and as prescribed by 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 fur contained in a fur product.

It is further ordered, That the respondent herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon him of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which he has complied with this order.

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF
MEYER SIEGEL TRADING AS
MAX SIEGEL & SON

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

Docket C-6. Complaint, Oct. 17, 1961—Decision, Oct. 17, 1961

Consent order requiring a Chicago furrier to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing, in labeling and invoicing fur products, to show the true animal name of the fur, the country of origin of imported furs, and when fur was dyed; and to disclose, in labeling, the name of the manufacturer or seller of fur products; 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 Meyer Siegel, an individual trading as Max Siegel & Son, 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. Meyer Siegel is an individual trading as Max Siegel & Son with his office and principal place of business located at 2637 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

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 manufacture for 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 manufactured for sale, 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