

IN THE MATTER OF
LUDWIG, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-8. Complaint, Oct. 23, 1961,—Decision, Oct. 23, 1961

Consent order requiring Boston furriers to cease violating the Fur Products
Labeling Act by failing to disclose, in labeling and invoicing fur products,

Complaint

59 F.T.C.

when the fur was dyed; failing to show on invoices the true animal name of the fur and the country of origin of imported furs; and 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 Ludwig, Inc., a corporation, and Herbert Ludwig, and Alvin Ludwig, individually and as officers of the said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have 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. Ludwig, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located at 18 Newbury Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Herbert Ludwig and Alvin Ludwig are officers of the said corporation and control, direct and formulate the acts, practices and policies of the said corporation. Their office and principal place of business is the same as that of the said corporation.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondents have been and are 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 have 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 without labels and with labels which failed:

1. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was dyed, when such was the fact.

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 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.

(b) 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 respondents 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 pertaining to fur products which failed:

1. To show the true animal 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 country of origin of 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 that required item numbers were not set forth on invoices in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 7. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, 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 respondents named in the caption hereof with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, and the respondents having been served with notice of said determination and with a copy of the complaint the Commission intended to issue, together with a proposed form of order; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondents 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 respondents

Order

59 F.T.C.

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 Ludwig, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Massachusetts with its office and principal place of business located at 18 Newbury Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Respondents Herbert Ludwig and Alvin Ludwig are officers of the said corporation and control, direct and formulate the acts, practices and policies of the said corporation. Their office and principal place of business is the same as that of the said corporation.

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 Ludwig, Inc., a corporation and its officers, and Herbert Ludwig and Alvin Ludwig, individually and as officers of the said corporation, and respondents' 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 of the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

B. 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.

C. 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 of the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

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

It is further ordered, That the respondents herein shall, within sixty