

school is limited to a specified number of persons from a particular area, contrary to fact.

It is further ordered, That the respondents herein 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 this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

KRAUSS BROS. FUR MFG., 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-120. Complaint, Apr. 16, 1962—Decision, Apr. 16, 1962

Consent order requiring New York City manufacturing furriers to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by labeling artificially colored fur as natural and failing to show on labels when furs were bleached or dyed; by invoicing which failed to show the true animal name of furs and to disclose when furs were artificially colored; and by furnishing false guaranties that their furs were not misbranded, falsely invoiced, or falsely advertised.

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 Krauss Bros. Fur Mfg., Inc., a corporation, and Carl Krauss, individually and as an officer of 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. Respondent Krauss Bros. Fur Mfg., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and virtue of the laws of the State of New York with its office and principal place of business located at 305 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Respondent Carl Krauss is president of the said corporate respondent and formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent. His office and principal place of business is the same as that of the said corporate respondent.

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 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 have 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 has 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 or otherwise falsely or deceptively labeled in that said fur products were labeled to show that the fur contained therein was natural when in fact such fur was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, 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.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products with labels which failed to show that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

Decision and Order

60 F.T.C.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in that they were not invoiced as required under the provisions of 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 such 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 bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 6. The respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their fur products were not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised, when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that the fur products so falsely guaranteed would be introduced, sold, transported or distributed, in commerce, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

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 and unfair methods of competition 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 to issue herein, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that the law has been violated as set forth in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreement, hereby accepts same, issue its complaint in the form contemplated by said agree-

ment, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Krauss Bros. Fur Mfg., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York with its office and principal place of business located at 305 Seventh Avenue, in the city of New York, State of New York.

Respondent Carl Krauss is an officer of said corporation and his address is the same as that of 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 respondents Krauss Bros. Fur Mfg., Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Carl Krauss, individually and as an officer 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 sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any fur products; or in connection with the manufacture for sale, sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution, of any fur product which has been 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. Representing, directly or by implication, on labels that the fur contained in fur products is natural, when such is not the fact.

B. 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.

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 Products Labeling Act.

3. Furnishing a false guaranty that any fur product is not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when the respondents have reason to believe that such fur product may be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce.

Complaint

60 F.T.C.

It is further ordered, That the respondents herein 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 this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

PHILLIP HAUSFELD TRADING AS PHILLIP HAUSFELD

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

Docket C-121. Complaint, Apr. 16, 1962—Decision, Apr. 16, 1962

Consent order requiring a New York City furrier to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by failing to show on invoices the true animal name of furs and the country of origin of imported furs, and to disclose when furs were artificially colored; using the term "blended" improperly on invoices; and failing in other respects to comply with 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 Phillip Hausfeld, an individual trading as Phillip Hausfeld, 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. Respondent Phillip Hausfeld is an individual trading as Phillip Hausfeld, with his office and principal place of business located at 233 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y.

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 has been shipped and received in commerce; and has introduced into commerce, sold, advertised or

offered for sale, in commerce, and transported and distributed, in commerce, fur as the terms "commerce", "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said furs and 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 the Rules and Regulations promulgated under such Act.

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

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product or the true animal name of the fur.

2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

3. To show the country of origin of the imported furs used in the fur product or to show the country of origin of the imported furs.

PAR. 4. 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) The term "blended" was used as part of the information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe the pointing, bleaching, dyeing, tip-dyeing or otherwise artificial coloring of furs contained in fur products in violation of Rule 19(f) 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. 5. 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 and unfair methods of competition 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 determination 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 respondent of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the complaint to issue herein, 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 such 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 Phillip Hausfeld is an individual trading as Phillip Hausfeld with his office and principal place of business located at 233 West 26th Street, in the city of New York, State of New York.
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 Phillip Hausfeld, an individual trading as Phillip Hausfeld, 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 any fur product; or in connection with the sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution of any fur product which is made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce; or 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 any fur, as "commerce", "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Falsely or deceptively invoicing furs or fur products by:
 - A. Failing to furnish invoices to purchasers of furs or 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 Products Labeling Act.

758

Complaint

2. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

A. Setting forth the term "blended" as part of the information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe the pointing, bleaching, dyeing, tipdyeing or otherwise artificial coloring of furs contained in fur products.

B. Failing to set forth the item number or mark assigned to 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