

or discount in lieu thereof, upon or in connection with any sale of citrus fruit or fruit products to such buyer for his own account.

It is further ordered, That the respondent herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon 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 this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

PFEIFERS OF ARKANSAS ET AL.

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

Docket C-234. Complaint, Sept. 13, 1962—Decision, Sept. 13, 1962

Consent order requiring a furrier in Little Rock, Ark., 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; by setting forth required information on invoices in abbreviated form; by advertising in newspapers which represented sale prices as reduced from regular prices which were in fact fictitious, and falsely stated purchasers could "Save $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and more"; and by failing to maintain adequate records as a basis for price and value claims.

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 Pfeifers of Arkansas, a corporation and John Hannahs, individually and as the manager of the fur department 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. Respondent Pfeifers of Arkansas is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Arkansas with its office and principal place of business located at 514-24 Main Street, Little Rock, Ark. Respondent Pfeifers of Arkansas is a department store engaged in retailing various commodities including fur products.

Respondent John Hannahs is manager of the fur department of the said corporate respondent and controls, directs and formulates the acts, practices and policies of the fur department 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 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 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 the Rules and Regulations promulgated under such Act.

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.
3. To show the country of origin of the imported furs used in the fur products.

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 that information required under Section 5(b)(1) 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.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised, in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that re-

Complaint

61 F.T.C.

spondents 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 and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of said fur products.

PAR. 6. Among and included in the advertisements as aforesaid, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondents, which appeared in issues of the Arkansas Gazette and Arkansas Democrat newspapers published in the city of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, 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, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said advertisements:

(a) Represented prices of fur products as having been reduced from regular or usual prices where the so-called regular or usual prices were in fact fictitious in that they were not the prices at which said merchandise was usually sold by respondents in the recent regular course of business, in violation of Section 5(a) (5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(a) of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) Represented through percentage savings claims such as "Save $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and more" that prices of fur products were reduced in direct proportion to the percentage of savings stated, when such was not the fact, in violation of Section 5(a) (5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 7. Respondents in advertising fur products for sale as aforesaid, made claims and representations respecting prices and values of fur products. Said representations were of the types covered by subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Rule 44 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act. Respondents in making such claims and representations failed to maintain full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such claims and representations were based, in violation of Rule 44(e) of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. 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 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 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 Pfeifers of Arkansas is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Arkansas with its office and principal place of business located at 514-24 Main Street, Little Rock, Arkansas. Respondent Pfeifers of Arkansas is a department store engaged in retailing various commodities including fur products.

Respondent John Hannahs is manager of the fur department of the said corporate respondent and his address is the same as that of the said corporate respondent.

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, Pfeifers of Arkansas, a corporation, and its officers and John Hannahs, individually and as manager of the fur department 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 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, as "com-

merce", "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. 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.

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.

2. 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. Represents, directly or by implication, that the regular or usual price of any fur product is any amount which is in excess of the price at which respondents have usually and customarily sold such products in the recent regular course of business.

B. Represents through percentage savings claims that prices of fur products are reduced in direct proportion to the percentage of savings stated, when such is not the fact.

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

3. Making claims and representations of the types covered by subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Rule 44 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Fur Products Labeling Act unless there are maintained by respondents full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such claims and representations are based.

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.

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

ANNIS FURS, 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-235. Complaint, Sept. 13, 1962—Decision, Sept. 13, 1962

Consent order requiring New York City furriers to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by advertising in newspapers which represented sale prices of fur products as reduced from purported regular prices which were in fact fictitious and which stated falsely that customers could "Save $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and more"; and by failing to maintain adequate records as a basis for price and value claims.

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 Annis Furs, Inc., a corporation, and Felix Merrick, an individual and employee 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. Respondent Annis Furs, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware with its office and principal place of business located at 130 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y. Respondent Annis Furs, Inc., is a wholesaler and retailer of fur products.

Respondent Felix Merrick is an employee of the said corporate respondent and participates in controlling, formulating and directing 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 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