

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 the order to cease and desist.

IN THE MATTER OF

HERBERT A. HOWELL DOING BUSINESS AS
HOOSIER SALES COMPANY

ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE
COMMISSION ACT

Docket 8551. Complaint, Jan. 3, 1963—Decision, Apr. 27, 1963

Order requiring a Fort Wayne, Ind., individual, engaged in the sale of "Rinse-Away" garbage disposal units to the public, to cease making a variety of misrepresentations—through his sales representatives and the literature they employed—concerning the effectiveness, comparative merits, and price of his product, scope of his business, his personnel, financial capacity, etc.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Herbert A. Howell, an individual trading and doing business as Hoosier Sales Company, hereinafter referred to as the respondent, has violated the provisions of said 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 Herbert A. Howell is an individual who for some time last past has traded and done business under the trade name and style of Hoosier Sales Company. His address is 2530 Tyler Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

PAR. 2. For some time last past the respondent has been engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of "Rinse-Away" garbage disposal units to the public.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of his business the respondent has caused his said product, when sold, to be shipped from its place of manufacture in the State of Wisconsin to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and at all times mentioned herein has maintained a substantial course of trade in said product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of his business, and for the purpose of inducing the sale of his garbage disposal units, by means of oral statements of sales representatives, and by means of sales aids, brochures and other literature which sales representatives have employed when soliciting prospective purchasers, the respondent has represented, directly or by implication:

1. That appointments with prospective customers are solicited for the purpose of explaining an "advertising plan".

2. That the prospect has been especially "selected" to participate in the plan.

3. That respondent's product will process all waste animal and vegetable matter commonly disposed of through the use of a garbage can, and will thus eliminate the necessity of maintaining and using a garbage can.

4. That the health of the prospect and his family is endangered by the common method of garbage disposal which includes the use of a covered garbage can and a regular collection service.

5. That the Rinse-Away garbage disposal unit is safer, more efficient and quieter than similar models of comparable price.

6. That respondent's business is national in scope; that he employs statisticians and engineers among others; and that he is financially capable of spending many thousands of dollars annually in nationwide advertising media.

7. That current and valid statistics indicate that 50 percent of prospects interviewed will become purchasers.

8. That the price at which the Rinse-Away is being offered is available for a limited time only, and that the prospect must take advantage of such offer immediately, or forego indefinitely such special price.

Complaint

62 F.T.C.

9. That purchasers will recover all or a substantial part of the total cost of the disposal unit through the receipt of referral fees.

10. That there are liquidated damages which the purchaser must pay if he cancels his order prior to installation.

11. That the respondent has a credit department which handles personal credit matters, and that the respondent does not contemplate the immediate discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper.

PAR. 5. In truth and in fact:

1. Appointments with prospective customers are not solicited for the purpose of explaining an advertising plan, but for the purpose of selling respondent's product.

2. The prospect has not been especially selected to participate in any plan or sale.

3. Respondent's product will not process all waste animal and vegetable matter commonly disposed of through the use of a garbage can, and will not eliminate the necessity of maintaining and using a garbage can.

4. The health of the prospect or his family is not endangered by the common method of garbage disposal which includes the use of a covered garbage can and a regular collection service.

5. The Rinse-Away garbage disposal unit is neither safer, more efficient, nor quieter than similar models of comparable price.

6. Respondent's business is not national in scope; he does not employ statisticians or engineers; and he is not financially capable of spending many thousands of dollars annually in nation-wide advertising media.

7. There are no current and valid statistics which indicate that 50 percent of prospects interviewed will become purchasers.

8. The price at which the Rinse-Away is being offered is not available for a limited time only, nor must the prospect take advantage of such offer immediately or risk foregoing indefinitely such special price.

9. Purchasers do not recover all or a substantial part of the total cost of the disposal unit through the receipt of referral fees.

10. There are no liquidated damages which the purchaser must pay if he cancels his order prior to installation.

11. Respondent does not have a credit department which handles personal credit matters, and he does contemplate the discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper.

Therefore, the representations referred to in Paragraph 4 were, and are, false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 6. In the course and conduct of his business, respondent has failed to disclose that in the event of a sale he intended to discount purchasers' negotiable paper. In the absence of such disclosure, pro-

spective purchasers believe that no discounting is intended. In truth and in fact, respondent has promptly discounted purchasers' negotiable paper in the regular course of his business. There is a preference among installment buyers for dealing with vendors who do not discount their customers' negotiable paper. In many cases purchasers of respondent's product would not have entered into contracts of sale had they known that their paper was to be discounted. Respondent's failure to reveal the material fact of his intentions or course of business concerning the discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper was, and is, an unfair and deceptive act or practice.

PAR. 7. In the course and conduct of his business, and at all times mentioned herein, respondent has been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of garbage disposal units of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondent.

PAR. 8. The use by respondent of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true, and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondent's product by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondent's competitors and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Mrs. Rose W. Sloan and Mr. David J. Eden supporting the complaint.

No appearance for respondent.

INITIAL DECISION BY WALTER K. BENNETT, HEARING EXAMINER

MARCH 19, 1963

The complaint in this proceeding was issued January 3, 1963. It charges respondent with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act for false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices.

Respondent was duly served with a copy of the complaint and filed no answer thereto. Respondent was also served with a notice that the hearing scheduled in the complaint would be held in Room 747, 1101

Initial Decision

62 F.T.C.

Building, 11th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., on March 18, 1963, at 10:00 a.m. The proceeding was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on that date in that place, and there being no appearance on behalf of respondent was again called to order at 10:15 a.m., with the same result.

On motion of counsel supporting the complaint, the hearing examiner duly noted the default, and, pursuant to Rule 4.5 of the Rules of Practice, found the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and adopted the order accompanying the complaint.

By reason of respondent's failure to answer or appear in this proceeding, the hearing examiner is authorized to enter an initial decision based on the facts alleged in the complaint, without further notice.

Accordingly, the following findings are made, conclusion reached and order issued.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent, Herbert A. Howell, is an individual who for some time last past has traded and done business under the trade name and style of Hoosier Sales Company. Respondent's address is set forth in the complaint as 2530 Tyler Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana. However, he was served at Rural Route No. 2, Hamilton, Indiana, according to the affidavit of service filed in this proceeding.

2. For some time last past the respondent has been engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of "Rinse-Away" garbage disposal units to the public.

3. In the course and conduct of his business the respondent has caused his said product, when sold, to be shipped from its place of manufacture in the State of Wisconsin to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and at all times mentioned herein has maintained a substantial course of trade in said product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

4. In the course and conduct of his business, and for the purpose of inducing the sale of his garbage disposal units, by means of oral statements of sales representatives, and by means of sales aids, brochures and other literature which sales representatives have employed when soliciting prospective purchasers, the respondent has represented, directly or by implication:

(a) That appointments with prospective customers are solicited for the purpose of explaining an "advertising plan".

(b) That the prospect has been especially "selected" to participate in the plan.

(c) That respondent's product will process all waste animal and

vegetable matter commonly disposed of through the use of a garbage can, and will thus eliminate the necessity of maintaining and using a garbage can.

(d) That the health of the prospect and his family is endangered by the common method of garbage disposal which includes the use of a covered garbage can and a regular collection service.

(e) That the Rinse-Away garbage disposal unit is safer, more efficient and quieter than similar models of comparable price.

(f) That respondent's business is national in scope; that he employs statisticians and engineers among others; and that he is financially capable of spending many thousands of dollars annually in nationwide advertising media.

(g) That current and valid statistics indicate that 50 percent of prospects interviewed will become purchasers.

(h) That the price at which the Rinse-Away is being offered is available for a limited time only, and that the prospect must take advantage of such offer immediately, or forego indefinitely such special price.

(i) That purchasers will recover all or a substantial part of the total cost of the disposal unit through the receipt of referral fees.

(j) That there are liquidated damages which the purchaser must pay if he cancels his order prior to installation.

(k) That the respondent has a credit department which handles personal credit matters, and that the respondent does not contemplate the immediate discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper.

5. In truth and in fact:

(a) Appointments with prospective customers are not solicited for the purpose of explaining an advertising plan, but for the purpose of selling respondent's product.

(b) The prospect has not been especially selected to participate in any plan or sale.

(c) Respondent's product will not process all waste animal and vegetable matter commonly disposed of through the use of a garbage can, and will not eliminate the necessity of maintaining and using a garbage can.

(d) The health of the prospect or his family is not endangered by the common method of garbage disposal which includes the use of a covered garbage can and a regular collection service.

(e) The Rinse-Away garbage disposal unit is neither safer, more efficient, nor quieter than similar models of comparable price.

(f) Respondent's business is not national in scope; he does not employ statisticians or engineers; and he is not financially capable of

spending many thousands of dollars annually in nationwide advertising media.

(g) There are no current and valid statistics which indicate that 50 percent of prospects interviewed will become purchasers.

(h) The price at which the Rinse-Away is being offered is not available for a limited time only, nor must the prospect take advantage of such offer immediately or risk foregoing indefinitely such special price.

(i) Purchasers do not recover all or a substantial part of the total cost of the disposal unit through the receipt of referral fees.

(j) There are no liquidated damages which the purchaser must pay if he cancels his order prior to installation.

(k) Respondent does not have a credit department which handles personal credit matters, and he does contemplate the discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper.

Therefore, the representations referred to in Finding No. 4 were, and are, false, misleading and deceptive.

6. In the course and conduct of his business, respondent has failed to disclose that in the event of a sale he intended to discount purchasers' negotiable paper. In the absence of such disclosure, prospective purchasers believe that no discounting is intended. In truth and in fact, respondent has promptly discounted purchasers' negotiable paper in the regular course of his business. There is a preference among installment buyers for dealing with vendors who do not discount their customers' negotiable paper. In many cases purchasers of respondent's product would not have entered into contracts of sale had they known that their paper was to be discounted. Respondent's failure to reveal the material fact of his intentions or course of business concerning the discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper was, and is, an unfair and deceptive act or practice.

7. In the course and conduct of his business, and at all times mentioned herein, respondent has been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of garbage disposal units of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondent.

8. The use by respondent of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true, and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondent's product by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

CONCLUSION

The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondent's competitors and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondent Herbert A. Howell, individually and doing business as Hoosier Sales Company, and respondent's agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of garbage disposers or any other product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Representing, directly or by implication,
 - (a) That an appointment with a prospective customer is solicited for the purpose of explaining an advertising plan or for any purpose other than the concluding of a sale.
 - (b) That a prospect has been especially selected to participate in any promotional plan or sale.
 - (c) That respondent's product will process all waste animal or vegetable matter commonly disposed of through the use of a garbage can, or will eliminate the necessity of maintaining or using a garbage can.
 - (d) That the health of the prospect or his family is endangered by the common method of garbage disposal which includes the use of a covered garbage can and a regular collection service.
 - (e) That respondent's product is safer, more efficient or quieter than similar models of comparable price.
 - (f) That respondent's business is national in scope; that he employs statisticians or engineers; that he is financially capable of spending many thousands of dollars annually in nation-wide advertising media; that the size, scope, or financial capability of his business or the number of his employees is greater than the true size, scope, financial capability or number; or that the qualifications of any of his employees are other than the true qualifications.
 - (g) That statistics indicate that fifty percent, or any percentage other than the true percentage, of prospects will become purchasers.

(h) That the price at which the respondent's product is offered is a promotional price, or a reduced price, or is available for a limited time.

(i) That a purchaser will recover all or a substantial part of the total cost of respondent's product through the receipt of referral fees; or that the amount of money or money's worth any purchaser or prospective purchaser will receive, or may reasonably expect to receive, from the submission of names of prospects under respondent's referral program, or otherwise, is greater than the true amount.

(j) That respondent's sales contract contains a provision for liquidated damages or other penalty unless such penalty provision is a legally significant and enforceable obligation of a party thereto.

(k) That the respondent has a credit department which handles personal credit matters, or that the respondent does not contemplate the discounting of a purchaser's negotiable paper.

2. Failing to clearly and adequately inform prospects that respondent contemplates the discounting of purchasers' negotiable paper.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE REPORT OF
COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 4.19 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, effective June 1, 1962, the initial decision of the hearing examiner shall on the 27th day of April 1963, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

It is 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 the order to cease and desist.

IN THE MATTER OF

ABBY KENT CO., INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDERS, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF SEC. 2(d)
OF THE CLAYTON ACT

*Dockets C-328-C-490. Complaints, May 1, 1963—Decisions, May 1, 1963**

*Reported as modified on June 28, 1963. These orders were made effective on August 9, 1965, and the firms directed to file report of compliance.

1248

Complaint

Consent orders consolidated, requiring 163 wearing apparel manufacturers to cease discriminating in price among their customers in violation of Sec. 2(d) of the Clayton Act by favoring certain retailers with promotional payments not made proportionally available to competing stores, and postponing the effective date of the orders to cease and desist until further order of the Commission.

COMPLAINTS

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that the respondents named in the appendix herein, page 1251, have violated and are now violating the provisions of subsection (d) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (U.S.C., Title 15, Sec. 13), and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereto would be in the interest of the public, the Commission hereby issues its complaints stating its charges as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. The respondents are corporations engaged in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the amended Clayton Act, and sell and distribute their wearing apparel products from one State to customers located in other States of the United States. The sales of respondents in commerce are substantial.

PAR. 2. The respondents in the course and conduct of their business in commerce paid or contracted for the payment of something of value to or for the benefit of some of their customers as compensation or in consideration for services and facilities furnished by or through such customers in connection with their sale or offering for sale of wearing apparel products sold to them by respondents, and such payments were not made available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing with favored customers in the sale and distribution of respondents' wearing apparel products.

PAR. 3. Included among, but not limited to, the practices alleged herein, respondents have granted substantial promotional payments or allowances for the promoting and advertising of their wearing apparel products to certain department stores and others who purchase respondents' said products for resale. These aforesaid promotional payments or allowances were not offered and made available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers of respondents who compete with said favored customers in the sale of respondents' wearing apparel products.

PAR. 4. The acts and practices alleged in paragraphs 1 through 3 are all in violation of subsection (d) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

DECISIONS AND ORDERS

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondents named in the appendix herein, and subsequently having determined that complaints should issue, and the respondents having entered into agreements containing orders to cease and desist from the practices being investigated and having been furnished copies of a draft of the complaints to issue herein charging them with violation of subsection (d) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended, and

The respondents having executed the agreements containing consent orders which agreements contain an admission of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the complaints to issue herein, and statements that the signing of the said agreements is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by the respondents that the law has been violated as set forth in such complaints, and also contain the waivers and provisions required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreements, hereby accepts the same, issues its complaints in the form contemplated by said agreements, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following orders:

1. Respondents named in the appendix herein are corporations organized and existing under the laws of various States of the United States, with their offices and principal places of business located as set forth in the appendix.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of these proceedings and of the respondents.

ORDERS

It is ordered, That respondents named in the appendix herein, p. 1251, corporations, their officers, directors, agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in the course of their business in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Clayton Act, as amended, do forthwith cease and desist from:

(1) Paying or contracting for the payment of anything of value to, or for the benefit of, any customer of the respondents as compensation or in consideration for advertising or promotional services, or any other service or facility, furnished by or through such customer in connection with the handling, sale or offering for sale of wearing apparel products manufactured, sold or offered for sale by respondents, unless such payment or consideration is made available on proportionally equal terms to all other

customers competing with such favored customer in the distribution or resale of such products.

It is further ordered, That the effective date of these orders to cease and desist be, and they hereby are postponed until further Order of the Commission.*

APPENDIX

RESPONDENTS NAMES AND ADDRESSES, NEW YORK CITY UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED

- (C-328) Abby Kent Co., Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-329) Adelaar Bros., Inc., 525 7th Ave.
- (C-330) All State Garment Corp., 205 W. 39th St.
- (C-331) Alps Sportswear Manufacturing Co., Inc., 65 Bedford St., Boston, Mass.
- (C-332) The Bernhard Altmann Corp., 100 W. 40th St.
- (C-333) Aquascutum Imports, Inc., 2 E. 37th St.
- (C-334) Aquascutum Co., Ltd., 2 E. 37th St.
- (C-335) Andrew Arkin, Inc., 530 Seventh Ave.
- (C-336) Aronoff & Richling, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-337) Cay Artley Apparel, Inc., 232 Levergood St., Johnstown, Pa.
- (C-338) S. Augstein & Co., 15-58 127th St., College Point, Long Island, N.Y.
- (C-339) Ballantyne Sweaters, Ltd., 40 E. 34th St.
- (C-340) Barmon Brothers Co., Inc., 893 Broadway, Buffalo, N.Y.
- (C-341) Ben Barrack Dresses, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-342) Ben Barrack Petites, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-343) The Beaumart Co., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-344) Beaver Shirt Manufacturing Co., Inc., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-345) Beldoch Popper, Inc., 1410 Broadway
- (C-346) Bermuda Knitwear Corp., 1410 Broadway
- (C-347) Biltwell Co., Inc., 1128 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
- (C-348) Biltwell Slacks, Inc., 1324 Santee, Los Angeles, Calif.
- (C-349) Blairmoor Knitwear Corp., 33-00 Northern Blvd., Long Island City, N.Y.
- (C-350) Braemar Knitwear (U.S.A.) Ltd., 1407 Broadway
- (C-351) Sue Brett, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-352) British Vogue, Inc., 1410 Broadway
- (C-353) Robert Bruce, Inc., 2867 E. Allegheny Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
- (C-354) Candy Frocks, Inc., 501 Seventh Ave.
- (C-355) Streamline Garment Corp., 530 W. 1st St., Greensburg, Ind.
- (C-356) Casualcraft, Inc., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-357) David A. Church Co., Inc., 47 Greenpoint Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.
- (C-358) Climatic, Inc., 1 Jackson Place, Yonkers, N.Y.
- (C-359) Martha Clyde, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-360) Joseph H. Cohen, Inc., 71 Fifth Ave.
- (C-361) Cotton Club Frocks, Inc., 275 Seventh Ave.
- (C-362) Country Set, Inc., 1520 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
- (C-363) Carol Crawford, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-364) David Crystal, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.

*The effective date postponed by modified order of June 28, 1963.

Decision and Order

62 F.T.C.

- (C-365) Dalton of America, Inc., 6611 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio
- (C-366) Darlene Knitwear, Inc., North Commercial St., Manchester, N.H.
- (C-367) H. Daroff & Sons, Inc., 2300 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- (C-368) Davidow Suits, Inc., 550 Seventh Ave.
- (C-369) Defiance Manufacturing Co., Inc., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-370) Jacques de Loux, Inc., Sellersville, Pa.
- (C-371) Derby Sportswear, Inc., 1333 Broadway
- (C-372) Donmoor-Isaacson, 1115 Broadway
- (C-373) Donwood, Ltd., 1407 Broadway
- (C-374) Dorset Knitwear, Ltd., 381 Park Avenue South
- (C-375) Dotti Original, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-376) Eagle Clothes, Inc., 1107 Broadway
- (C-377) Eagle-Freedman-Rodelheim Co., 5th & Juniper Sts., Quakertown, Pa.
- (C-378) Elder Manufacturing Co., 13th & Lucas Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
- (C-379) Esquire Sportswear Mfg. Co., 43 W. 23rd St.
- (C-380) Excello Shirts, Inc., 390 Fifth Ave.
- (C-381) Exmoor Knitwear Co., Inc., 40 Spring St., Haverstraw, N.Y.
- (C-382) Stanley M. Feil, Inc., 2073 E. Fourth St., Cleveland, Ohio
- (C-383) Fordham-Bardell Shirt Corp., 212 Fifth Ave.
- (C-384) French Knitwear Co., Inc., 1407 Broadway
- (C-385) Gant of New Haven, Inc., 162 James St. New Haven, Conn.
- (C-386) Garland Knitting Mills, 117 Bickford St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
- (C-387) Jerry Gilden Fashions, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-388) Globe Knitwear Co., Inc., 831 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- (C-389) Gordon & Ferguson Co., 250 E. Fifth St., St. Paul, Minn.
- (C-390) Grunwald-Marx, 932 Wall St., Los Angeles, Calif.
- (C-391) Harper Shirt Co., Inc., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-392) B. W. Harris Manufacturing Co., 396 Sibley St., St. Paul, Minn.
- (C-393) Haspel Brothers, Inc., 2527 St. Bernard St., New Orleans, La.
- (C-394) Hayette, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-395) Haymaker Sports, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-396) Helga, 722 Los Angeles St., Los Angeles, Calif.
- (C-397) Highlander Sportswear, Inc., 135 Monroe St., Newark, N.J.
- (C-398) Hochenberg & Gelb, Inc., 915 Broadway
- (C-399) Jane Holly, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-400) Henry I. Siegel Co., Inc., 16 E. 34th St.
- (C-401) Hortex Manufacturing Co., Inc., 100 S. Cotton St., El Paso, Tex.
- (C-402) House of Perfection, Inc., 45 W. 36th St.
- (C-403) House of Worsted-Tex, Inc., 2300 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- (C-404) F. Jacobson & Sons, Inc., 390 Fifth Ave.
- (C-405) Juniorite, Inc., 1407 Broadway
- (C-406) Kadet, Kruger & Co., 216 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
- (C-407) The Kaynee Co., Greenville, S.C.
- (C-408) William B. Kessler, Inc., Pleasant and Tilton Sts., Hammonton, N.J.
- (C-409) Lackawanna Pants Manufacturing Co., Inc., 300 Brook St., Scranton, Pa.
- (C-410) Lawrence of London, Ltd., 512 Seventh Ave.
- (C-411) The H. D. Lee Co., Inc., 117 W. 20th St., Kansas City, Mo.
- (C-412) Rhoda Lee, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-413) Lehigh Trouser Co., 514 S. Main St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
- (C-414) Levin & Co., Inc., 1350 Broadway
- (C-415) Londontown Manufacturing Co., 3600 Clipper Mill Road, Baltimore, Md

- (C-416) Loomtogs, Inc., 1410 Broadway
- (C-417) MacShore Classics, Inc., 1410 Broadway
- (C-418) Majestic Specialties, Inc., 340 Claremont Ave., Jersey City, N.J.
- (C-419) Major Blouse Co., Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-420) The Majer Brand Co., Inc., 200 Fifth Ave.
- (C-421) Masket Bros. Sport Wear, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-422) Lynne Manufacturing Co., 27-01 Bridge Plaza N., Long Island City, N.Y.
- (C-423) Abby Michael, Ltd., 1407 Broadway
- (C-424) Michaels Stern & Co., Inc., 87 N. Clinton Ave., Rochester, N.Y.
- (C-425) Miller Manufacturing Co., Inc., 915 Main St., Joplin, Mo.
- (C-426) Morrison Knitwear, Inc., 130 Palmetto St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
- (C-427) Nelly De Grab, 533 Seventh Ave.
- (C-428) Nelly Don, Inc., 3500 E. 17th St., Kansas City, Mo.
- (C-429) Nelson-Caine, 1400 Broadway
- (C-430) Newman & Newman, 11 E. 26th St.
- (C-431) Palm Beach Co., 426 E. 4th St., Cincinnati, Ohio
- (C-432) Park-Storyk Corp., 1407 Broadway
- (C-433) Pattullo-Jo Copeland, Inc., 498 Seventh Ave.
- (C-434) Pauker Boyswear Corp., 25 W. 31st St.
- (C-435) Peerless Robes and Sportswear, Inc., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-436) Fashions by Blauner, Inc., 134 W. 37th St.
- (C-437) Pickwick Knitting Mills, Inc., 49 Junius St., Brooklyn, N.Y.
- (C-438) Plymouth Manufacturing Co., 500 Harrison Ave., Boston, Mass.
- (C-439) Milton Saunders Co., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-440) Princess Peggy, Inc., 1001 S. W. Adams St., Peoria, Ill.
- (C-441) Rabhor Robes, Inc., South Norwalk, Conn.
- (C-442) Ratner Manufacturing Co., 730 Thirteenth St., San Diego, Calif.
- (C-443) Rona Dresses, 1400 Broadway
- (C-444) S. Rudofker's Sons, Inc., 22nd & Market Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
- (C-445) Rugby Knitting Mills, Inc., 1490 Jefferson Ave., Buffalo, N.Y.
- (C-446) Sagner, Inc., South Wisner St., Frederick, Md.
- (C-447) Savoy Knitting Mills Corp., 801 Meadow St., Allentown, Pa.
- (C-448) Abe Schrader Corp., 530 Seventh Ave.
- (C-449) Alfred Shapiro, Inc., 240 Madison Ave.
- (C-450) Shelby Manufacturing Co., 1350 Broadway
- (C-451) M & D Simon Co., 700 St. Clair Ave., West, Cleveland, Ohio
- (C-452) Miss Smart Frocks, Inc., 501 Seventh Ave.
- (C-453) Smartee, Inc., 45 E. 12th St.
- (C-454) Sorority Frocks, Inc., 120 W. 28th St.
- (C-455) Sport Kraft, Inc., 413 W. Third St., Lewes, Del.
- (C-456) Sportsville Men's Wear, Inc., 16 E. 34th St.
- (C-457) Sigma Fashions, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-458) Talbott, Inc., 1407 Broadway
- (C-459) Tellshire, Inc., 270 W. 38th St.
- (C-460) Thomson Co., 405 Park Ave.
- (C-461) Timely Clothes, Inc., 1415 Clinton Ave., North, Rochester, N.Y.
- (C-462) Towncliffe, Inc., 512 Seventh Ave.
- (C-463) Triton Mfg. Co., Inc., 18 Pocasset St., Fall River, Mass.
- (C-464) Troy Shirt Makers Guild, Inc., 71 Lawrence St., Glen Falls, N.Y.
- (C-465) Usona Shirt Co., 230 Fifth Ave.
- (C-466) Weber and Lott, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-467) Weber Originals, Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.

Complaint

62 F.T.C.

- (C-468) Margo Walters, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-469) Wentworth Manufacturing Co., Blanding St., Lake City, S.C.
- (C-470) White Stag Manufacturing Co., 5100 S. E. Harney Drive, Portland, Oreg.
- (C-471) Wolfson & Greenbaum, Inc., 132 W. 36th St.
- (C-472) Wright Manufacturing Co., Toccoa, Ga.
- (C-473) Ben Zuckerman, Inc., 512 Seventh Ave.
- (C-474) The Enro Shirt Co., Inc., 4300 Leghorn Drive, Louisville, Ky.
- (C-475) Famous-Sternberg, Inc., 950 Poeyfarre St., New Orleans, La.
- (C-476) Glen Mfg., Inc., 320 E. Buffalo St., Milwaukee, Wis.
- (C-477) Ilene Manufacturing Co., Inc., 525 Seventh Ave.
- (C-478) Jolee, Inc., 250 W. 39th St.
- (C-479) M. J. Levine, Inc., 250 W. 39th St.
- (C-480) Kelita, Inc., 1407 Broadway
- (C-481) Malcolm Kenneth Co., 11 Leon St., Boston, Mass.
- (C-482) Kimberly Knitwear, Inc., 1410 Broadway
- (C-483) Leathermode Sportswear, Inc., 357 Kossuth St., Bridgeport, Conn.
- (C-484) Mode de Paris, Inc., 58 Second St., San Francisco, Calif.
- (C-485) New Era Shirt Co., 316 N. 18th St., St. Louis, Mo.
- (C-486) Raab-Meyerhoff Co., 350 Fifth Ave.
- (C-487) Ronnie Fashions, Inc., 1400 Broadway
- (C-488) M. C. Schrank Co., 17-21 Broad St., Bridgeton, N.J.
- (C-489) Norman Wiatt Co., 124 E. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.
- (C-490) Wonderknit Corp., 112 W. 34th St.

IN THE MATTER OF

PERMA-LITE RAYBERN MFG. CORP. ET AL.

ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION ACT