

IN THE MATTER OF
SYLVANIA ELECTRIC PRODUCTS, INC.

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

*Docket 8501. Complaint, June 13, 1962—Decision, Feb. 28, 1964 **

Consent order requiring a Waltham, Mass., manufacturer of photographic lighting products, including flash lamps, flood lamps and projection lamps, to cease violating Sec. 2(d) of the Clayton Act by such practices as paying a membership service corporation composed of wholesale druggists at least \$18,000 as compensation for advertising and at least \$2,700 for promotional or other services furnished in connection with the sale of respondent's products, while not making comparable allowances available to all competitors of the favored wholesale druggists.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that the party respondent named in the caption hereof, and hereinafter more particularly described, has violated and is 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), hereby issues its complaint, stating its charges with respect thereto as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Sylvania Electric Products, 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 63 Second Avenue, Waltham, Massachusetts.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and has been engaged in the business of manufacturing, selling and distributing flash lamps, flood lamps, projection lamps and other miscellaneous type of photographic lighting products. It sells its products to drug and sundries wholesalers located throughout the United States. The total sales of re-

*This proceeding was reopened, cease and desist order vacated and the complaint was dismissed on Feb. 24, 1965.

SYLVANIA ELECTRIC PRODUCTS, INC.

1273

1243

Complaint

(3) Respondents shall file, within sixty (60) days of receipt of this order, a written report setting forth in detail the manner and form of their compliance with the order.

Commissioner Anderson concurring in the result; Commissioner MacIntyre not concurring; and Commissioner Reilly not participating for the reason that he did not hear oral argument.
