

Complaint

66 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

ROLAND BARON TRADING AS SANDLER'S FUR SHOP

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

Docket C-816. Complaint, Aug. 24, 1964—Decision, Aug. 24, 1964

Consent order requiring a manufacturing furrier in Chicago, Ill., to cease misbranding, falsely advertising and deceptively invoicing his fur products.

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 Roland Baron, an individual trading as Sandler's Fur Shop, 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 Roland Baron is an individual trading as Sandler's Fur Shop.

Respondent is a manufacturer and retailer of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 4758 Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois.

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 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 has manufactured for sale, sold, advertised, offered for sale, transported and distributed fur products which have been made in whole or in part of furs which have 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 falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such misbranded fur products but not limited thereto, were fur products which were labeled as "Hudson Seal" when the fur contained in such products was in fact Dyed Sheared Muskrat.

Also, among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products labeled as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

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:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur products.
2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.
3. To show the name, or other identification issued and registered by the Commission, of one or more of the persons who manufactured such fur product for introduction into commerce, introduced it into commerce, sold it in commerce, advertised or offered it for sale, in commerce, or transported or distributed it in commerce.
4. To show the country of origin of the imported fur contained in the fur product.

PAR. 5. 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 set forth on labels in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth on labels in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on labels in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) The term "natural" was not used on labels to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or other-

wise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth in handwriting on labels, in violation of Rule 29(b) of said Rules and Regulations.

(f) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth in the required sequence, in violation of Rule 30 of said Rules and Regulations.

(g) 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.

PAR. 6. Certain of said 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 fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products covered by invoices 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 product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.
3. To show the country of origin of imported furs used in fur products.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products which were invoiced as "Northern Seal" when, in fact, the fur contained in such fur products was "Rabbit."

Also among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products but not limited thereto were fur products which were invoiced as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 8. 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) Information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth on invoices in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) The term "natural" was not used on invoices to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 9. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that certain advertisements intended to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of such fur products were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid advertisements but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondent which appeared in issues of the Community Publications, a newspaper published in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in the fur product.
2. To show 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 or imported furs contained in fur products.

PAR. 10. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in that said fur products were falsely or deceptively identified with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively advertised fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products advertised as "Broadtail"

Decision and Order

66 F.T.C.

thereby implying that the furs therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 11. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that the said fur products were not advertised in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

(a) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required, in violation of Rule 8 of the said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required, in violation of Rule 10 of the said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "natural" was not used to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of the said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 12. In advertising fur products for sale, as aforesaid, respondent made pricing claims and representations of the types covered by subsections (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Rule 44 of the Regulations under the Fur Products Labeling Act. Respondent in making such claims and representations failed to maintain full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such pricing claims and representations were based, in violation of Rule 44(e) of the said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 13. 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 Roland Baron is an individual trading as Sandler's Fur Shop with his office and principal place of business located at 4758 Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois.

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 Roland Baron, an individual trading as Sandler's Fur Shop 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, or manufacture for introduction, into commerce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation and distribution in commerce, of any fur product, or in connection with the manufacture for sale, sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation, distribution, of any fur product which is 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, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding fur products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively labeling or otherwise identifying any such fur product as to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product.

2. Failing to affix labels to fur products showing in words and in 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.

3. Setting forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in abbreviated form on labels affixed to fur products.

4. Failing to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" on labels in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

5. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" on labels in the manner required where an election is made to use that term in lieu of the term "Dyed Lamb."

6. Failing to set forth the term "natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on labels under the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

7. Setting forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in handwriting on labels affixed to fur products.

8. Failing to set forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder on labels in the sequence required by Rule 30 of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

9. Failing to set forth separately on labels attached to fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal fur 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.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices as the term "invoice" is defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed in each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Setting forth on invoices pertaining to fur products any false or deceptive information with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in such fur product.

3. 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.

4. Failing to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

5. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the words "Dyed Lamb."

6. Failing to set forth the term "natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on invoices under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

7. Failing to set forth on invoices the item number or mark assigned to fur products.

C. 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 any fur product, and which:

1. Fails to set forth in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(a) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Falsely or deceptively identifies any such fur product as to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product.

3. Fails to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

4. Fails to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the words "Dyed Lamb."

5. Fails to set forth the term "natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed in advertisements under the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe fur products which are not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

D. 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 respondent full and adequate records disclosing the facts upon which such claims and representations are based.

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 and form in which he has complied with this order.

Complaint

66 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

SOLMICA, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-817. Complaint, Aug. 25, 1964—Decision, Aug. 25, 1964

Consent order requiring five affiliated home improvement companies headquartered in St. Louis, Mo., to cease misrepresenting the quality of their aluminum siding and other products, that their customers receive special discounts, that their imitation stone is genuine, and deceptively guaranteeing their products.

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 Solmica, Inc., a corporation, and Saul Schmidt and Leon A. Moel, individually and as officers of said corporation, and Solmica of St. Louis, Inc., Solmica of the South, Inc., Solmica of Georgia, Inc., and Solmica of Nashville, Tennessee, corporations, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have 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 Solmica, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, with its principal office and place of business located at 4636 Easton Avenue, in the city of St. Louis, State of Missouri.

Respondents Saul Schmidt and Leon A. Moel are officers of the corporate respondent Solmica, Inc. They formulate, direct and control the acts and practices of said corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their address is the same as that of the corporate respondent, Solmica, Inc.

Respondent Solmica of St. Louis, Inc., is a subsidiary of and is controlled by Solmica, Inc. It is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, with its principal office and place of business located at 2501 South Kingshighway Boulevard, in the city of St. Louis, State of Missouri.

Respondent Solmica of the South, Inc., is a subsidiary of and is controlled by Solmica, Inc. It is a corporation organized, existing and