

after such textile fiber product has been shipped in commerce and prior to the time such textile fiber product is sold and delivered to the ultimate consumer.

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.

IN THE MATTER OF

M. RAPPAPORT'S FUR SHOP, 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-824. Complaint, Sept. 2, 1964—Decision, Sept. 2, 1964

Consent order requiring Chicago retail furriers to cease violating the Fur Products Labeling Act by affixing fictitious price labels to fur products and representing falsely thereby that prices were reduced from former higher prices and the amount of such reductions constituted savings to purchasers.

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 M. Rappaport's Fur Shop, Inc., and Herman Seeman, 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 M. Rappaport's Fur Shop, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois.

Respondent Herman Seeman is an officer of the corporate respondent and formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent, including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are retailers of fur products with their office and prin-

cial place of business located at 2032 W. 95th Street, Chicago, Illinois.

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 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 violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely and deceptively identified in that labels affixed to fur products, contained representations, either directly or by implication that the prices of such fur products were reduced from respondents' former prices and the amount of such purported reductions constituted savings to purchasers of respondents' fur products. In truth and in fact, the alleged former prices were fictitious in that they were not actual, bona fide prices at which respondents offered the products to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time in the recent regular course of business and the said fur products were not reduced in price as represented and savings were not afforded purchasers of respondents' said fur products, as represented.

PAR. 4. 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 labels which were affixed to the aforesaid fur products and by means of which the respondents falsely and deceptively advertised such fur products, in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act by representing either directly or by implication, that the prices of such fur products were reduced from respondents' former prices and the amount of such purported reductions constituted savings to purchasers of respondents' fur products. In truth and in fact, the alleged former prices were fictitious in that they were not actual, bona fide prices at which respondents offered the products to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time in the recent regular course of business and the said fur products were not reduced in price as represented and savings

were not afforded to purchasers of respondents' said fur products as represented.

PAR. 5. In advertising fur products for sale as aforesaid, respondents 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. Respondents 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. 6. 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 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 M. Rappaport's Fur Shop, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois, with its office and principal place of business located at 2032 W. 95th Street, in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois.

Respondent Herman Seeman 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 M. Rappaport's Fur Shop, Inc., a corporation and its officers, and Herman Seeman, 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 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 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. Representing, directly or by implication on labels, that any price, whether accompanied or not by descriptive terminology, is the respondents' former price of a fur product when such amount is in excess of the actual, bona fide price at which respondents offered such fur product to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time in the recent regular course of business.

2. Misrepresenting in any manner on labels or other means of identification the savings available to purchasers of respondents' products.

3. Falsely or deceptively representing in any manner, directly or by implication, on labels or other means of identification that prices of respondents' fur products are reduced.

B. 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. Represents directly or by implication that any price, whether accompanied or not by descriptive terminology, is the respondents' former price of a fur product when such amount is in excess of the actual, bona fide price at which respondents offered such fur product to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time in the recent regular course of business.

Complaint

66 F.T.C.

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

3. Falsely or deceptively represents in any manner that prices of respondents' fur products are reduced.

C. 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.