

237

Complaint

(2) in application to this case for the reasons in his accompanying opinion.

IN THE MATTER OF
RINA CASUALS, LTD., ET AL.

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

Docket C-883. Complaint, Feb. 26, 1965—Decision, Feb. 26, 1965

Consent order requiring New York City importers of wool products to cease misbranding wool products in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act by falsely labeling sweaters as containing "60% Mohair, 35% Wool, 5% Nylon," when such sweaters contained substantially different fibers and amounts than represented, by failing to disclose the correct fiber content and other elements of information on attached labels, as required, and by using the term "mohair" in lieu of the word "wool" on affixed labels when the fibers were not entitled to such designation.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that Rina Casuals, Ltd., a corporation, and Philip Orlinsky, 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 Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, 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 Rina Casuals, Ltd., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Individual respondent Philip Orlinsky is an officer of said corporation and formulates, directs, and controls the acts, policies and practices of the corporate respondent including the acts and practices hereinafter referred to.

Respondents are importers of wool products with their office and principal place of business located at 224 West 35th Street, New York, New York.

Complaint

67 F.T.C.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, respondents have introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped and offered for sale in commerce as "commerce" is defined in said Act, wool products as "wool product" is defined therein.

PAR. 3. Certain of said wool products were misbranded within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a)(1) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified with respect to the character and amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were sweaters stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified as containing 60% Mohair, 35% Wool, 5% Nylon, whereas in truth and in fact, such sweaters contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were further misbranded in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were certain sweaters with labels on or affixed thereto, which failed to disclose the percentage of the total fiber weight of the wool products, exclusive of ornamentation, not exceeding five percentum of said total fiber weight; of (1) woolen fibers; (2) each fiber other than wool present in the wool product in the amount of five percentum or more by weight; and (3) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. Certain of said wool products were misbranded in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that the term "Mohair" was used in lieu of the word "Wool" in setting forth the required fiber content information on labels affixed to wool products when certain of the fibers described as "Mohair" were not entitled to such designation, in violation of Rule 19 of the Rules and Regulations under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

PAR. 6. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth above were, and are in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted, and now constitute, unfair and deceptive acts and

255

Decision and Order

practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce, within the intent and meaning of 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 Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, 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 Rina Casuals, Ltd. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 224 West 35th Street, in the city of New York, State of New York.

Respondent Philip Orlinsky 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 Rina Casuals, Ltd., a corporation and its officers, and Philip Orlinsky, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from introducing into commerce, or offering for sale, selling, transporting, distributing or delivering for ship-

Complaint

67 F.T.C.

ment in commerce, wool sweaters or any other wool product, as "commerce" and "wool product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939:

1. Which are falsely or deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified as to the character or amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Unless each such product has securely affixed thereto, or placed thereon, a stamp, tag, label or other means of identification correctly showing in a clear and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(a) (2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

3. To which is affixed a label wherein the term "Mohair" is used in lieu of the word "Wool" in setting forth the required information on labels affixed to such wool products unless the fibers described as "Mohair" are entitled to such designation and are present in at least the amount stated.

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.

IN THE MATTER OF

MISSOURI COLLEGE OF AUTOMATION, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE