

IN THE MATTER OF

DALTON CONE COMPANY DOING BUSINESS as J. & J.
RUGS ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS
IDENTIFICATION ACTS

Docket C-1117. Complaint, Oct. 3, 1966—Decision, Oct. 3, 1966

Consent order requiring a Dalton, Ga., carpet manufacturer to cease misbranding, furnishing false guaranties, and failing to keep required records on its textile fiber products in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that Dalton Cone Company, a corporation, doing business as J. & J. Rugs, and Thomas R. Jones, 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 Textile Fiber Products Identification 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 Dalton Cone Company is a corporation doing business as J. & J. Rugs. Said corporation is organized,

Complaint

70 F.T.C.

existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Georgia.

Respondent Thomas R. Jones is an officer of the corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts and practices of the corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. The respondents are engaged in the buying and selling of odd lots of carpet yarns, and also the manufacturing of carpet rolls from such yarns. The respondents have their office and principal place of business located at 805 South Green Street, Dalton, Georgia.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act on March 3, 1960 respondents have been and are now engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising and offering for sale in commerce and in the importation into the United States of textile fiber products; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, after shipment in commerce, textile fiber products, either in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, invoiced, advertised, or otherwise identified as to the name or amount of constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products with labels which set forth the fiber content as 50% Wool and 50% Acrylic, whereas, in truth and in fact, said product contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers.

PAR. 4. Certain of said textile fiber products were further misbranded in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products with labels which failed:

1. To disclose the true generic names of the fibers present; and
2. To disclose the percentage of such fibers.

PAR. 5. Respondents have failed to maintain proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by them, in violation of Section 6(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 6. Respondents have furnished their customers with false guaranties that certain of the textile fiber products were not misbranded or falsely invoiced by falsely representing in writing on invoices that respondents have filed a continuing guaranty under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act with the Federal Trade Commission in violation of Rule 38(d) of the Rules and Regulations under said Act and Section 10(b) of such Act.

PAR. 7. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth above were and are in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted and now constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices, and unfair methods of competition in commerce, within the intent and meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondents named in the caption hereof, and the respondents having been furnished thereafter with a copy of a draft of complaint which the Bureau of Textiles and Furs proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondents with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the aforesaid draft of complaint, a statement that the signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by the respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

Order

70 F.T.C.

The Commission having reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and having determined that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, hereby issues its complaint, accepts said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Dalton Cone Company, doing business as J. & J. Rugs, is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Georgia, with its office and principal place of business located at 805 South Green Street, Dalton, Georgia.

Respondent Thomas R. Jones 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 Dalton Cone Company, a corporation doing business as J. & J. Rugs or under any other name, and Thomas R. Jones, 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, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or the importation into the United States of textile fiber products; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, after shipment in commerce of any textile fiber products, whether they are in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding textile fiber products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, invoicing, advertising or otherwise identifying such products as to the name or amount of constituent fibers contained therein.

1039

Complaint

2. Failing to affix labels to such textile fiber products showing in a clear, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

B. Failing to maintain and preserve for at least three years proper records showing the fiber content of textile fiber products manufactured by them, as required by Section 6(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

C. Furnishing false guaranties that textile fiber products are not misbranded or otherwise misrepresented under the provisions of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

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.
