

IN THE MATTER OF

RICHARD PICK & HELLER CO.

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

Docket C-1139. Complaint, Nov. 21, 1966—Decision, Nov. 21, 1966

Consent order requiring a Chicago, Ill., wholesaler of cut-to-order upholstery fabrics to cease falsely advertising and misbranding its textile fiber products.

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 Richard Pick & Heller Co., a corporation, hereafter referred to as respondent, has 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:

Complaint

70 F.T.C.

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Richard Pick & Heller Co. is a corporation, organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois. Said corporation is a wholesaler and distributor of cut-to-order upholstery fabrics, with its office and principal place of business located at 345 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act on March 3, 1960, respondent has been and is now engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, and in the importation into the United States, of textile fiber products; and has sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, after shipment in commerce, textile 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 by respondent 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, and invoiced, advertised or otherwise identified as to the name or amount of the constituent fiber contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products, namely upholstery fabrics, containing more than one fiber with labels which:

A. Set forth the generic name of a particular fiber, namely nylon, in such a manner as to over emphasize the nylon content of the product, to detract from the required fiber content disclosure and to represent or imply, that the products were composed entirely of nylon when in truth and in fact the products contained fibers other than nylon.

B. Set forth the fiber content of textile fiber products composed in part of nylon, in such a manner as to imply that the product was composed entirely of nylon when in truth and in fact such products contained fibers other than nylon.

Also among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products which were falsely and

deceptively advertised by means of price lists which used terms such as "Nylon," "Nylon Matelasse," and "Nylon Brocade," among others but not limited thereto, in such a manner as to represent or imply that the products were composed entirely of nylon when in truth and in fact such products contained fibers other than nylon.

PAR. 4. Certain of such textile fiber products were further misbranded by respondent 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 prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products but not limited thereto were upholstery fabrics with labels which failed: (1) to disclose the true generic names of the constituent fibers present in the product in the order of predominance by the weight thereof; (2) the percentages of each fiber present, by weight; (3) any fiber or group of fibers present in the amount of less than 5 percentum as "other fiber" or "other fibers"; and (4) the name, or other identification issued and registered by the Commission, of the manufacturer of the product or one or more persons subject to Section 3 of said Act with respect to such products.

Also among such misbranded textile fiber products were certain textile fiber products, namely upholstery fabrics, sold by means of samples, swatches or specimens, and unaccompanied by an invoice or other paper showing the information required to appear on the label, which textile fiber products were not stamped, tagged, or labeled to disclose the information required by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 5. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

A. Nonrequired information was placed on labels in such a manner as to minimize, detract from, and conflict with the required information and in such a way as to be false or deceptive as to fiber content, in violation of Rule 16(c) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

B. Fiber trademarks were placed on labels without the generic names of fibers appearing on such labels, in violation of Rule 17(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

C. Generic names and fiber trademarks were used on labels

without a full and complete fiber content disclosure appearing on such labels, in violation of Rule 17(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

D. Generic names of fibers were used in nonrequired information on labels in such a manner as to be false, deceptive or misleading as to fiber content, and to indicate, directly or indirectly, that such textile fiber products were composed wholly or in part of a particular fiber, when such was not the case, in violation of Rule 17(d) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said textile fiber products were falsely and deceptively advertised in that respondent in making disclosures or implications as to the fiber content of such textile fiber products in written advertisements used to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of said products failed to set forth the required information as to fiber content as specified by Section 4(c) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were upholstery fabrics which were falsely and deceptively advertised by means of price lists, distributed by respondent throughout the United States in that the true generic name of each fiber present in the products was not set forth.

PAR. 7. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondent falsely and deceptively advertised textile fiber products in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that said textile fiber products were not advertised in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

A. The generic name of a fiber was used in advertising textile fiber products, namely upholstery fabrics, in such a manner as to be false, deceptive and misleading as to fiber content and to indicate, directly or indirectly, that such textile fiber product was composed wholly or in part of such fiber when such was not the case, in violation of Rule 41(d) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

B. In advertising textile fiber products in such a manner as to require disclosure of the information required by the Act and Regulations, all parts of the required information were not stated in immediate conjunction with each other in legible and conspicu-

ous type or lettering of equal size and prominence, in violation of Rule 42(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. The acts and practices of respondent 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 methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices, in commerce, under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondent named in the caption hereof, and the respondent 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 respondent with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act; and

The respondent and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondent 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 respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondent has 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 Richard Pick & Heller Co. 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 345 West Chicago Avenue, 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 Richard Pick & Heller Co., a corporation, and its officers, and respondent's representatives,

Order

70 F.T.C.

agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, delivery 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 any textile fiber product; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported of any textile fiber product which has 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 product whether in its 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 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 the constituent fibers contained therein.
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.
3. Placing nonrequired information on labels in such a manner as to minimize, detract from, or conflict with the required information or to be false or deceptive as to fiber content.
4. Using a fiber trademark on labels affixed to such textile fiber products without the generic name of the fiber appearing on the said labels.
5. Using a generic name or fiber trademark on any label, whether required or nonrequired, without making a full and complete fiber content disclosure in accordance with the Act and Regulations, the first time such generic name or fiber trademark appears on the label.
6. Using the generic names of fibers in nonrequired information on any label in such a manner as to be false, deceptive or misleading as to fiber content or to indicate, directly or indirectly, that such textile fiber products are

composed wholly or in part of a particular fiber, when such is not the case.

B. Falsely and deceptively advertising textile fiber products by:

1. Making any representations, directly or by implication, as to the fiber content of any textile fiber product in any written advertisement which is used to aid, promote or assist directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of such textile fiber product, unless the same information required to be shown on the stamp, tag or label or other means of identification under Section 4(b) (1) and (2) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act is contained in the said advertisement, in the manner and form required except that the percentages of the fibers present in the textile fiber product need not be stated.

2. Using the generic name of a fiber in advertising textile fiber products in such a manner as to be false, deceptive or misleading as to fiber content or to indicate, directly or indirectly, that such textile fiber products are composed wholly or in part of such fiber when such is not the case.

3. Failing to set forth all parts of the required information in advertisements of textile fiber products in immediate conjunction with each other in legible and conspicuous type or lettering of equal size and prominence.

It is further ordered, That the respondent herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon it of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied with this order.