
IN THE MATTER OF
SOL RATTNER, 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-1247. Complaint, June 30, 1967—Decision, June 30, 1967

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturing furrier to cease
misbranding and falsely invoicing its 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 Sol Rattner, Inc., a corporation, and Sol Rattner also known as Sol Ratner, 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 Sol Rattner, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent Sol Rattner, also known as Sol Ratner, is an officer of the corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are manufacturers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 252 West 30th Street, city of New York, State of New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, 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 have 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 the country of origin of furs contained in such fur products, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products labeled to show the country of origin of furs used in such fur products as the United States when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Argentina.

PAR. 4. 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 labeled as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact the furs contained therein were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 5. 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 any such fur product.
2. To disclose 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 of the imported furs contained in the fur products.

PAR. 6. 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) 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.

(b) 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.

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

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the respondents 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 any such fur product.
2. To disclose 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 of imported furs used in fur products.

PAR. 8. 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 "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact the furs contained therein were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 9. 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) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

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

PAR. 10. 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 methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and 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 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 Fur Products Labeling 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

The Commission, having reason to believe that the respondents have violated 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 Sol Rattner, Inc., 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 252 West 30th Street, city of New York, State of New York.

Respondent Sol Rattner also known as Sol Ratner 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 Sol Rattner, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Sol Rattner also known as Sol Ratner, 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, or manufacture for 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 manufacture for sale, 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 any fur product by:

1. Falsely or deceptively labeling or otherwise falsely or deceptively identifying any such fur product as to the country of origin of furs contained in such fur product.

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

3. Failing to affix a label to such fur product 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.

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

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

6. Failing to set forth on a label the item number or mark assigned to such fur product.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing any fur product by:

1. Failing to furnish an invoice, 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 by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Setting forth on an invoice pertaining to such fur product 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. 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."

4. 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."

5. Failing to set forth the term "natural" as part of

1578

Complaint

the information required to be disclosed on an invoice under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe such fur product which is not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

6. Failing to set forth on an invoice the item number or mark assigned to such fur product.

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.
