

with distribute a copy of the Order to each of its operating divisions.
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
HANCOCK TEXTILE COMPANY, INC., 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-1328. Complaint, May 1, 1968—Decision, May 1, 1968

Consent order requiring four chain pieces goods outlets located in Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, to cease falsely advertising and misbranding their 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 Hancock Textile Company, Inc., a corporation, Hancock Fabric Outlet, a corporation, Hancock Fabric Outlet, Inc., a corporation, and Hancock Textile Outlet, a corporation, and Lawrence D. Hancock and Robert E. Tedford, individually and as officers of said corporations, 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 Hancock Textile Company, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Mississippi, with its principal office and place of business located at Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

Respondent Hancock Fabric Outlet is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Mississippi, with its principal office and place of business located at Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

Respondent Hancock Fabric Outlet, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Alabama, with its principal office and place of business located at 850 Government Street, Mobile, Alabama.

Respondent Hancock Textile Outlet is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, with its principal office and place of business located at 6240 Bissonet Street, Houston, Texas.

Individual respondents Lawrence D. Hancock and Robert E. Tedford are officers of each of the foregoing corporate respondents. The office and principal place of business of these individual respondents is Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

The individual respondents operate a chain of 20 retail piece goods outlets including the corporate respondents named above and they are responsible for the acts, practices and policies of said piece goods outlets. Although each of the 20 retail piece goods outlets is separately incorporated within the State in which they do business, they are operated as a chain with headquarters at Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi from which emanates much of the advertising for the individual units.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, 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 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.

Complaint

73 F.T.C.

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded by respondents 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 the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto were textile fiber products which were falsely and deceptively advertised in the "Daily Journal" a newspaper published in Tupelo, Mississippi, the "Mobile Press Register" a newspaper published in Mobile, Alabama and the "Houston Chronicle" a newspaper published in Houston, Texas. These newspapers have interstate circulation, and certain of said advertisements contained such terms as "linen type weave," "linen type," "candy linen" and "print linens" which represented directly or by implication that such products were composed of linen fibers when such was not the case.

PAR. 4. Certain of such textile fiber products were further misbranded by respondents 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 textile fiber products with labels which failed:

1. To disclose the true generic names of the fibers present; and
2. To disclose the true percentage of such fibers; and
3. To disclose 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 the said Act, with respect to such product.

Also among such misbranded textile fiber products were remnants which were not labeled or otherwise identified as to fiber content.

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

(b) 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.

PAR. 6. Certain of said textile fiber products were falsely and deceptively advertised in that respondents 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 the aforesaid advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondents which appeared in issues of the "Daily Journal," the "Mobile Press Register," and "The Houston Post," newspapers having interstate circulation, in which textile fabrics were advertised with such fiber implying terms as corduroy, dacron, antique satin, and broadcloth among others but not limited thereto without the true generic names of the fibers in such articles being set forth.

PAR. 7. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents 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 thereunder in the following respects:

(a) A fiber trademark was used in advertising textile fiber products without a full disclosure of the fiber content information required by the said Act, and the Rules and Regulations thereunder in at least one instance in said advertisement, in violation of Rule 41(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

(b) Fiber trademarks were used in advertising textile fiber products, containing more than one fiber, other than permissive ornamentation, and such fiber content trademarks did not appear in the required fiber content information in immediate proximity and conjunction with the generic name of the fiber in plainly legible type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness, in violation of Rule 41(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. The acts and practices of 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 methods of competition and unfair

Decision and Order

73 F.T.C.

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 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 respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Hancock Textile Company, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Mississippi, with its office and principal place of business located at Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

Respondent Hancock Fabric Outlet is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Mississippi, with its office and principal place of business located at Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

Respondent Hancock Fabric Outlet, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Alabama, with its office and principal place of business located at 850 Government Street, Mobile, Alabama.

Respondent Hancock Textile Outlet is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, with its office and principal place of business located at 6240 Bissonet Street, Houston, Texas.

Respondents Lawrence D. Hancock and Robert E. Tedford are officers of said corporations and their address is Highway 6 West, Tupelo, Mississippi.

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 Hancock Textile Company, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, Hancock Fabric Outlet, a corporation, and its officers, Hancock Fabric Outlet, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, Hancock Textile Outlet, a corporation, and its officers, and Lawrence D. Hancock and Robert E. Tedford, individually and as officers of said corporations, and respondents' representatives, 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 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 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 the constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, invoicing, advertising or otherwise identifying such products by representing either, directly or by implication, through the use of such terms as "candy linen," "print linen," and

"linen type weaves" or any other terms, that any fibers are present in a textile fiber product when such is not the case.

3. 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.

4. Using a fiber trademark on labels affixed to such textile fiber products without the generic name of the fiber appearing on such label.

5. Using a generic name or fiber trademark on any label, whether required or non-required, without making a full and complete fiber content disclosure in accordance with the Act and the Rules and Regulations thereunder the first time such generic name or fiber trademark appears on the label.

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 a fiber trademark in advertisements without a full disclosure of the required content information in at least one instance in the said advertisement.

3. Using a fiber trademark in advertising textile fiber products, containing more than one fiber without such fiber trademark appearing in the required fiber content information in immediate proximity and conjunction with the generic name of the fiber in plainly legible type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporations shall forthwith distribute a copy of this Order to each of their operating divisions.

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.

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

JACK SOKOLOFF TRADING AS A & A TRAVEL BUREAU

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket C-1329. Complaint, May 2, 1968—Decision, May 2, 1968*

Consent order requiring an operator of a travel agency with offices in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Md., to cease misrepresenting that its services are free, using the names of well-known resort hotels without authorization, misrepresenting that accommodations are available, failing to make prompt refund of deposits, and engaging in other deceptive practices.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Jack Sokoloff, trading as A & A Travel Bureau, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has violated the provisions of said 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 Jack Sokoloff is the sole proprietor of a travel agency with locations at 1029 Vermont Avenue, NW., in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and at 2 East Lombard Street in the city of Baltimore, Maryland. In the course of his business respondent Jack Sokoloff also uses the names Mr. Stein, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Wilson.

Respondent does business under the names A & A Travel Bureau; A & A Tours; Jewish Students Tour Association; Jewish Travel Club for Single People; Lecture Bureau of Baltimore; New York Theater Ticket Service; Israel Travel Center; Jewish Travel Center; Jewish Travel Club; and Jewish Couples Travel Club. Respondent also lists his travel agency in The Washington and Baltimore Classified Telephone Directories under the following names each identified as a division of A & A Travel Bureau: Bermuda Travel Reservations; California Hotel Reservations Service; Catskill Hotel Reservations; Concord Hotel Reservation Service; Free Hotel & Motel Reservations Service; Grossinger Reservation Service; Hotel Reservation Service; Las Vegas Hotel Reservations; Manhattan Hotels Reservations; New York Theatre Service; Pocono Mountains Reservation Service; San