

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

Docket C-1529. Complaint, May 5, 1969—Decision, May 5, 1969

Consent order requiring two affiliated New York City manufacturers of women's and misses' apparel to cease misbranding, falsely invoicing and deceptively guaranteeing 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 Goldline Fashions, Inc., a corporation, and Briarlee Modes, Inc., a corporation, and Louis Goldstein and William Wertlieb, 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 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 Goldline Fashions, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. Respondent Briarlee Modes, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents Louis Goldstein and William Wertlieb are officers of the corporate respondents. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of the corporate respondents including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are manufacturers of women's and misses' apparel including fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 519 Eighth Avenue, New York, 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 to show that fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 4. 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 to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. 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 to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in that said fur products were invoiced to show that the fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 7. Respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their fur products were not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that fur products so falsely guaranteed would be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 8. 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 there-

after 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 Goldline Fashions, 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 519 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York.

Respondent Briarlee Modes, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 519 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York.

Respondents Louis Goldstein and William Wertlieb are officers of the said corporations and their address is the same as that of said corporations.

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 Goldline Fashions, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Briarlee Modes, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Louis Goldstein and William Wertlieb, 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, 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. Representing directly or by implication on a label that the fur contained in such fur product is natural when such fur is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

2. 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.

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. Representing, directly or by implication, on invoices that the fur contained in such fur product is natural when such fur is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

It is further ordered, That respondents Goldline Fashions, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Briarlee Modes, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Louis Goldstein and William Wertlieb, individually and as officers of said corporations, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from furnishing a false guaranty that any fur product is not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when the respondents have reason to believe that such fur product may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce.

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

75 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

MANHATTAN FUR DRESSING CORP., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1530. Complaint, May 13, 1969—Decision, May 13, 1969

Consent order requiring a New York City fur dressing corporation to cease
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 Manhattan Fur Dressing Corp., a corporation, and Herman Handros, Herman Aronowitz and Romeo Pinotti, individually and as officers 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 in 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 Manhattan Fur Dressing Corp. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents Herman Handros, Herman Aronowitz and Romeo Pinotti are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are dressers of furs with their office and principal place of business located at 158-64 West 27th 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