

this order.

IN THE MATTER OF
YOUNG HERITAGE, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1542. Complaint, June 10, 1969—Decision, June 10, 1969

Consent order requiring a New York City clothing manufacturer to cease
misbranding and falsely guaranteeing its wool products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that Young Heritage, Inc., a corporation, and David Freedman, Harold Steinberg and Sheldon Raywood, 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 Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, 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 Young Heritage, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents David Freedman, Harold Steinberg and Sheldon Raywood are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are manufacturers of wool products, with their office and principal place of business located at 225 West 37th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents, now and for some time last past, have manufactured for introduction into commerce, introduced into commerce, sold, transported, distributed, delivered for shipment, shipped and offered for sale in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 wool products as "wool product" is defined therein.

PAR. 3. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by the respondents within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a)(1) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified with respect to the character and amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were wool products which were:

(a) Labeled or tagged by respondents as 60 percent wool, 25 percent nylon, 15 percent other fibers, when, in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers than as represented.

(b) Labeled or tagged by respondents as 80 percent wool, 8 percent nylon, 12 percent silk, when in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than as represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as required under the provisions of Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were wool products, namely women's coats, with labels on or affixed thereto, which failed to disclose the percentage of the

total fiber weight of the said wool products, exclusive of ornamentation not exceeding 5 per centum of the total fiber weight, of (1) wool; (2) reprocessed wool; (3) reused wool; (4) each fiber other than wool, when said percentage by weight of such fiber was 5 per centum or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. Certain of said wool products were misbranded by respondents in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in that certain wool products composed of two or more sections of different fiber composition, were not labeled in such a manner as to disclose the fiber composition of each section and such form of marking was necessary to avoid deception in violation of Rule 23(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. The respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their said wool products were not misbranded, when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that the wool products so falsely guaranteed might be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 9(b) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

PAR. 7. The acts and practices of the respondents as set forth in the paragraphs above were, and are in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 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 Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939; 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 Young Heritage, 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 225 West 37th Street, New York, New York.

Respondents David Freedman, Harold Steinberg and Sheldon Raywood are officers of said corporation and their address is the same as that of the 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 Young Heritage, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and David Freedman, Harold Steinberg and Sheldon Raywood, individually and as officers 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 offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution, delivery for shipment or shipment, in commerce, of wool products, as "commerce" and "wool product" are defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding such products by:

1. Falsely and deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, or otherwise identifying such products as to the character or

amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Failing to securely affix to, or place on, each such product a stamp, tag, label or other means of identification showing in a clear and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(a)(2) of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

3. Failing to set forth required information on labels attached to wool products consisting of two or more sections of different fiber content, in such a manner as to show the fiber content of each section in all instances where such marking is necessary to avoid deception.

It is further ordered, That respondents Young Heritage, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and David Freedman, Harold Steinberg and Sheldon Raywood, individually and as officers of said corporation, 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 wool product is not misbranded under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder when there is reason to believe that any wool product so guaranteed may be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, as the term "commerce" is defined in the aforesaid Act.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this 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

TEXAS REFINERY CORP., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT