

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
SPORTPIPER OF MIAMI, 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-1594. Complaint, Oct. 10, 1969—Decision, Oct. 10, 1969

Consent order requiring a Miami, Fla., clothing manufacturer to cease misbranding its textile fiber products and failing to preserve required records.

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 Sportpiper of Miami, Inc., a corporation, and Louis Goldleaf, 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 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 Sportpiper of Miami, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida. The said corporation is currently inactive but has not been dissolved.

Respondent Louis Goldleaf is an officer of said corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of said corporate respondent.

Respondents were engaged in the manufacture and sale of textile fiber products, including ladies' dresses, with their office and principal place of business located previously at 2222 NW. Fifth Avenue, Miami, Florida. The present address of Louis Goldleaf is 1745 James Avenue, Miami Beach, Florida.

PAR. 2. Respondents for some time last past were engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture 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 had 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.

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 names and amounts of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were ladies' dresses labeled as "100% Rayon" whereas, in truth and in fact, such products contained substantially different amount of fibers other than as represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of the textile fiber products were misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified to show each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

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 ladies' dresses which failed to disclose the true generic names of the fibers present.

PAR. 5. Respondents have failed to maintain proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by them, in violation of Section 6 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 6. The acts and practices of respondents, as set forth above in Paragraphs Three, Four and Five 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 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 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 Sportpiper of Miami, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida. The said corporation is currently inactive but has not been dissolved.

Respondent Louis Goldleaf is an officer of said corporation and his address is 1745 James Avenue, Miami Beach, Florida.

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 Sportpiper of Miami, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Louis Goldleaf, 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, delivery for introduction, manufacture 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 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 constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Failing to affix a stamp, tag, label or other means of identification to each such product showing in a clear,

Decision and Order

76 F.T.C.

legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

B. Failing to maintain and preserve proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by said respondents, as required by Section 6 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

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.
