

IN THE MATTER OF
MIAMI SPORTSWEAR CO., INC., TRADING AS CEEB OF
MIAMI, 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-1627. Complaint, Nov. 17, 1969—Decision, Nov. 17, 1969

Consent order requiring an Opa Locka, Fla., sportswear and beachwear manufacturer to cease misbranding, falsely advertising, and deceptively guaranteeing its 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 Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., a corporation, trading as Ceeb of Miami, and Jack L. Brasington and Clayton B. Brasington, Jr., 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 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 charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida. Respondent Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., trades, among others, under the name of Ceeb of Miami with its executive office and place of business located at 2600 Ali Baba Avenue, Opa Locka, Florida.

Individual respondents Jack L. Brasington and Clayton B. Brasington, Jr., are officers of said corporation. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of said corporation and their address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacture and sale of sportswear and beachwear.

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

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded by the 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 (swimsuits) with labels which set forth the fiber content as "All Cotton," whereas, in truth and in fact, the said textile fiber products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of such textile fiber products were further 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 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.

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 were placed 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. 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 such textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were ladies' swimsuits which were falsely and deceptively advertised by means of a brochure, distributed by respondents throughout the United States in that the true generic names of the fibers in such articles were not 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, namely ladies' swimsuits, 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.

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

B. A fiber trademark was used in advertising textile fiber products, namely ladies' swimsuits, containing more than one fiber and such fiber trademark 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.

C. A fiber trademark was used in advertising textile fiber products, namely ladies' swimsuits, containing only one fiber and such fiber trademark did not appear, at least once in the said advertisement, in immediate proximity and conjunction with the generic name of the fiber, in plainly legible and conspicuous type, in violation of Rule 41(c) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. Respondents have furnished false guaranties that their textile fiber products were not misbranded or falsely or deceptively invoiced or advertised in violation of Section 10(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 9. 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 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 vio-

lated 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 Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida, with its office and principal place of business located at 2600 Ali Baba Avenue, Opa Locka, Florida.

Respondents Jack L. Brasington and Clayton B. Brasington, Jr., are officers of said corporation and their 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 Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., a corporation, trading as Ceeb of Miami, or under any other name or names, and its officers, and Jack L. Brasington and Clayton B. Brasington, Jr., 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, 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 the 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, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

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

4. Using a generic name or fiber trademark on any label, whether required or nonrequired, without making a full and complete fiber content disclosure in accordance with the Act and Regulations 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 representation, 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, 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, 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 advertisements.

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.

4. Using a fiber trademark in advertising textile fiber products containing only one fiber without such fiber trademark appearing at least once in the advertisement, in immediate proximity and conjunction with the generic name of the fiber, in plainly legible and conspicuous type.

It is further ordered, That respondents Miami Sportswear Co., Inc., a corporation, trading as Ceeb of Miami, or under any other name or names, and its officers, and Jack L. Brasington and Clayton B. Brasington, Jr., 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 textile fiber product is not misbranded or falsely or deceptively invoiced or advertised under the provisions of the Textile Fiber Products Identification 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 respondents notify the Commission at least 30 days prior to any proposed change in the corporate respondent such as dissolution, assignment or sale resulting in the emergence of a successor corporation, the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries or any other change in the corporation which may affect compliance obligations arising out of the order.

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

76 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

HUDSON'S DEPARTMENT STORE, INC.

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

Docket C-1628. Complaint, Nov. 17, 1969—Decision, Nov. 17, 1969

Consent order requiring an Anniston, Ala., department store to cease falsely advertising its fur products and failing to keep required records.

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 Hudson's Department Store, Inc., a corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondent, has 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 Hudson's Department Store, 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 1017 Noble Street, Anniston, Alabama.

Respondent operates a department store and retails various commodities including fur products.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been engaged in the 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 has 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 falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in