

It is further ordered, That respondent herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon him of this order, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which he has complied with this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

JAY-CEE BLOUSE CO., INC., TRADING AS LA ROSE
OF CALIFORNIA, EL AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE TEXTILE FIBER
PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACTS

Docket C-1676. Complaint, Jan. 27, 1970—Decision, Jan. 27, 1970

Consent order requiring a Los Angeles, Calif., manufacturer of ladies' blouses to cease falsely guaranteeing and misbranding its textile fiber products and failing to maintain 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 Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., a corporation, trading under its own name and as La Rose of California, and Myer Roseman, 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 charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California. Respondent Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., also trades under the name of La Rose of California, and its office and principal place of business is located at 746 South Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California.

Individual respondent Myer Roseman is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs and controls the policies, acts and prac-

tices of said corporation and his address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacture of ladies' blouses.

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 (blouses) with labels which set forth the fiber content as "100% 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. Respondents have failed to maintain and preserve proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by them in violation of Section 6(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 7. The respondents have furnished false guaranties that their textile fiber products were not misbranded nor falsely nor deceptively advertised by falsely representing in writing that respondents had filed a continuing guaranty under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act with the Federal Trade Commission, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 38(d) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

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 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

Order

77 F.T.C.

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 Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California, with its office and principal place of business located at 746 South Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California. The respondent does business under its own name and as La Rose of California.

Respondent Myer Roseman is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs and controls the policies, acts and practices of said corporation and his address is the same as that of said corporation.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacturing of ladies' blouses. They ship and distribute such products to various customers throughout the United States.

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 Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., a corporation, trading under its own name and as La Rose of California, or trading under any other name or names, and its officers, and Myer Roseman, 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 to 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. Failing to maintain and preserve proper records of fiber content of textile fiber products manufactured by respondents, as required by Section 6(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

It is further ordered, That respondents Jay-Cee Blouse Co., Inc., a corporation, trading under its own name and as La Rose of California, or trading under any other name or names, and its officers, and Myer Roseman, individually and as an officer 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 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

Complaint

77 F.T.C.

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 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.
