

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
MARTY NEWMAN, 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-1677. Complaint, Jan. 27, 1970—Decision, Jan. 27, 1970

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturer of women's and misses' apparel to cease falsely guaranteeing and misbranding 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 Marty Newman, Inc., a corporation, and Martin Newman, 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 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 Marty Newman, 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 247 West 38th Street, New York, New York.

Respondent Martin Newman 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 the corporate respondent.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacturing of women's and misses' apparel.

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 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 ladies' coats, stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified by respondents as "100% wool," whereas in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

Also among such misbranded wool products, but not limited thereto, were ladies' coats containing interlinings stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified by respondents as "100% wool," whereas in truth and in fact, said products contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of said wool products were further 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 ladies' 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 said 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 further misbranded by the respondents in violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act of

Decision and Order

77 F.T.C.

1939 in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, in the following respects:

1. Required information as to the fiber content was not set forth in such a manner as to separately show the fiber content of each section of wool products containing two or more sections, in violation of Rule 23(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

2. The fiber content of the interlinings contained in garments was not set forth separately and distinctly as a part of the required information on the stamps, tags, labels or other marks of identification of such garments, in violation of Rule 24(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their wool products were not falsely or deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that wool products so falsely guaranteed would 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 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 methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices, in commerce within the 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 Marty Newman, 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 247 West 38th Street, New York, New York.

Respondent Martin Newman 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.

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 Marty Newman, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Martin Newman, 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, 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.

Complaint

77 F.T.C.

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

4. Failing to set forth separately the fiber content of interlining as part of the required information on stamps, tags, labels or other marks of identification on such garments.

It is further ordered, That respondents Marty Newman, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Martin Newman, 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 wool product is not falsely or deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified when respondents have reason to believe that such wool product may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce.

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 the 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 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

HANDKERCHIEF CRAFT CO., INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACTS

Docket C-1678. Complaint, Jan. 27, 1970—Decision, Jan. 27, 1970

Consent order requiring a Los Angeles, Calif., importer and wholesaler of handkerchiefs and scarves to cease importing and marketing products made of dangerously flammable fabrics.