

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

NAT BEINHORN

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

Docket C-2204. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring a New York City retail furrier of fur products to cease misbranding and falsely or deceptively invoicing its products.

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 Nat Beinhorn, an individual trading as Nat Beinhorn 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 Nat Beinhorn is an individual doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent is primarily a retail furrier of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 130 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertis-

Complaint

80 F.T.C.

ing, 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 misbranded in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled to show that fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products with labels which failed to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on labels, in violation of Rule 40 of said rules and regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the respondent in that they were not invoiced as required by Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the rules and regulations promulgated under such Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products covered by invoices which failed to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products were bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not invoiced in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated under such Act in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said rules and regulations.

PAR. 8. Respondent sold and distributed fur products which were bleached, dyed or artificially colored. Certain of these fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of Section 5(b)(2)

711

Complaint

3. Describing fur products which have been bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored by the name of mink or by any other animal name or names without disclosing that the said fur products were bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

4. Failing to set forth on invoices the item number or mark required to be assigned to such fur products.

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.