

Modifying Order

91 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

NORLIC IMPORT COMPANY, INC., ET AL.

MODIFYING ORDER, IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND WOOL PRODUCTS LABELING ACTS

Docket C-2583. Complaint, Oct. 22, 1974 — Modifying Order, Jan. 25, 1978.

This order modifying order to cease and desist issued October 22, 1974, 40 FR 6777, 84 F.T.C. 1173, substitutes for subparagraph 2 of the first "IT IS ORDERED" paragraph one that inserts the words "reprocessed or reused" before the first usage of the term "wool product."

ORDER MODIFYING ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST

On March 28, 1977, respondents petitioned to reopen and modify the decision and order in this matter. Addenda to the petition were filed on April 7, 1977 and on May 25, 1977. The Bureau of Consumer Protection has filed an answer wherein it advises that it does not oppose respondents' request, as modified by respondents' filing of May 25, 1977.

The Commission has duly considered respondents' request and has determined that it should be granted.

It is ordered, That the proceeding be, and it hereby is, reopened;

It is further ordered, That the order to cease and desist be, and it hereby is, modified by striking subparagraph 2 of the first "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED" paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

Importing or participating in the importation of reprocessed or reused wool products into the United States except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said wool products and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

IN THE MATTER OF
LANCASTER COLONY CORPORATION, ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT AND SEC. 7 OF THE
CLAYTON ACT

Docket 9101. Complaint, June 17, 1977 — Decision, Feb. 1, 1978

This consent order, among other things, requires a Columbus, Ohio manufacturer of machine-made glassware, and a Montvale, N.J. firm, similarly engaged, to present the Commission with evidence that their acquisition agreement has been terminated, and to return to each other all exchanged confidential documents. Further, during periods set forth in the order, these firms are required to provide the Commission with prescribed advance notice of any intention to acquire a machine-made glassware business, and refrain from consummating any such transaction, pending final Commission decision.

Appearances

For the Commission: *Peter E. Greene, Brian H. Siegel, Edward S. Atkinson, Jr., David J. Saylor and Alfred F. Dougherty.*

For the respondents: *Richard R. Murphey, Jr., Dunbar, Kiengle & Murphey, Columbus, Ohio and Ralph W. Brenner, Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, Philadelphia, Pa. for Lancaster Colony Corp. Edward Wolfe, White & Case, New York City for Federal Paper Board Company Inc.*

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that the above-named respondents, each subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, have entered into an acquisition agreement which, if consummated, would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 18, and Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45, that said agreement already constitutes a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and that a proceeding in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint, pursuant to Section 11 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 21, and Section 5(b), of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45(b), stating its charges as follows:

I

DEFINITION

1. For the purpose of this complaint, the following definition