

thereafter distributes any of said products under any of respondent's brand names or labels.

II

It is further ordered, That within sixty (60) days after this order becomes final, and annually thereafter, respondent shall furnish to the Federal Trade Commission a verified written report setting forth the manner and form in which it intends to comply, is complying, or has complied with paragraph I of this order.

III

It is further ordered, That in the event the Commission issues any order or rule which is less restrictive than the provisions of paragraph I of this order, in any proceeding involving the merger or acquisition of a snack food or milling or cereal company, then the Commission shall, upon the application of General Mills reconsider this order and may reopen this proceeding in order to make whatever revisions, if any, are necessary to bring the foregoing paragraph into conformity with the less stringent restrictions imposed upon respondent's competitors.

IV

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

IN THE MATTER OF

GREEN & ROTHMAN, ET AL.

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

Docket C-1502. Complaint, Mar. 11, 1969—Decision, Mar. 11, 1969

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturing furrier to cease misbranding and falsely invoicing its fur products, and furnishing false guaranties that its fur products are not misbranded or falsely invoiced.

Complaint

75 F.T.C.

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 Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act 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 Green & Rothman is a partnership, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents William Green and Zoltan Rothman are individual copartners trading as Green & Rothman.

Respondents are manufacturers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 214 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the manufacture for 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 have manufactured for sale, 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 inasmuch as information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth on labels in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced by the respondents 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 was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 7. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in that said fur products were invoiced to show that the fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 8. Respondents furnished false guaranties that certain of their fur products were not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that fur products so falsely guaranteed would be introduced, sold, transported or distributed in commerce, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents, as herein alleged, are in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and 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 Fur Products Labeling 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 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 Green & Rotham in a partnership existing and doing business under the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 214 West 30th Street, city of New York, State of New York.

Respondents William Green and Zoltan Rothman are individual copartners trading as Green & Rothman and their address is the same as that of said partnership.

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 Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman or any other name or names, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into com-

merce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any fur product; or in connection with the manufacture for sale, sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution of any fur product which is made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce, as the terms "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding any fur product by:

1. Representing, directly or by implication, on a label that the fur contained in such fur product is natural when the fur contained therein is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

2. Failing to affix a label to such fur product showing in words and in figures plainly legible all of the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

3. Setting forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in an abbreviated form on a label affixed to such fur product.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing any fur product by:

1. Failing to furnish an invoice, as the term "invoice" is defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by each of the subsections of Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

2. Representing, directly or by implication, on an invoice that the fur contained in such fur products is natural when such fur is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

It is further ordered, That the respondents Green & Rothman, a partnership, and William Green and Zoltan Rothman, individually and as copartners trading as Green & Rothman or any other name or names, 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 fur product is not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when the respondents have reason to believe that such fur product may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce.

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.

IN THE MATTER OF

THE B. F. GOODRICH COMPANY AND TEXACO, INC.
(Formerly The Texas Company)

ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Docket 6485. Complaint, Jan. 11, 1956—Decision, Mar. 12, 1969

Order modifying a cease and desist order dated January 14, 1966, 69 F.T.C. 22, pursuant to a decision and remand of the Supreme Court, 393 U.S. 223, by deleting numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of the order directed against Texaco, Inc.

ORDER MODIFYING ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST

Respondents having filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit petitions to review and set aside the order to cease and desist issued herein on January 14, 1966; and that court on September 25, 1967, having rendered its opinion setting aside the Commission's order; and the Supreme Court of the United States on December 16, 1968, having issued its opinion reversing in part the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and remanding the case to that court for enforcement of the Commission's order to cease and desist with the exception of numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of that portion of the order directed against Texaco; and the Supreme Court on January 10, 1969, having forwarded its judgment in lieu of mandate to the court of appeals; and the court of appeals on February 25, 1969, having issued its judgment in accordance with the mandate of the Supreme Court;

Now, therefore, it is hereby ordered, That the aforesaid order to cease and desist be, and it hereby is, modified by deleting numbered paragraphs 5 and 6 of that portion of the order directed against Texaco.

It is further ordered, That respondents, The B.F. Goodrich

Company, a corporation, and The Texas Company, a corporation, shall within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission reports in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

Chairman Dixon not participating.

IN THE MATTER OF

WASSNER SPORTSWEAR MFG., INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1503. Complaint, Mar. 13, 1969—Decision, Mar. 13, 1969

Consent order requiring four affiliated New York City importers and manufacturers of wearing apparel to cease misbranding their wool products and falsely advertising their textile fiber products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 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 Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., corporations, and Isidor Wassner, David Wassner and Joseph Wassner, individually and as officers of said corporations, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of the said Acts and the Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and 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 complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondents Wassner Sportswear Mfg., Inc., Gotham Men's & Boys' Wear, Inc., Olympic Shirts, Inc., and Lustberg, Nast & Co., Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York with their office and principal place of business located at 31 West 27th Street, New York, New York.

