

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

ASSOCIATED PEST CONTROL SERVICES, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
SECTION 2(f) OF THE CLAYTON ACT*Docket C-1638. Complaint, Nov. 26, 1969—Decision, Nov. 26, 1969*

Consent order requiring a Memphis, Tenn., association of pest controllers to cease inducing and receiving discriminatory prices for pesticides and related products from suppliers of such products.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that the parties respondent named in the caption hereof, and hereinafter more particularly designated and described, have violated and are now violating the provisions of subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (U.S.C. Title 15, Section 13), hereby issues its complaint stating its charges with respect thereto as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., hereinafter referred to as "Associated," is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Tennessee, with its principal office and place of business located at 1313 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee.

Respondent Associated is an association of pest control organizations which was ostensibly organized to further the interests and development of the members of the association, through the interchange of ideas, the dissemination of scientific information and other services and purposes incidental to the general welfare of its members. Its membership is comprised of persons, partnerships and corporations engaged in the performance of pest control, industrial sanitation and exterminating services. Associated also performs other services for its members, including the negotiation of discounts for its members from distributors of pesticides, application equipment and other necessary supplies.

Respondent Associated had approximately 37 members in October 1967, which members were located in 17 States of the United States, the Dominion of Canada, and the Bahamas. The membership of Associated constitutes a class so numerous and changing as to make it impracticable to specifically name and describe each and all of such members as parties respondent herein.

Respondent Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Tennessee with its principal office and place of business located at 1313 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee. It is a member of respondent Associated and is fairly representative of the entire membership of Associated. It is named as a respondent herein in its individual capacity and as representative of all members of respondent Associated. All such members not named specifically are therefore made parties respondent herein as though they had been named individually.

Respondent Louis I. Kotler, 1313 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee, is an officer of respondent Associated and the president of respondent Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc. He has been responsible, in part, for the direction and control of Associated. He is named as a respondent herein in his individual capacity, as an officer of respondent Associated and as the chief executive officer of respondent Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc.

PAR. 2. The members of respondent Associated have purchased and now purchase in commerce from suppliers engaged in commerce numerous pesticides and other supplies, such as application equipment, for use, consumption or resale within the United States. Said members and said suppliers cause the products and supplies so purchased to be shipped and transported among and between the several States of the United States, the Dominion of Canada, and the Bahamas from the respective State or States of location of said suppliers to the respective locations of said members of Associated. The members of respondent Associated and said suppliers are therefore engaged in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Clayton Act.

PAR. 3. In the purchase, use and resale of said pesticides and supplies, the members of respondent Associated are in active competition with independent persons, partnerships and corporations not affiliated with respondent Associated; and the suppliers selling to said members of Associated and their independent competitors are in active competition with other suppliers of similar products and supplies.

PAR. 4. Respondent Associated, since its formation in February 1959, has been and is now, maintained, managed and operated by its secretary-treasurer, respondent Louis I. Kotler, for its membership and each member has participated in, approved, furthered, or cooperated with respondent Louis I. Kotler and the other mem-

bers of Associated in the carrying out of the procedures and activities hereinafter described.

In practice and effect, respondent Associated has been, and is now, serving as the medium or instrumentality by, through, or in conjunction with, which the said members of Associated exert the influence of their combined bargaining power on the competitive suppliers hereinbefore described. As a part of their operating procedure, said members of respondent Associated direct the attention of said suppliers to their aggregate purchasing power as a buying group and, by reason of such, have knowingly demanded and received, upon their individual purchases, discriminatory prices, discounts, allowances, rebates and terms and conditions of sale. Suppliers not acceding to such demands are usually replaced as sources of supply for the commodities concerned and such market is closed to them, in whole or in substantial part, in favor of such suppliers as can be, and are, induced to afford the discriminatory prices, discounts, allowances, rebates, and terms and conditions of sale so demanded.

This procedure effects a discrimination in price on goods of like grade and quality between the members of respondent Associated and competing independent persons, partnerships and corporations whose discounts, allowances or rebates from such suppliers are based upon only their individual volumes.

PAR. 5. Respondents have induced or received from their suppliers, in the the manner aforescribed, favorable prices, discounts, allowances, rebates, terms and conditions of sale which they knew or should have known constituted discriminations in price prohibited by subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

PAR. 6. The effect of knowing inducement or receipt by respondents of the discriminations in price, as above alleged, has been, and may be, substantially to lessen, injure, destroy or prevent competition between suppliers of pesticides and other supplies granting such discriminations and other suppliers of such products and supplies who do not grant or allow such discriminations, and also between respondent members and competing independent customers not receiving or securing such discriminations.

PAR. 7. The foregoing acts and practices of respondents in knowingly inducing or receiving discriminations in price prohibited by subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, are in violation of subsection (f) of Section 2 of said Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission having heretofore determined to issue its complaint charging the respondents named in the caption hereof with violation of subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended, and the respondents having been served with notice of said determination and with a copy of the complaint the Commission intended to issue, together with a proposed form of order; 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 complaint to issue herein, 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 considered the agreement and having accepted same, and the agreement containing consent order having thereupon been placed 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 in the form contemplated by said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Tennessee, with its principal office and place of business located at 1313 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee.

Respondent Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Tennessee, with its principal office and place of business located at 1313 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee. It is a member of Associated and is fairly representative of the entire membership of Associated.

Respondent Louis I. Kotler is an officer of Associated and is president of Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc. He has been responsible in part, for the direction and control of Associated. His address is the same as that of said corporations.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this proceeding and of the respondents.

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondents Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., a corporation, Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc., a corporation, individually and as a member of and as representative of the entire membership of Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., all other members of Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., and Louis I. Kotler, individually and as an officer of respondents Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., and Kotler Exterminating Co., Inc., their respective successors and assigns, officers, agents, representatives, employees and members, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering to purchase or purchase of any pesticides and other supplies, such as application equipment, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Clayton Act, as amended, do forthwith cease and desist from:

Directly or indirectly inducing and receiving, receiving or accepting any discrimination in the price of such products by accepting from any seller a net price respondents know or should know is below the net price at which said products of like grade and quality are being sold by such seller to other purchasers where respondents are competing with the purchaser paying the higher price or with a customer of the purchaser paying the higher price.

For the purpose of determining the "net price" under the terms of this order, there shall be taken into account all discounts or other terms and conditions of sale by which net prices are affected.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporation, Associated Pest Control Services, Inc., shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its members.

It is further ordered, That respondents notify the Commission at least 30 days prior to any proposed change in the corporate respondents 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 compliance obligations arising out of the order.

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.

703

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

KEENEY BROTHERS FARMS, ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket C-1639. Complaint, Nov. 26, 1969—Decision, Nov. 26, 1969*

Consent order requiring a New Freedom, Pa., seller of chinchilla breeding stock to cease making exaggerated earning claims, misrepresenting the quality and fertility of its stock, and misrepresenting its services to purchasers.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Keeney Brothers Farms, a partnership, and Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney, individually and as copartners trading and doing business as Keeney Brothers Farms, and Larry Keeney, individually and as an office manager of said partnership, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said 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 Keeney Brothers Farms is a partnership comprised of Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney who formulate, direct and control its acts, policies and practices, including those hereinafter set forth. The principal office and place of business of said partnership is located at Route 2, New Freedom, Pennsylvania.

Respondents Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney are individuals and copartners trading and doing business as Keeney Brothers Farms, with their principal office and place of business at the above-stated address.

Respondent Larry Keeney is an individual and office manager of said partnership. He cooperated in and effectuated the acts, policies and practices of the partnership. His address is the same as that of the partnership.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of chinchilla breeding stock to the public.

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of their aforesaid business, respondents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, their said chinchillas, when sold, to be shipped from their place of business in the State of Pennsylvania to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and maintain, and at all times mentioned herein have maintained, a substantial course of trade in said products in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their aforesaid business, and for the purpose of obtaining the names of prospective purchasers and inducing the purchase of said chinchillas, respondents have made, and are now making numerous statements and representations in magazine publications, direct mail advertising and through the oral statements and display of promotional material to prospective purchasers by their salesmen, with respect to the breeding of chinchillas in the home for profit without previous experience, the rate of reproduction of said animals and the expected income from their sale.

Typical and illustrative of the statements and representations contained in said advertising and promotional material, but not all inclusive thereof, are the following:

*** Here is a ready made market! The demand for Chinchilla breeding stock is so great authorities estimate that 500,000 animals will be needed for breeding stock alone, before pelting can be seriously considered.

* * * * *

*** The space you will need to raise, breed and sell Chinchillas to start, need be no more than your garage, basement, or even the kitchen or bedroom. ***

The return is quick and BIG. You can have Chinchillas ready for market in just five or six months. A chinchilla can have up to three litters a year, averaging from 1 to as high as 6 in a litter. The young can bring from \$200.00 a pair on up.

YOU CAN MAKE UP TO \$800.00 IN ONE YEAR JUST FROM ONE PAIR OF CHINCHILLAS!

Here's how. Supposing you get a real conservative average of 2 young per litter. In a year's time you can have 3 pair from your original pair, plus at least one pair from the first offspring. If you sell your young at \$200.00 per pair, you would then have \$800.00. By keeping at least one pair for future breeding the next year, you could make from \$600.00 to \$1800.00. ***

* * * * *

CAN YOU USE \$1,000.00 to \$5,000.00-\$10,000.00 per year?

Of course you can. And by answering our advertisement you have taken a step forward in that direction. ***

* * * * *

703

Complaint

Then consider carefully our program: A tremendous National Advertising Campaign (to millions every month all over the United States) specially designed to sell the Chinchillas YOU BREED AT HOME. Yes, you'll agree after digesting this information that we want to work with you as a sort of "YOU BREED 'EM—WE'LL HELP SELL 'EM" team.

* * * * *

Is Chinchilla breeding difficult? Absolutely not. Nature takes care of the breeding, as paired animals are left together at all times. * * *

* * * * *

WHAT OTHER BUSINESS OFFERS YOU THESE THRILLING ADVANTAGES?

* * * YOU ARE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH NATURE and nature does the work for you. * * *

YOUR HOME, GARAGE, BARN, BASEMENT IS YOUR FACTORY

* * * * *

YOU DON'T HAVE TO FIND A MARKET FOR THE CHINCHILLAS YOU BREED, BECAUSE Our National Advertising was originated with the idea of making people interested in raising Chinchillas come to you * * * no matter where you live. YOUR SUCCESS IS OUR SUCCESS. That is why we pay for this large nation-wide advertising campaign to help you. No other type of home business offers you this extra assurance of profits.

* * * * *

They have hardy constitutions and with proper care, feed and housing, are relatively free from illness and disease.

* * * * *

PAR. 5. By and through the use of said statements and representations made by respondents in their advertising and promotional material, and others of similar import and meaning but not expressly set out herein, and in oral statements and representations made by their salesmen, respondents represent, and have represented, directly or by implication, that:

1. It is commercially feasible to breed and raise chinchillas from breeding stock purchased from respondents in homes, basements, garages, kitchens, bedrooms and that large profits can be made in this manner.

2. The breeding of chinchillas from breeding stock purchased from respondents as a commercially profitable enterprise requires no previous experience in the breeding, raising and caring for such animals.

3. Chinchillas are hardy animals and are free from illness and disease.

4. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring will produce at least three live offspring per year.

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

5. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring will produce several successive litters of from one to six live offspring each year.

6. The offspring referred to in Paragraph Five subparagraph (5) above will sell for at least \$200 a pair, a pair being one female and one male.

7. A purchaser starting with one female and one male of respondents' chinchilla breeding stock will have a gross income of at least \$600 from the sale of animals in the second year.

8. There is a great demand for the offspring and for the pelts of the offspring of chinchilla breeding stock purchased from respondents.

9. The purpose of respondents' national advertising is to help purchasers of their chinchilla breeding stock market the chinchillas they raise.

PAR. 6. In truth and in fact:

1. It is not commercially feasible to breed or raise chinchillas from breeding stock purchased from respondents in homes, basements, garages, kitchens, bedrooms and large profits cannot be made in this manner. Such quarters or buildings, unless they have adequate space and the requisite temperature, humidity, ventilation and other necessary environmental conditions are not adaptable to or suitable for the breeding or raising of chinchillas on a commercial basis.

2. The breeding of chinchillas from breeding stock purchased from respondents as a commercially profitable enterprise requires specialized knowledge in the breeding, raising and care of said animals much of which must be acquired through actual experience.

3. Chinchillas are not hardy animals and are not free from illness and disease.

4. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring will not produce at least three live offspring per year, but generally less than that number.

5. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring will not produce several successive litters of from one to six each year, but generally less than that number.

6. The offspring referred to in subparagraph (5) Paragraph Five above will not sell for at least \$200 a pair but substantially less than that amount.

7. A purchaser starting with one female and one male of respondents' breeding stock will not have a gross income of at least \$600 from the sale of animals in the second year but substantially less than that amount.

8. There is not a great demand for the offspring nor for the pelts of the offspring of chinchilla breeding stock purchased from respondents.

9. The purpose of respondents' national advertising is not to help purchasers of their chinchilla breeding stock market the chinchillas they raise but to sell respondents' own breeding stock.

Therefore, the statements and representations as set forth in Paragraphs Four and Five hereof were and are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 7. In the course and conduct of their business, and at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of chinchilla breeding stock.

PAR. 8. The use by respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices has had, and now has, the tendency and capacity to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' chinchillas by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of the respondents, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 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 Deceptive Practices 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 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 Act, 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 Keeney Brothers Farms is a partnership comprised of Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney who formulate, direct and control its acts, policies and practices. The principal office and place of business of said partnership is located at Route 2, New Freedom, Pennsylvania.

Respondents Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney are individuals trading and doing business as a copartnership under the aforesaid name and style. Their address is the same as that of the partnership.

Respondent Larry Keeney is an individual and office manager of said partnership. He cooperated in and effectuated the acts, policies and practices of the partnership. His address is the same as that of the 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 Keeney Brothers Farms, a partnership, and Alvin L. Keeney and Elmer H. Keeney, individually and as copartners trading and doing business as Keeney Brothers Farms, or trading and doing business under any other name or names, and Larry Keeney, individually and as an office manager of said partnership, and respondents' representatives,

agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the advertising, offering for sale, sale or distribution of chinchilla breeding stock or any other products, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Representing, directly or by implication, that:

1. It is commercially feasible to breed or raise chinchillas in homes, basements, garages, kitchens or bedrooms, or other quarters or buildings unless in immediate conjunction therewith it is clearly and conspicuously disclosed that the represented quarters or buildings can only be adaptable to and suitable for the breeding and raising of chinchillas on a commercial basis if they have the requisite space, temperature, humidity, ventilation and other environmental conditions.

2. Breeding chinchillas as a commercially profitable enterprise can be achieved without previous knowledge or experience in the breeding, raising and care of such animals.

3. Chinchillas are hardy animals or are free from illness or disease.

4. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring produce at least three live young per year.

5. The number of live offspring produced per female chinchilla is any number or range of numbers; or representing, in any manner, the past number or range of numbers of live offspring produced per female chinchilla of purchasers of respondents' breeding stock unless, in fact, the past number or range of numbers represented are those of a substantial number of purchasers and accurately reflect the number or range of numbers of live offspring produced per female chinchilla of these purchasers under circumstances similar to those of the purchaser to whom the representation is made.

6. Each female chinchilla purchased from respondents and each female offspring will produce several successive litters of one to six live offspring each year.

7. The number of litters or sizes thereof produced per female chinchilla is any number or range thereof; or representing, in any manner, the past number or range

of numbers of litters or sizes produced per female chinchilla of purchasers of respondents' breeding stock unless, in fact, the past number or range of numbers represented are those of a substantial number of purchasers and accurately reflect the number or range of numbers of litters or sizes thereof produced per female chinchilla of these purchasers under circumstances similar to those of the purchaser to whom the representation is made.

8. The offspring of respondents' chinchilla breeding stock sell for at least \$200 per pair.

9. Chinchilla offspring from respondents' breeding stock will sell for any price, average price, or range of prices; or representing, in any manner, the past price, average price or range of prices of purchasers of respondents' breeding stock unless, in fact, the past price, average price or range of prices represented are those of a substantial number of purchasers and accurately reflect the price, average price or range of prices realized by these purchasers under circumstances similar to those of the purchaser to whom the representation is made.

10. A purchaser starting with one female and one male will have, from the sale of animals, a gross income, earnings or profits of \$600 in the second year after purchase.

11. Purchasers of respondents' breeding stock will realize earnings, profits or income in any amount or range of amounts; or representing, in any manner, the past earnings, profits or income of purchasers of respondents' breeding stock unless, in fact, the past earnings, profits or income represented are those of a substantial number of purchasers and accurately reflect the average earnings, profits or income of these purchasers under circumstances similar to those of the purchaser to whom the representation is made.

12. Purchasers of respondents' breeding stock can expect to be able to sell the offspring or the pelts of the offspring of respondents' chinchillas because said chinchillas or pelts are in great demand.

13. The purpose of respondents' national advertising is to help purchasers of their chinchilla breeding stock

708

Decision and Order

market the chinchillas they raise; or misrepresenting, in any manner, the advertising, promotional or sales assistance engaged in by respondents or furnished to purchasers of respondents' products.

B. Misrepresenting, in any manner, the earnings or profits to purchasers or the quality or reproduction capacity of any chinchilla breeding stock.

C. Failing to deliver a copy of this order to cease and desist to all present and future salesmen or other persons engaged in the sale of respondents' products or services, and failing to secure from each such salesman or other person a signed statement acknowledging receipt of said order.

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

KAYE BROTHERS, ET AL.

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

Docket C-1640. Complaint, Nov. 26, 1969—Decision, Nov. 26, 1969

Consent order requiring a Chicago, Ill., manufacturer of men's and boys' sport jackets to cease 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 Kaye Brothers, a partnership, and Ben Kaye and Edward Kaye, individually and as co-partners trading as Kaye Brothers, 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 inter-

est, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Kaye Brothers is a partnership with its office and principal place of business located at 1750 North Wolcott, Chicago, Illinois.

Individual respondents Ben Kaye and Edward Kaye are copartners trading as Kaye Brothers. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of said respondent partnership and their address is the same as that of said partnership.

Respondents are manufacturers of men's and boys' sport jackets.

PAR. 2. Respondents, now and for some time last past, have introduced into commerce, manufactured for introduction 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 the 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 men's and boys' sport jackets, stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified as containing a shell fiber content of 100% reprocessed wool, a lining fiber content of all rayon and a knit content of 50% cotton, 50% wool, whereas in truth and in fact, such jackets 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 with labels on or affixed thereto which failed to disclose the percentage of total fiber weight of the wool product, exclusive of ornamentation not exceeding five 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 five per centum or more; and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers.

PAR. 5. 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 and practices in commerce, within the intent and 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 Kaye Brothers is a partnership with its office and principal place of business located at 1750 North Wolcott, Chicago, Illinois.

Respondents Ben Kaye and Edward Kaye are copartners trading as Kaye Brothers. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of the said respondent partnership 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 Kaye Brothers, partnership, and Ben Kaye and Edward Kaye, individually and as copartners trading as Kaye Brothers, or under 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 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.

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.

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

S. SCHNEIDERMAN & SONS, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket C-1641. Complaint, Nov. 26, 1969—Decision, Nov. 26, 1969

Consent order requiring a New York City manufacturing furrier to cease falsely invoicing and deceptively guaranteeing its fur 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 S. Schneiderman & Sons, Inc., a corporation, and Joseph Schneiderman and Harry Schneiderman, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have 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 S. Schneiderman & Sons, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents Joseph Schneiderman and Harry Schneiderman are officers of the corporate respondent. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of the said corporate respondent including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are manufacturers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 150 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, trans-

ported 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 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 fur products were bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in that certain of said fur products were invoiced to show that the fur contained therein was "color altered" when in fact such fur was "dyed," in violation of Section 5(b) (2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 5. 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. 6. Respondents furnished false guaranties under Section 10(b) of the Fur Products Labeling Act with respect to certain of their fur products by falsely representing in writing that respondents had a continuing guaranty on file with the Federal Trade Commission when respondents in furnishing such guaranties had reason to believe that the fur products so falsely guarantied would be introduced, sold, transported and distributed in commerce, in violation of Rule 48(c) of said Rules and Regulations under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Section 10(b) of said Act.

PAR. 7. 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 has 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 records 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 S. Schneiderman & Sons, 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 150 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

Respondents Joseph Schneiderman and Harry Schneiderman are officers of the said corporation. They formulate, direct and control the policies, acts and practices of said corporation and their address is the same of 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 S. Schneiderman & Sons, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Joseph Schneiderman and Harry Schneiderman, individually and as officers 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 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 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 product is "color altered," when such fur is dyed.

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

It is further ordered, That respondents S. Schneiderman & Sons, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Joseph Schneiderman and Harry Schneiderman, individually and as officers 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 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 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

715

Decision and Order

emergence 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 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.

IN THE MATTER OF

BEATRICE FOODS CO. AND THE KROGER CO., INC.

ORDER, OPINIONS, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF
SECS. 2 (a) AND 2 (f) OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Docket 8663. Complaint, July 30, 1965—Decision, Dec. 1, 1969

Order requiring a major food chain store with headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio, to cease knowingly inducing or receiving discriminatory prices from competing suppliers of fluid milk and other dairy products, and dismissing price discrimination charges against a major dairy products distributor.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that respondent Beatrice Foods Co., has violated and is now violating the provision of subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act (U.S.C., Title 15, Section 13) as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, approved June 19, 1936, and that respondent The Kroger Co., Inc., has violated and is now violating subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act (U.S.C., Title 15, Section 13) as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, approved June 19, 1936, hereby issues its complaint charging as follows:

COUNT I

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Beatrice Foods Co., hereinafter referred to as "Beatrice," is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of

Delaware with its principal office and place of business located at 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

PAR. 2. Respondent Beatrice is a holding and operating company having on February 28, 1963, a 100% voting power in approximately 15 subsidiary corporations. In addition to these corporations, Beatrice conducts a diversified dairy business including virtually all branches thereof through its operating divisions. Its principal operations are milk, creamery butter, ice cream, produce, cold storage and frozen foods. Beatrice's chief trade name is "Meadow Gold."

Respondent Beatrice has 134 plants for the manufacturing and processing of milk, butter, ice cream, ice cream mixes, dried buttermilk and powdered milk. These plants are located in 33 States. Sales branches are maintained by Beatrice at its manufacturing plants and, in addition, Beatrice has 242 selling branches in 42 States.

Beatrice's gross sales, less returns, for the fiscal year ending February 28, 1964, were \$606,157,642.

PAR. 3. Respondent The Kroger Co., Inc., hereinafter referred to as "Kroger," is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Ohio with its principal office and place of business located at 1014 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PAR. 4. Respondent Kroger is now, and for many years has been engaged in the operation of a large chain of retail grocery stores. In the course and conduct of said business, Kroger maintains a highly integrated operation which includes the manufacturing, processing, distributing and retailing of a broad line of merchandise, including fluid milk and other dairy and food products and a variety of nonedible household products. On December 28, 1963, Kroger operated approximately 1,424 retail grocery stores in 24 States of the United States. Kroger's net sales amounted to \$2,102,106,248 in 1963, \$1,947,570,909 in 1962 and \$1,842,342,667 in 1961.

Included among Kroger's retail grocery chain stores are approximately 44 stores located in portions of the States of West Virginia, Ohio and Kentucky comprising the Charleston Division of The Kroger Co., Inc., an operating division of the said respondent Kroger.

PAR. 5. Respondent Beatrice sells fluid milk and other dairy products of like grade and quality to a large number of purchasers

located throughout 42 States of the United States, including the States of West Virginia, Ohio and Kentucky for use, consumption or resale therein.

PAR. 6. In the course and conduct of its business, respondent Beatrice is now, and for many years past has been, transporting fluid milk and other dairy products, or causing the same to be transported, from dairy farms and other points of origin to said respondent's receiving stations, processing and manufacturing plants and distribution depots located in States other than the State of origin.

Beatrice is now, and for many years past has been transporting fluid milk and other dairy products, or causing the same to be transported, from the State or States where such products are processed, manufactured or stored in anticipation of sale or shipment, to purchasers located in other States of the United States.

Beatrice also sells and distributes its said fluid milk and other dairy products to purchasers located in the same States and places where such products are processed, manufactured or stored in anticipation of sale.

All of the matters and things, including the acts, practices, sales and distribution by Beatrice of its said fluid milk and other dairy products, as hereinbefore alleged, were and are performed and done in a constant current of commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Clayton Act.

PAR. 7. Respondent Beatrice sells its fluid milk and other dairy products to retailers and consumers. Beatrice's retailer-purchasers resell to consumers. Many of said respondent's retailer-purchasers are in competition with other retailer-purchasers of Beatrice.

Respondent Beatrice, in the sale of its fluid milk and other dairy products to retailers and consumers, is in substantial competition with other manufacturers, distributors and sellers of such products.

PAR. 8. In the course and conduct of its business in commerce, respondent Beatrice has discriminated and is now discriminating in price in the sale of fluid milk and other dairy products by selling such products of like grade and quality at different prices to different purchasers at the same level of trade.

Included in, but not limited to, the discriminations in price, as above alleged, beginning on or about June 4, 1962, Beatrice has discriminated in price in the sale of said products by charging many retailer-purchasers, who were and are in competition with

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

the retail stores of Kroger's Charleston Division, higher prices than it charged Kroger's said retail stores. Such differences in price have ranged as high as 32 percent for fluid milk in gallon containers.

PAR. 9. The effect of such discriminations in price by respondent Beatrice in the sale of fluid milk and other dairy products has been or may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in the purchasing, processing or sale of said products and to injure, destroy or prevent competition:

1. Between Beatrice and its competitors in the manufacture, processing, distribution and sale of such products.
2. Between retailers paying higher prices and competing retailers paying lower prices for Beatrice's said products.

PAR. 10. The discriminations in price, as herein alleged, are in violation of subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended.

COUNT II

PAR. 11. Paragraphs One through Ten of Count I hereof are hereby set forth by reference and made a part of this count as fully and with the same effect as if quoted herein verbatim.

PAR. 12. Respondent Kroger, in the course and conduct of its business, is now, and for many years has been purchasing in commerce from sellers engaged in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the amended Clayton Act, numerous food and household products, including fluid milk and other dairy products, for use, consumption and resale within the United States.

In connection with such transactions, respondents are now, and have been, in active competition with other corporations, partnerships, firms and individuals also engaged in the purchase for use, consumption and resale of such food and household products, including fluid milk and other dairy products, of like grade and quality from the same or competitive sellers. The aforesaid sellers are located in the various States of the United States, and respondent Kroger and such sellers cause the products when purchased by said respondent, to be transported from the place of manufacture, processing or purchase, to Kroger's warehouses and retail stores located in the same State or the various other States of the United States. Further, in many instances the aforesaid sellers must purchase or obtain raw materials, supplies and finished products from States other than the State in which such food and household products, including fluid milk and other dairy

products, are manufactured, processed or purchased as aforesaid, in order to fulfill the obligations of said sellers in their commitments to supply the said respondent.

PAR. 13. Respondent Kroger is, and was at all times mentioned herein a knowledgeable processor, manufacturer and buyer of fluid milk and other dairy products. Kroger owns and operates at least three plants for the processing and manufacture of fluid milk, and other dairy products.

PAR. 14. In the course and conduct of its business in commerce, Kroger has knowingly induced or received discriminations in price which are prohibited by subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended.

For example, respondent Kroger, in its negotiations with respondent Beatrice, before and after June 4, 1962, for the supply of fluid milk and other dairy products under private label to the stores of Kroger's Charleston Division, knowingly induced prices which were and are discriminatory under the provisions of Section 2 of the amended Clayton Act, as set forth in Count I of this complaint. Further, respondent Kroger had and has, since June 4, 1962, knowingly induced or received prices from respondent Beatrice in the purchase of such products for the stores of said Charleston Division which said prices were and are discriminatory under the provisions of Section 2 of the amended Clayton Act, as set forth in Count I hereof.

By the term private label, it is meant that such products were packaged under labels bearing brand names owned by Kroger or peculiar to the retail operations of Kroger, its divisions and subsidiaries, instead of under labels displaying the brand names owned by Beatrice or peculiar to the operations of Beatrice.

PAR. 15. When respondent Kroger knowingly induced or received the discriminatory prices from its supplier, as alleged, Kroger knew or should have known that such prices constituted discriminations in price prohibited by subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

PAR. 16. The foregoing acts and practices of Kroger are in violation of subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended.

Mr. Fiodie P. Favarella, Mr. John J. Mathias, and Mr. Rafe H. Cloe supporting the complaint.

Mr. Edward L. Foote of Winston, Strawn, Smith & Patterson, 38 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill., and Mr. John P. Fox, Jr.,

Complaint

76 F.T.C.

and *Mr. Peter J. Marcus*, 120 South LaSalle St., Suite 2200, Chicago, Ill., for respondent Beatrice Foods Co.

Mr. Norman Diamond, *Mr. Murray H. Bring*, and *Mr. Max H. Crohn, Jr.*, of *Arnold & Porter*, 1229 19th St., NW., Washington, D.C., for respondent The Kroger Co., Inc.

INITIAL DECISION BY ABNER E. LIPSCOMB, HEARING EXAMINER
 SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

CONTENTS

	Page
I. The Complaint and the Statute	726
II. The Respondents' Answers	727
III. Hearings, Proposed Findings, and Abbreviations	728
IV. The Issues	728
V. Identity and Business of Beatrice	729
VI. Identity and Business of Kroger	730
VII. The Products Involved and the Methods of Sale and Delivery	731
VIII. Reasons Given by Kroger for Wanting Private-label Milk	733
IX. Sequence of Events Leading to the Beatrice-Kroger Agreement	734
X. Discount Prices to A & P	745
XI. Discount Prices to Garden Fresh Markets	746
XII. Like Grade and Quality	747
XIII. Commerce in Sales to Kroger and A & P	747
XIV. Duration of Agreement and Areas Involved	749
XV. Injury to Competing Dairies—Primary Line	750
XVI. Injury to Retailers—Secondary Line	751
XVII. Determining the Extent of Discriminations	753
XVIII. Knowledge Chargeable to Kroger	755
XIX. Good Faith in Meeting Competition	757
XX. The Cost-justification Defense	760
XXI. Conclusions	768
XXII. The Order	769

I. THE COMPLAINT AND THE STATUTE

The complaint in this proceeding, consisting of two counts, was issued on July 30, 1965.

Count I of the complaint, as modified by the More Definite Statement made by complaint counsel, alleges that the respondent Beatrice Foods Co., beginning in June 1962, violated Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, by discriminating in prices in the sale of fluid milk and other dairy products and by selling those products to The Kroger Co., Inc., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc., and Garden Fresh Markets, Inc., at lower prices than Beatrice Foods Co. sells those products of like grade and quality to other retail customers in competition with the companies named above. The provisions of the Clayton Act upon which Count I of the complaint is based provide as follows:

Sec. 2.(a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered: * * *

(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

Count II of the complaint alleges that respondent The Kroger Co., Inc., in its negotiations with respondent Beatrice Foods Co., “* * * for the supply of fluid milk and other dairy products under private label brands to the stores of Kroger’s Charleston Division * * *,” before and after June 4, 1962, knowingly induced or received prices “* * * which were and are discriminatory under the provisions * * *” of subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended. The portion of the Clayton Act upon which Count II of the complaint is based provides as follows :

(f) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, knowingly to induce or receive a discrimination in price which is prohibited by this section.

II. THE RESPONDENTS’ ANSWERS

On September 15, 1965, respondent Beatrice Foods Co. filed its answer in which it made certain factual admissions, but denied the principal charges alleged in the complaint, and pled a number of affirmative defenses, as follows:

1. The prices charged were not unlawfully discriminatory;
2. Competitors of Beatrice Foods Co. were not injured within the meaning of Section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act;
3. Competitors of the alleged favored customers were not injured within the meaning of Section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act;
4. Certain of the alleged discriminatory sales were not sales in commerce as defined in Section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act;
5. All price differentials, if any, were instituted in good faith to meet competitors’ prices; and
6. All price differentials, if any, represented permissible differentials because they made due allowances for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery that resulted from differing methods of distribution or differing quantities sold to the alleged favored customers.

Respondent The Kroger Co., Inc., filed its answer on September 27, 1965, in which it made certain factual admissions, but specifically denied that the alleged differentials in price as to sales to The Kroger Co., Inc., violated Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act; and further, it denied that it knowingly induced or received any unlawful price discriminations from Beatrice Foods Co. or that it knew or should have known that the prices of Beatrice Foods Co. constituted discriminations violative of Section 2(a).

