

# FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION DECISIONS

FINDINGS, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS, JANUARY 1, 1967, TO JUNE 30, 1967

IN THE MATTER OF

HETTRICK MANUFACTURING COMPANY, INC., ET AL.

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

*Docket C-1154. Complaint, Jan. 3, 1967—Decision, Jan. 3, 1967*

Consent order requiring a Statesville, N.C., manufacturer of tents, tarpaulins and other canvas products to cease using fictitious pricing methods in catalogs furnished retailers of its products.

## 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 Hettrick Manufacturing Company, Inc., a corporation, and Aldo L. Tombari, individually and as an officer of said corporation, 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 Hettrick Manufacturing Company, Inc., 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 Taylorsville Road, Statesville, North Carolina.

PAR. 2. Respondent Aldo L. Tombari, is an officer of the corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts and practices of the corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. The business address of Aldo L. Tombari is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

PAR. 3. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the manufacture, advertising, offering for sale,

sale and distribution of hunting clothes, tents, tarpaulins, and other canvas products to retailers for resale to the public.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, said products, when sold, to be shipped from their place of business in the State of North Carolina to retailers thereof located in various 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. 5. Respondents, for the purpose of inducing the purchase of their products, have engaged in the practice of using fictitious prices in connection therewith by the following method and means:

By distributing, or causing to be distributed to retailers and others, catalogs which depict and describe their aforesaid products and contain a stated price for each.

In the manner aforesaid respondents thereby represent, directly or indirectly, that the amounts shown are respondents' bona fide estimate of the actual retail prices of said products in respondents' trade area and that they do not appreciably exceed the highest prices at which substantial sales of said products are made at retail in said trade area.

In truth and in fact, said amounts shown are not respondents' bona fide estimate of the actual retail prices of said products in respondents' trade area and they appreciably exceed the highest prices at which substantial sales of said products are made at retail in said trade area.

Therefore, the statements and representations set forth above are false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 6. By the aforesaid acts and practices, respondents place in the hands of retailers the means and instrumentalities by and through which they may mislead the public as to the usual and regular retail price of said products.

PAR. 7. In the course and conduct of their business and at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been engaged in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of products of the same general kind and nature as those sold by respondents.

PAR. 8. The use by the respondents of the aforesaid false, misleading and deceptive statements, representations and practices, has had, and now has, the capacity and tendency to mislead members of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken

1

Order

belief that said statements and representations were and are true and into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' products by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of 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 Commission having heretofore determined to issue its complaint charging the respondents named in the caption hereof with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 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 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 set forth in such complaint, and waivers and provisions as required by the Commission's rules; and

The Commission, having considered the agreement, hereby accepts same, issues its complaint in the form contemplated by said agreement, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Hettrick Manufacturing Company, Inc., 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 Taylorsville Road, Statesville, North Carolina.

Respondent Aldo L. Tombari is an officer 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, Hettrick Manufacturing Com-

pany, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Aldo L. Tombari, 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 advertising, offering for sale, sale, or distribution of tents, tarpaulins, or other merchandise, in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

1. Advertising, disseminating or distributing any purported retail price unless (a) it is respondents' bona fide estimate of the actual retail price of the product in the area where respondents do business and (b) it does not appreciably exceed the highest price at which substantial sales of said product are made in said trade area.

2. Misrepresenting in any manner the prices at which respondents' merchandise is sold at retail.

3. Furnishing to others any means or instrumentalities whereby the purchasing public may be misled as to the retail prices of respondents' products.

*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

SOLOMON FURRIERS, INC.

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

*Docket C-1155. Complaint, Jan. 3, 1967—Decision, Jan. 3, 1967*

Consent order requiring an Albany, N.Y., retail furrier to cease deceptively advertising, invoicing, and labeling 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 Solomon Furriers, Inc., a corporation, 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 Solomon Furriers, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent is a retailer of fur products with its office and principal place of business located at 64 South Pearl Street, city of Albany, State of New York.

PAR. 2. Subsequent to the effective date of the Fur Products Labeling Act on August 9, 1952, respondent has been, and is now, engaged in the 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 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 violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely and deceptively identified in that labels affixed to fur products, contained representations, either directly or by implication, that the prices of such fur products were reduced from respondent's former bona fide prices in the recent regular course of business and the amount of such purported reduction constituted savings to purchasers of respondent fur products. In truth and in fact, the alleged former prices were false and deceptive in that they were not the actual, bona fide prices at which respondent offered the products to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time in the recent regular course of business. The said fur products were not reduced in price as represented, nor were savings afforded purchasers of respondent's fur products as represented.

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 show the true animal name of the fur used in any such fur product.

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 respects:

(a) 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.

(b) The term "natural" was not used on labels to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth in handwriting on labels, in violation of Rule 29(b) of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) Information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was not set forth separately on labels with respect to each section of fur products composed of two or more sections containing different animal furs, in violation of Rule 36 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:

1. To show the true animal name of the fur used in any such fur product.

2. To disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

3. To show the country of origin of imported furs used in fur products.

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 thereunder in the following respects:

(a) Information required under Section 5(b)(1) of the Fur

Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder was set forth on invoices in abbreviated form, in violation of Rule 4 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Persian Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(c) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on invoices in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 of said Rules and Regulations.

(d) The term "natural" was not used on invoices to describe fur products which were not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Rule 19(g) of said Rules and Regulations.

(e) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced with respect to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such falsely and deceptively invoiced fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products invoiced as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb" when in truth and in fact they were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 9. Certain of said fur products were falsely and deceptively advertised in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that certain advertisements intended to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale and offering for sale of such fur products were not in accordance with the provisions of Section 5(a) of the said Act.

Among and included in the aforesaid advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements of respondent which appeared in issues of the Times Union, a newspaper published in the city of Albany, State of New York.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed to show that the fur contained in the fur product was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 10. Respondent falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in violation of Section 5(a)(5) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rule 44(a) of the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder by affixing labels thereto which represented

