

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

IN THE MATTER OF
HOFFMAN-MORTON CO. TRADING AS
HOFFMAN-MORTON FURRIERS ET AL.

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

Docket C-1264. Complaint, Oct. 25, 1967—Decision, Oct. 25, 1967

Consent order requiring a Chicago, Ill., furrier to cease misbranding, falsely advertising and deceptively invoicing 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 Hoffman-Morton Co., a partnership, trading under its own name and as Hoffman-Morton Furriers, and Morton H. Hoffman, Mabel Hoffman, Ida Hoffman and David Veltman, individually and as copartners trading as Hoffman-Morton Co., 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 Hoffman-Morton Co. is a partnership existing and doing business in the State of Illinois and trading under its own name and as Hoffman-Morton Furriers. Respondents Morton H. Hoffman, Mabel Hoffman, Ida Hoffman and David Veltman are copartners in the said partnership.

Respondents are manufacturers and retailers of fur products with their office and principal place of business located at 679 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

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 trans-

portation 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 or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified with respect to the name of the country of origin of furs contained in such fur products, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products labeled to show the country of origin of furs used in such fur products as Canada when the country of origin of such furs was, in fact, Russia.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were falsely and deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified 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 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products which were labeled as "Opossum," when fur contained in such fur products was, in fact, "Australian Opossum."

Also among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products labeled as "Broadtail" thereby implying that the furs contained therein were entitled to the designation "Broadtail Lamb," when in truth and in fact, the furs contained therein were not entitled to such designation.

PAR. 5. 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:

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 the imported furs contained in the fur products.

PAR. 6. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that labels attached thereto, set forth the name of an animal other than the name of the animal that produced the fur from which the said fur products had been manufactured, in violation of Section 4(3) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 7. 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) The term "Persian-broadtail Lamb" was not set forth on labels in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 8 of said Rules and Regulations.

(b) The term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" was not set forth on labels in the manner required by law, in violation of Rule 10 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 in the required sequence, in violation of Rule 30 of said Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 8. 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:

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

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

PAR. 9. 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) 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.

(b) The term "Persian-broadtail 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.

PAR. 10. 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 respondents which appeared in issues of the Chicago Daily News, a newspaper published in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois and having a wide circulation in Illinois and in other States of the United States.

Among such false and deceptive advertisements, but not limited thereto, were advertisements which failed to show the true animal name of the fur used in any such fur product.

PAR. 11. By means of the aforesaid advertisements and others of similar import and meaning not specifically referred to herein, respondents falsely and deceptively advertised fur products in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that the said fur products were not advertised in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

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

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

(c) The term "Persian-broadtail Lamb" was not set forth in the manner required, in violation of Rule 8 of the said Rules and Regulations.

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

(e) All parts of the information required under Section 5(a) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations

promulgated thereunder were not set forth in type of equal size and conspicuousness and in close proximity with each other, in violation of Rule 38(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 12. 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 Hoffman-Morton Co. is a partnership existing and doing business in the State of Illinois and trading under its own name and as Hoffman-Morton Furriers, with its office and principal place of business located at 679 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Respondents Morton H. Hoffman, Mabel Hoffman, Ida Hoffman and David Veltman are individuals and copartners in said 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 Hoffman-Morton Co., a partnership, trading under its own name or as Hoffman-Morton Furriers or any other name or names, and Morton H. Hoffman, Mabel Hoffman, Ida Hoffman and David Veltman, individually and as copartners trading as Hoffman-Morton Co., 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:

A. Misbranding any fur product by:

1. Falsely or deceptively labeling or otherwise identifying any such fur product as to the country of origin of furs contained in such fur product.
2. Falsely or deceptively labeling or otherwise identifying such fur product as to the name or designation of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur product.
3. 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.
4. Setting forth on a label attached to such fur product the name or names of any animal or animals other than the name of the animal producing the fur contained in the fur product as specified in the Fur Products Name Guide, and as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations.
5. Failing to set forth the term "Persian-broadtail Lamb" on a label in the manner required where an elec-

Decision and Order

tion is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

6. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" on a label in the manner required where an election is made to use that term in lieu of the term "Dyed Lamb."

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

8. Failing to set forth information required under Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder on a label in the sequence required by Rule 30 of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

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. Failing to set forth the term "Persian Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

3. Failing to set forth the term "Persian-broadtail Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the word "Lamb."

4. Failing to set forth the term "Dyed Broadtail-processed Lamb" in the manner required where an election is made to use that term instead of the words "Dyed Lamb."

5. Failing to set forth the term "natural" as part of the information required to be disclosed on an invoice under the Fur Products Labeling Act and Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder to describe such fur product which is not pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

C. Falsely or deceptively advertising any fur product through the use of any advertisement, representation, public announcement or notice which is intended to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale, or offering for sale of any fur product, and which:

1. Fails to set forth in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by

