

IN THE MATTER OF
SOUTH VILLAGE MILLS, INC., ET AL.

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

Docket 7217. Complaint, Aug. 4, 1958—Decision, Dec. 20, 1958

Consent order requiring a corporate manufacturer and its president in Webster, Mass., to cease violating the Wool Products Labeling Act by tagging and invoicing as "100% Vicuna," woolen fabrics which did not contain vicuna or contained substantially less than said quantity, and by failing to label wool products as required by the Act.

As to the general manager of respondent corporation, the matter was disposed of by order of Oct. 21, 1959, 56 F.T.C. —.

Mr. Daniel T. Coughlin and Mr. Thomas F. Howder for the Commission.

Ely, Bartlett and Brown, of Boston, Mass., by Mr. Norman T. Byrnes, for South Village Mills, Inc., and Edward Kunkel.

INITIAL DECISION AS TO RESPONDENTS SOUTH VILLAGE MILLS, INC.,
AND EDWARD KUNKEL BY WILLIAM L. PACK, HEARING EXAMINER

The complaint in this matter charges the respondents with violation of the Wool Products Labeling Act, and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, in connection with the sale and distribution of certain wool products.

An agreement for disposition of the proceeding by means of a consent order has now been entered into by counsel supporting the complaint and respondents South Village Mills, Inc., and Edward Kunkel. Respondent Joseph Crowley is not a party to the agreement, and the term "respondents" as used hereinafter will not include this individual.

The agreement provides, among other things, that respondents admit all of the jurisdictional allegations in the complaint; that the record on which the initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and agreement; that the inclusion of findings of fact and conclusions of law in the decision disposing of this matter is waived, together with any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; that the order hereinafter set forth may be entered in disposition of the proceeding, such order to have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing,

respondents specifically waiving any and all rights to challenge or contest the validity of such order; that the order may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided for other orders of the Commission; that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; and that the agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint.

The hearing examiner having considered the agreement and proposed order and being of the opinion that they provide an adequate basis for appropriate disposition of the proceeding as to the present respondents, the agreement is hereby accepted, the following jurisdictional findings made, and the following order issued:

1. Respondent South Village Mills, Inc., is a corporation existing and doing business under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its office and principal place of business located at South Main Street, Webster, Mass. Individual respondent Edward Kunkel is located at the same address as that of the corporate respondent.

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 the respondents, South Village Mills, Inc., a corporation, and its officers and Edward Kunkel, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' agents, representatives 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 or distribution in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, of "wool products," as such products are defined in and subject to the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding such products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling or otherwise identifying such products as to the character or amount of the constituent fibers contained or included therein;

2. Falsely or deceptively identifying such products as to the character or amount of the constituent fibers contained or included therein on sales invoices or shipping memoranda applicable thereto;

3. Failing to securely affix to or place on each such product

Decision

55 F.T.C.

a stamp, tag, label or other means of identification showing in a clear and conspicuous manner:

(a) The percentage of the total fiber weight of such 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 where said percentage by weight of such fiber is five per centum or more and (5) the aggregate of all other fibers;

(b) The maximum percentages of the total weight of such wool product of any nonfibrous loading, filling or adulterating matter;

(c) The name or the registered identification number of the manufacturer of such wool product or of one or more persons engaged in introducing such wool product into commerce, or in the offering for sale, sale, transportation, distribution or delivery for shipment thereof in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939.

It is further ordered, That South Village Mills, Inc., a corporation, and Edward Kunkel, individually and as an officer of said corporation, and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale or distribution of Vicuna products or materials or any other products or materials in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from directly or indirectly:

Misrepresenting the constituent fibers of which their products are composed or the percentages or amounts thereof in sales invoices, shipping memoranda or in any other manner.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION AND ORDER TO FILE
REPORT OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Section 3.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the initial decision as to respondents South Village Mills, Inc., and Edward Kunkel of the hearing examiner shall, on the 20th day of December 1958, become the decision of the Commission; and, accordingly:

It is ordered, That respondents South Village Mills, Inc., and Edward Kunkel, 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 the order to cease and desist.

Order

IN THE MATTER OF
COMBINED INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA

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

Docket 6280. Complaint, Dec. 28, 1954—Order, Dec. 22, 1958

Order vacating and setting aside initial decision on jurisdictional grounds, following the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in the combined cases of *Federal Trade Commission v. National Casualty Co.* and *Federal Trade Commission v. The American Hospital and Life Insurance Co.*, 357 U.S. 560, and dismissing complaint charging a Chicago insurance company with falsely advertising its accident and health insurance policies.

Before *Mr. Loren H. Laughlin*, hearing examiner.

Mr. Roslyn D. Young, Jr. and *Mr. Paul R. Dixon* for the Commission.

Arrington & Healy, of Chicago, Ill., for respondent.

FINAL ORDER

This matter having come on to be heard upon the appeals of counsel supporting the complaint and of counsel for respondent from the hearing examiner's initial decision filed prior to the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in the combined cases of *Federal Trade Commission v. National Casualty Company* and *Federal Trade Commission v. The American Hospital and Life Insurance Company*, 357 U.S. 560 (1958); and

The Commission having considered said appeals and the record and having concluded that this proceeding should be dismissed on jurisdictional grounds upon the authority of said ruling of the Supreme Court:

It is ordered, That the initial decision herein, filed July 15, 1957, be, and it hereby is, vacated and set aside.

It is further ordered, That the complaint herein be, and it hereby is, dismissed.

Complaint

55 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF
HUNT-MARQUARDT, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION
OF SEC. 2(f) OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Docket 6765. Complaint, Apr. 5, 1957—Decision, Dec. 23, 1958

Consent order requiring 14 New York and New England jobbers of automotive replacement parts and their buying organization, which served merely as a bookkeeping device to exert their combined bargaining power, to cease violating Sec. 2(f) of the Clayton Act by soliciting and accepting illegal price advantages from suppliers which were not available to their competitors.

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, since June 19, 1936 have violated and are now violating the provisions of Subsection (f), Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, approved June 19, 1936 (U.S.C. Title 15, Sec. 13) hereby issues its complaint stating its charges with respect thereto as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. (1) Respondent Hunt-Marquardt, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 244 Brighton Avenue, Boston, Mass.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Alfred S. Hunt, president.

Arthur C. Marquardt, treasurer.

H. Nelson Hartstone, secretary.

(2) Respondents George G. Mellor and Raymond W. Mellor are individuals and copartners trading as Mellor's Auto Parts with their principal office and place of business located at 134 Broad Street, Providence, R.I.

(3) Respondent Standard Auto Gear Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 531 Columbia Road, Dorchester, Mass.

910

Complaint

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Morris Roazen, president and treasurer.

David Roazen, vice president.

Louis J. Roazen, secretary and assistant treasurer.

(4) Respondent, The Tarbell-Watters Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 144 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Mass.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Lucius H. Tarbell, president.

John S. Leven, vice president.

Clarence E. Trevor, treasurer and secretary.

(5) Respondent Auto Electric Service Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Hampshire with its principal office and place of business located at 21 Dow Street, Manchester, N.H.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

James Pettigrew, president.

Everett P. McAfee, treasurer and general manager.

Omar H. Amyot, secretary.

(6) Respondent Farrar-Brown Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maine with its principal office and place of business located at 49 Darthmouth Street, Portland, Maine.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Frank G. Congdon, president.

Christian Olesen, Jr., treasurer.

Franz U. Burkett, secretary.

(7) Respondent Christie & Thomson, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with its principal office and place of business located at 3 Quinsigamond Avenue, Worcester, Mass.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of the said respondent corporation:

Complaint

55 F.T.C.

Robert Thompson, president.

William Christie, treasurer.

Abraham Hodes, secretary.

(8) Respondent Grinold Auto Parts, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Connecticut with its principal office and place of business located at 354 Hudson Street, Hartford, Conn.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of the said respondent corporation:

Raymond W. Grinold, president and treasurer.

Cleo T. (Mrs. R. W.) Grinold, vice president.

Richard E. Ryder, secretary.

(9) Respondent Horton-Gallo-Creamer Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Connecticut, with its principal office and place of business located at 96-104 State Street, New Haven, Conn.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of the said respondent corporation:

Raymond W. Grinold, president and treasurer.

Cleo T. (Mrs. R. W.) Grinold, vice president.

James T. Fleming, secretary.

(10) Respondent Hagar Hardware & Paint Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Vermont, with its principal office and place of business located at 164 St. Paul Street, Burlington, Vt.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Frank J. Whalen, president and treasurer.

George I. Hagar, vice president.

(11) Respondent Plattsburgh Motor Service, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its principal office and place of business located at 95 Bridge Street, Plattsburgh, New York.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Walter H. Church, Sr., president and treasurer.

Walter H. Church, Jr., vice president.

Joseph S. Church, secretary.

(12) Respondent Detroit Supply Company, Inc., is a corpora-

910

Complaint

tion organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its principal office and place of business located at 78-82 Central Avenue, Albany, N.Y.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Samuel Weiss, president and treasurer.

Sidney R. Nathan, vice president.

Jacob Weiss, second vice president.

Eugene J. Nathan, assistant treasurer.

Sylvan Raab, secretary.

(13) Respondent William T. Manning Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 133 Pocasset Street, Fall River, Mass.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

William T. Manning, Sr., president.

William T. Manning, Jr., treasurer.

Margaret C. (Mrs. Daniel) Egan, secretary.

(14) Respondent Thorpe Automotive Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Rhode Island, with its principal office and place of business located at 61 Montgomery Street, Pawtucket, R.I.

The following respondent individuals are the officers of said respondent corporation:

Luke E. Thorpe, president.

William H. Thorpe, vice president and treasurer.

John J. Thorpe, assistant treasurer.

Vincent Thorpe, secretary.

(15) Respondent Six-State Associates with principal office and place of business located at 285 Newtonville Avenue, Newton, Mass., is an association organized, existing and doing business under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by virtue of a Declaration of Trust effective December 31, 1948. Said respondent association upon its organization purchased all of the assets of Six-State Sales, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in October 1947.

The following respondent individuals are the trustees and officers of said respondent association:

Complaint

55 F.T.C.

Alfred S. Hunt, president and trustee.

Louis J. Roazen, vice president and trustee.

Christian Olesen, Jr., vice president.

Arthur C. Marquardt, treasurer and trustee.

PAR. 2. The respondent corporations and the co-partnership set forth in paragraph I, supra, are independent business entities principally engaged in the jobbing of automotive replacement parts and supplies. Since June 19, 1936, said jobbers have purchased and now purchase in commerce from sellers, and from sellers engaged in commerce, numerous such parts and supplies for use, consumption or resale within the United States and in the District of Columbia, and in connection with such transactions said jobbers have been and are now in active and substantial competition with other corporations, partnerships, firms and individuals also engaged in the purchase for use, consumption or resale of automotive replacement parts and supplies of like grade and quality from the same or competitive sellers. The aforesaid sellers are located in the several States of the United States, and the aforesaid buyers and said sellers cause the parts and supplies so purchased, in manner and method and for purposes as aforesaid, to be shipped and transported among and between the several States of the United States from the respective State or States of location of said sellers to the respective State or States of location of the said buyers.

PAR. 3. Respondent Six-State Associates, at all times mentioned herein has been and is now maintained, managed, controlled and operated by and for the particular jobbers associated together at any given time for the effectuation of the purchasing policies and practices hereinafter described. Certain of the respondent jobbers have been so associated together since the inception of this course of action by the organization of Six-State Sales, Inc., in 1947. All of the respondent jobbers are currently so associated together in the continuation of said course of action by respondent Six-State Associates, and each said respondent jobber following such association, adopted, ratified, approved and began taking part in the purchasing policies and practices hereinafter described.

In practice and effect, respondent Six-State Associates has been and is now serving as the medium or instrumentality by, through or in conjunction with which said jobbers exert the influence of their combined bargaining power on the competitive commodity sellers hereinbefore described. As a part of their planned com-

910

Complaint

mon course of action, said jobbers direct the attention of said commodity sellers to the potential purchasing power possessed by them acting in concert and, by reason of such, have demanded on their individual purchases discriminatory prices, discounts, allowances, rebates and terms and conditions of sale not otherwise offered or granted by said commodity sellers in such transactions. Sellers not acceding to such demands are usually replaced as sources of supply for the commodities concerned and such market is closed to them in favor of such sellers as can be and are induced to afford the discriminatory prices, discounts, allowances, rebates and terms and conditions of sale so demanded.

Said planned common course of action usually includes the demand by said jobbers, among other things, that acceding sellers shall consider their several purchases in the aggregate for the purpose of granting thereon quantity discounts, allowances or rebates in accordance with said sellers' established schedule. When and if this demand is acceded to by a particular seller, the subsequent purchase transactions between said seller and the individual jobbers have been and are billed to and paid for through the aforesaid organizational device of Six-State Associates. Said organization thus purports to be the commodity purchaser when in truth and in fact it has been and is now serving only as agent for the several individual purchasers aforesaid or as a mere bookkeeping device for facilitating the inducement and receipt by the said purchasers from the said sellers of discriminatory and off-scale merchandise pricing. Said Six-State Associates has not functioned and does not now function as a purchaser for its own account for consumption, use or resale of the commodities concerned.

PAR. 4. Each and all of the respondents aforesaid since June 19, 1936, have adopted, followed, and pursued purchasing policies and practices which were knowingly designed and intended to and did induce from such of the aforesaid commodity sellers as acceded, discriminatory and illegal prices, discounts, allowances, rebates, and terms and conditions of sale favorable to said respondent jobbers as aforesaid in the commodity purchase transactions hereinbefore described.

Each and all of the aforesaid respondents in furtherance of the said policies and practices and in connection with the said commodity purchase transactions are and have been utilizing and employing the device of respondent Six-State Associates, to

Complaint

55 F.T.C.

induce and receive by, through or in conjunction therewith, from the aforesaid acceding sellers in said transactions, the aforesaid favorable prices, discounts, allowances, rebates, terms and conditions of sale, which were known or should have been known by said respondents to be discriminatory, illegal and prohibited to said acceding sellers under subsection (a) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Each and all of the aforesaid respondent jobbers during the times aforesaid made individual purchases of the said commodities upon which and upon the total aggregate of which and otherwise said jobbers knowingly induced and received through use of the aforesaid device substantial monetary amounts in discriminatory and favorable prices, discounts, allowances, rebates, terms and conditions of sale from the acceding sellers in the aforesaid purchase transactions. In 1954 said respondent jobbers made purchases through Six-State Associates in the amount of \$932,426.80 and received rebates in the amount of \$107,641.41 from 72 such acceding sellers. In 1955 such purchases amounted to \$1,618,078.12 and rebates totalled \$182,753.97 from 78 said suppliers. Except under color of such or a similar organizational device, the said favorable discriminatory prices, discounts, rebates, terms and conditions of sale were to the knowledge of said respondents not available to, offered, or granted by said sellers, or their aforesaid competitors to respondents or respondents' aforesaid competitors, nor received by respondents or respondents' said competitors in connection with the aforesaid or like or similar such purchase transactions of the same or similar such commodities of like grade and quality so purchased for consumption, use or resale.

Each and all of the aforesaid discriminatory purchase transactions, so negotiated and made, tend to and do establish the acceding sellers therein as preferred sources of supply over competitive sellers not so acceding, for the purchase for consumption, use or resale by said respondent jobbers of the commodities concerned, and to give said jobbers a price advantage over competitive nonfavored buyers as aforesaid in the purchase for consumption, use or resale of the same or similar such commodities of like grade and quality.

PAR. 5. The effect of each and all of the aforesaid discriminations in prices induced by each and all of the respondents aforesaid in each and all of the purchase transactions aforesaid

made in the manner and method and for the purpose aforesaid, and received in each and all of said transactions by each and all of the respondents as aforesaid, has been and may be to substantially lessen competition in the lines of commerce in which the aforesaid acceding sellers, said sellers' competitors, said respondent jobbers, and said jobbers' competitors, as aforesaid, are engaged and to injure, destroy or prevent competition with the said acceding sellers, the said respondent jobbers or with customers of either of them.

PAR. 6. The foregoing alleged acts and practices of said respondents, in knowingly inducing and in knowingly receiving, since June 19, 1936, the aforesaid discriminations in price prohibited by subsection (a), Section 2, of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, approved June 19, 1936 (U.S.C., Title 15, Sec. 13), are in violation of subsection (f), Section 2, of said Act.

Mr. Eldon P. Schrup and Mr. Robert E. Vaughan for the Commission.

Gorman, Voss, Brodbine & Gorman, by *Mr. John J. Brodbine*, and *Withington, Cross, Park & McCann*, by *Mr. Claude B. Cross*, all of Boston, Mass., for respondents.

INITIAL DECISION BY FRANK HIER, HEARING EXAMINER

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, approved June 19, 1936 (U.S.C., Title 15, Sec. 13), the Federal Trade Commission on April 5, 1957, issued and subsequently served its complaint in this proceeding against the above-named respondents.

On October 28, 1958, after five hearings in October 1957, there was submitted to the undersigned hearing examiner an executed agreement between respondents and counsel supporting the complaint, accompanied by a subsequently executed motion to amend said agreement, which motion is signed by all counsel of record and which motion represents that all signatories to the consent agreement (except James T. Fleming as to whom this complaint is being dismissed) have consulted with them and that counsel for respondents are specifically authorized by such respondents to join with counsel in support of the complaint in this action,

Decision

55 F.T.C.

providing for the entry of a consent order. Said motion being deemed appropriate, it is herewith granted.

By the terms of said agreement, as amended, respondents admit all the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint and agree that the record may be taken as if findings of jurisdictional facts had been duly made in accordance with such allegations. By such agreement, as amended, respondents waive any further procedural steps before the hearing examiner and the Commission; waive the making of findings of fact and conclusions of law; and waive all of the rights they may have to challenge or contest the validity of the order to cease and desist entered in accordance with this agreement, as amended. The agreement, as amended, further provides that it disposes of all of this proceeding as to all parties; that the record on which this initial decision and the decision of the Commission shall be based shall consist solely of the complaint and this agreement, as amended; that the latter shall not become a part of the official record unless and until it becomes a part of the decision of the Commission; that the agreement, as amended, is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that they have violated the law as alleged in the complaint; and that the following order to cease and desist may be entered in this proceeding by the Commission without further notice to respondents, and, when so entered, it shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing, and may be altered, modified, or set aside in the manner provided for other orders; and that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order.

Said agreement, as amended, further provides that the following individual respondents are deceased:

Arthur C. Marquardt	Morris Roazen
Lucius H. Tarbell	John S. Leven
Omar H. Amyot	Frank G. Congdon
Frank J. Whalen	

and that the following listed respondents are no longer connected with any respondent corporation, and counsel supporting the complaint do not have available any evidence or reason to believe that they will participate in like practices in the future:

David Roazen, formerly vice president,
Standard Auto Gear Co.
Franz U. Burkett, formerly secretary,
Farrar-Brown Co.

Robert Thompson, formerly president,
Christie & Thomson, Inc.
William Christie, formerly secretary,
Christie & Thomson, Inc.
James T. Fleming, formerly secretary,
Horton-Gallo-Creamer Company.

The hearing examiner having considered the agreement, as amended, and proposed order, and being of the opinion that they provide an appropriate basis for settlement and disposition of this proceeding, the agreement, as amended, is hereby accepted, the following jurisdictional findings made, and the following order issued.

1. Respondent Hunt-Marquardt, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 244 Brighton Avenue, Boston, Mass.

The following respondent individuals are officers of said respondent corporation:

Alfred S. Hunt
H. Nelson Hartstone

Respondents George G. Mellor and Raymond W. Mellor are individuals and copartners trading as Mellor's Auto Parts with their principal office and place of business located at 134 Broad Street, Providence, R.I.

Respondent Standard Auto Gear Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 531 Columbia Road, Dorchester, Mass.

Respondent Louis J. Roazen, is an officer of said respondent corporation.

Respondent The Tarbell-Watters Co., Inc. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal office and place of business located at 144 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Mass.

Respondent Clarence E. Trevor is an officer of said respondent corporation.

Respondent Auto Electric Service Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of

Decision

55 F.T.C.

the State of New Hampshire with its principal office and place of business located at 21 Dow Street, Manchester, N.H.

The following respondent individuals are officers of said respondent corporation:

James Pettigrew
Everett P. McAfee

Respondent Farrar-Brown Co. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Maine with its principal office and place of business located at 49 Dartmouth Street, Portland, Maine.

Respondent Christian Olesen, Jr., is an officer of said respondent corporation.

Respondent Christie & Thomson, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with its principal office and place of business located at 3 Quinsigamond Avenue, Worcester, Mass.

Respondent Abraham Hodes is an officer of said respondent corporation.

Respondent Grinold Auto Parts, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Connecticut with its principal office and place of business located at 354 Hudson Street, Hartford, Conn.

The following respondent individuals are officers of the said respondent corporation:

Raymond W. Grinold
Cleo T. (Mrs. R. W.) Grinold
Richard E. Ryder

Respondent Horton-Gallo-Creamer Company is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Connecticut, with its principal office and place of business located at 96-104 State Street, New Haven, Conn.

The following respondent individuals are officers of the said respondent corporation:

Raymond W. Grinold
Cleo T. (Mrs. R. W.) Grinold

Respondent Hagar Hardware & Paint Co., Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Vermont, with its principal office and place of business located at 164 St. Paul Street, Burlington, Vt.

