

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 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 respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

It is further ordered, That 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

NAT BEINHORN

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

Docket C-2204. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring a New York City retail furrier of fur products to cease misbranding and falsely or deceptively invoicing its 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 Nat Beinhorn, an individual trading as Nat Beinhorn 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 Nat Beinhorn is an individual doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent is primarily a retail furrier of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 130 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertis-

Complaint

80 F.T.C.

ing, 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 that they were falsely and deceptively labeled to show that fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products with labels which failed to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on labels, in violation of Rule 40 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 to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products were bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

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 under such Act in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said rules and regulations.

PAR. 8. Respondent sold and distributed fur products which were bleached, dyed or artificially colored. Certain of these fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of Section 5(b)(2)

of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that the said fur products were described on invoices as "Mink" without disclosing that said fur products were bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored. The respondent's description of the said fur products as "mink" without a disclosure that the said fur products were bleached, dyed or artificially colored had the tendency and capacity to mislead respondent's customers and others into the erroneous belief that the fur products were not bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored. Such failure to disclose a material fact was to the prejudice of respondent's customers and the purchasing public and constituted false and deceptive invoicing under Section 5(b)(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 9. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, 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 in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondent named in the caption hereof, and the respondent having been furnished thereafter with a copy of a draft of complaint which the Bureau of Consumer Protection proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondent with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act; and

The respondent and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondent 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 respondent 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 respondent has violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed 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 Section 2.34(b) of its rules, the Commission

Decision and Order

80 F.T.C.

hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Nat Beinhorn is an individual doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. He is primarily a retail furrier of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 130 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

2. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the proceeding and of the respondent and the proceeding is in the public interest.

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondent, Nat Beinhorn, an individual trading as Nat Beinhorn, or under any other name or names and respondent's representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the 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 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" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding fur products by:

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

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

3. Failing to set forth on labels the item number or mark to be assigned to each fur product.

B. Falsely or deceptively invoicing fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices, 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 invoices that the fur contained in the fur products is natural when such fur is pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored.

707

Complaint

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 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 respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

It is further ordered, That 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

NAT BEINHORN

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

Docket C-2204. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring a New York City retail furrier of fur products to cease misbranding and falsely or deceptively invoicing its 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 Nat Beinhorn, an individual trading as Nat Beinhorn 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 Nat Beinhorn is an individual doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent is primarily a retail furrier of fur products with his office and principal place of business located at 130 West 30th Street, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been engaged in the introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertis-

ing, 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 that they were falsely and deceptively labeled to show that fur contained therein was natural, when in fact such fur was pointed, bleached, dyed, tip-dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, in violation of Section 4(1) of the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in that they were not labeled as required under the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Fur Products Labeling Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Among such misbranded fur products, but not limited thereto, were fur products with labels which failed to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products was bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored, when such was the fact.

PAR. 5. Certain of said fur products were misbranded in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on labels, in violation of Rule 40 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 to disclose that the fur contained in the fur products were bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored when such was the fact.

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 under such Act in the following respect:

(a) Required item numbers were not set forth on invoices, in violation of Rule 40 of said rules and regulations.

PAR. 8. Respondent sold and distributed fur products which were bleached, dyed or artificially colored. Certain of these fur products were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of Section 5(b)(2)

711

Complaint

3. Describing fur products which have been bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored by the name of mink or by any other animal name or names without disclosing that the said fur products were bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored.

4. Failing to set forth on invoices the item number or mark required to be assigned to such fur products.

It is further ordered, That 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

NAT SHOMER, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACTS

Docket C-2205. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring three Brooklyn, New York, importers of fabrics to cease importing, selling or transporting fabrics so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Nat Shomer, Inc., Best Importing Co., Inc., and Shomer's Imports, Inc., corporations, and Nat Shomer, individually and as an officer of said corporations, and Isaac Mitrani, individually and as an officer of Best Importing Co., Inc., hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts and the rules and regulations promulgated under the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondents Nat Shomer, Inc., Best Importing Co., Inc., and Shomer's Imports, Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York. The address of the above corporations is 2513 65th Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Decision and Order

80 F.T.C.

Respondent Nat Shomer is an officer of the corporate respondents. Respondent Isaac Mitrani is an officer of Best Importing Co., Inc. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of their respective corporate respondents including those hereinafter set forth.

Respondents are engaged in the importation, sale and distribution of textile products, including, but not limited to, women's scarves.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now and for some time last past have been engaged in the sale and offering for sale, in commerce, and the importation into the United States, and have introduced, delivered for introduction, transported and caused to be transported in commerce, and have sold or delivered after sale or shipment in commerce, products as the terms "commerce" and "product" are defined in the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, which fail to conform to an applicable standard or regulation continued in effect, issued or amended under the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended.

Among such products mentioned hereinabove were 100 percent nylon scarves with metallic stripes billed out as style number 212 and women's black scarves with a fiber content composition of 100 percent nylon ground and a 100 percent rayon ornamentation.

PAR. 3. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents were and are in violation of the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, 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 New York Regional Office proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondents with violation of the Flammable Fabrics Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and

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 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 Section 2.34(b) of its rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order.

1. Respondents Nat Shomer, Inc., Best Importing Co., Inc., and Shomer's Imports, Inc., are corporations, organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with their office and principal place of business located at 2513 65th Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Respondent Nat Shomer is president of said corporations. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of said corporations and his principal office and place of business is located at the above stated address. Respondent Isaac Mitrani is an officer of Best Importing Co., Inc., and he also formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of said corporation and his principal office and place of business is located at the above stated address.

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 Nat Shomer, Inc., Best Importing Co., Inc., and Shomer's Imports, Inc., corporations, their successors and assigns and their officers and Nat Shomer, individually and as an officer of said corporations, and Isaac Mitrani, individually and as an officer of Best Importing Co., Inc., and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporation, subsidiary, division or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from selling, offering for sale, in commerce, or importing into the United States, or introducing, delivering for introduction, transporting, or causing to be transported in commerce, or selling or delivering after sale or shipment in commerce, any product, fabric, or related material; or manufacturing for sale, selling or offering for sale, any product made of fabric or related material which has been shipped

or received in commerce as "commerce," "product," "fabric" and "related material" are defined in the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, which product, fabric, or related material fails to conform to an applicable standard or regulation issued, amended or continued in effect, under the provisions of the aforesaid Act.

It is further ordered, That respondents notify all of their customers who have purchased or to whom have been delivered the products which gave rise to the complaint, of the flammable nature of said products and effect the recall of said products from such customers.

It is further ordered, That the respondents herein either process the products which gave rise to the complaint so as to bring them into conformance with the applicable standard of flammability under the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, or destroy said products.

It is further ordered, That the respondents herein shall, within ten (10) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission an interim special report in writing setting forth the respondents' intentions as to compliance with this order. This special report shall also advise the Commission fully and specifically concerning (1) the identity of the products which gave rise to the complaint, (2) the number of said products in inventory, (3) any action taken and any further actions proposed to be taken to notify customers of the flammability of said products and effect the recall of said products from customers, and of the results thereof, (4) any disposition of said products since January 21, 1971, and (5) any action taken or proposed to be taken to bring said products into conformance with the applicable standard of flammability under the Flammable Fabrics Act, as amended, or destroy said products, and the results of such action.

Such report shall further inform the Commission as to whether or not respondents have in inventory any product, fabric, or related material having a plain surface and made of paper, silk, rayon and acetate, nylon and acetate, rayon, cotton or any other material or combinations thereof in a weight of two ounces or less per square yard, or any product, fabric, or related material having a raised fiber surface. Respondents shall submit samples of not less than one square yard in size of any such product, fabric, or related material with this report.

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 emergence of a successor corporation, the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries

715

Complaint

or any other change in the corporation which may affect compliance obligations arising out of this order.

It is further ordered, That the respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

It is further ordered, That respondents 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 contained herein.

 IN THE MATTER OF

LOUIS BRAUN, 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-2206. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring a New York City fur merchant to cease falsely and deceptively invoicing his merchandise.

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 Louis Braun, Inc., a corporation, and Louis Braun, individually and as an officer 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 Louis Braun, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent Louis Braun is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs, and controls the policies, acts and practices of said corporation.

Respondents are fur merchants with their office and principal place of business located at 150 W. 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 manu-

Decision and Order

80 F.T.C.

facture for introduction into commerce, and in the sale, advertising and offering for sale in commerce, and in the transportation and distribution in commerce, of fur products; and have manufactured for sale, sold, advertised, offered for sale, transported and distributed fur products which have been made in whole or in part of furs which have been shipped and received in commerce; and have introduced into commerce, sold, advertised and offered for sale in commerce and transported and distributed in commerce, furs, as the terms "commerce," "fur" and "fur product" are defined in the Fur Products Labeling Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said fur products or furs 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 or furs but not limited thereto, were fur products or furs covered by invoices which failed:

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

2. To show the name or names (as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide) of the animal or animals that produced the fur contained in the fur products or furs.

PAR. 4. Certain of said fur products or furs were falsely and deceptively invoiced in violation of the Fur Products Labeling Act for the reason that they were not invoiced in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in that the fact that said fur products or furs were composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur was not disclosed in the required information on invoices covering the said fur products or furs in violation of Rule 19(a) of said rules and regulations.

PAR. 5. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents 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 Division of Textiles and

Furs, Bureau of Consumer Protection 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 the 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 Section 2.34(b) of its rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Louis Braun, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondent Louis Braun is an officer of said corporation. He formulates, directs, and controls the policies, acts and practices of said corporation.

Respondents are fur merchants with their office and principal place of business located at 150 W. 30th Street, New York, New York.

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 Louis Braun, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Louis Braun, 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 introduction into commerce, or the 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, or in connection with the introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of furs, 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 furs or fur products by:

1. Failing to furnish invoices, 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 when a fur or fur product is pointed or contains or is composed of bleached, dyed or otherwise artificially colored fur, to disclose such facts as a part of the required information on invoices pertaining thereto.

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 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 respondent corporation shall forthwith distribute a copy of this order to each of its operating divisions.

It is further ordered, That 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

DAVID KASSMAN, 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-2207. Complaint, May 1, 1972—Decision, May 1, 1972

Consent order requiring a New York City fur merchant to cease falsely and deceptively invoicing its merchandise.

