

Complaint

86 F.T.C.

Appearances

For the Commission: *Harold E. Kirtz, Karen G. Bokart and Charles W. Corddry, III.*

For the respondent: *Michael J. Henke, Vinson, Elkins, Searls, Connolly & Smith, Wash., D.C.*

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Respondent American General Insurance Company and intervenor Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland move for reconsideration of an order by the Commission, dated Dec. 5, 1972 [81 F.T.C. 1052], vacating the administrative law judge's initial decision and remanding the case for further proceedings. The administrative law judge filed an initial decision sustaining the complaint in this matter on Aug. 7, 1975.

Respondent and intervenor have failed to make a sufficient showing why the Commission should grant their motion for reconsideration, especially after the lapse of almost three years from the date of issuance of the order they seek to challenge. Accordingly,

It is ordered, That the aforesaid motion for reconsideration be, and it hereby is, denied.

IN THE MATTER OF

KOSCOT INTERPLANETARY, INC., ET AL.

ORDER, OPINION ETC., IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATION OF
THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT AND SEC. 2 OF THE
CLAYTON ACT

Docket 8888. Complaint, May 24, 1972-Final Order, Nov. 18, 1975

Order requiring an Orlando, Fla., seller and distributor, of cosmetics and cosmetic distributorships, among other things to cease using its open-ended, multilevel marketing plan; engaging in illegal price fixing and price discrimination and imposing selling and purchasing restrictions on its distributors; and to cease making exaggerated earnings claims and other misrepresentations in an effort to recruit distributors.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., and Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc., corporations, and Glenn W. Turner, Terrell Jones, Malcolm Julian, Ben

Bunting, Michael Delaney, Hobart Wilder, and Raleigh P. Mann, individually and as former officers, officers, or directors of said corporations, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts, 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 Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., and Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc., are corporations organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida, with their principal office and place of business located at 4805 Sand Lake Rd., Orlando, Fla.

Respondent Glenn W. Turner is chairman of the board of directors of Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., and is the sole stockholder of Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc. Mr. Turner was the founder of Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., and instituted the marketing plan and distribution policies. He, with others named herein, has been and is responsible for establishing, supervising, directing and controlling the business activities and practices of corporate respondents Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., and Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc., including the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Mr. Turner's address is the same as that of the corporate respondents.

Respondents Terrell Jones, Malcolm Julian, Ben Bunting, Michael Delaney, Hobart Wilder, and Raleigh P. Mann are officers, or directors of said corporate respondents. Together with others, said respondents have been and are responsible for the formulation, control and direction of the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. Their address is the same as that of the corporate respondents.

The aforementioned respondents cooperate and act together in carrying out the acts and practices hereinafter set forth.

PAR. 2. In the conduct of their business, at all times mentioned herein, respondents have been in substantial competition in commerce with corporations, firms and individuals in the sale of cosmetics, toiletries and associated items of the same general kind and nature as those sold by respondents.

PAR. 3. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have, engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of cosmetics, toiletries and associated items and distributorships and franchises to the public, and are inducing, and have induced, persons to invest substantial sums of money in respondents' multilevel marketing program as hereinafter more fully described.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents now cause, and for some time last past have caused, their products, when

sold, to be shipped from their places of business in various States to purchasers thereof located in various States of the United States other than the State of origination, 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 and the Clayton Act.

PAR. 5. In the course and conduct of their business, respondents have used a multilevel marketing program having four levels of distributors and are presently using a multilevel marketing program which allows the potential participant to enter at any one of three levels, *i.e.*, beauty advisor, supervisor or director. All participants are designated as independent contractors and except for the beauty advisors who sell primarily at retail through party plans and door-to-door methods, are permitted to, and do, sell or attempt to sell at both wholesale and retail. A description of these levels, in order of ascendancy, follows:

1. Beauty advisor (retailer)—The beauty advisor purchases products from her sponsor (who may be a supervisor or director) at a 40 percent discount, for sale to the consuming public. The beauty advisor receives a refund bonus from her sponsor each month, based on the total retail volume ordered during the month. Entrant qualifies by investing \$10 for a starter kit.

2. Supervisor (sub-distributor)—The supervisor purchases products from the company at a 55 percent discount for distribution to his beauty advisors and direct sales to the consuming public. The supervisor receives a special commission for each new supervisor order he creates, \$500 or 25 percent of the \$2000 paid for the initial order. An entrant qualifies as a supervisor in any one of these ways:

- a. By investing \$2000 immediately;
- b. By purchasing \$5400 in Koscot cosmetics (at retail value) from his sponsor;
- c. By selling a portion of the required \$5400 volume through his organization and purchasing the balance in one lump sum.

3. Director (distributor)—The director purchases products from the company at a 65 percent discount for distribution to his direct distributors (supervisors and beauty advisors) and for direct sales to the consuming public. The director is entitled to a 10 percent special commission on all of his supervisor's purchases. He receives \$500 for each supervisor order that he sells. The director sponsoring a new director is also entitled to a 65 percent commission (\$1,950) on the \$3,000 additional inventory which the new director is required to purchase. An entrant qualifies as a director by: a) becoming a supervisor, purchasing the additional \$3000 director inventory and selling a new supervisor order in order to replace himself in his

sponsoring director's organization; or b) by initially investing \$5000 and becoming known as an apprentice director until he fulfills all the necessary aforementioned requirements.

These positions are described more fully to the prospective investors at "Opportunity Meetings" held weekly in various locations across the country. At such a meeting, a movie is shown and speeches are made which concentrate upon the unlimited potential to earn large sums of money in a relatively short time by recruiting others into the Koscot program. In most instances, the opportunity meeting will closely follow the script provided by respondents as found in the distributor's training manual. This meeting is run in such a manner as to excite those attending and to induce them into making an emotional decision to invest in the program.

PAR. 6. In the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, respondents have done and performed and are doing and performing the following:

1. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. has entered into contracts, agreements, combinations, or understandings with its distributors whereby said distributors agree to maintain the resale prices established and set forth by respondent corporation, notwithstanding that some of such distributors are located in States which do not have Fair Trade laws.

2. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. has entered into contracts, agreements, combinations, or understandings with its distributors whereby said distributors agree to maintain the discounts, overrides, rebates, bonus schedules, finder's fees and release fees, between and among all other distributors, as established and set forth by respondent corporation.

3. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. has entered into contracts, agreements, combinations, or understandings with its distributors whereby said distributors understand that a violation of any company rule or regulation is reason for immediate termination of their status as distributors by the company board of directors.

4. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. has instituted certain rules and regulations, among which are those set out below, whereby its distributors:

- (a) Agree to purchase merchandise only from respondent or his sponsor in accordance with Koscot's marketing program,
- (b) agree that all purchases of merchandise from respondent corporation or his sponsor constitutes a nonrefundable sale,
- (c) agree not to engage in the sale of a competitive line of products or individual products which would be considered competitive to respondent corporation,

(d) agree never to make any consignment of merchandise to anyone without receiving written notice of approval by Koscot Interplanetary, Inc.,

(e) agree to restrict retail sales and display of cosmetics to home service routes and beauty forums, and to certain categories of retail outlets specified by respondent but only with Koscot's approval,

(f) agree to obtain prior written approval from Koscot for any promotion or advertising of Koscot products or his distributorship,

(g) agree to maintain a record of the names and addresses of all his customers and to provide Koscot with such information through his supervisor or director,

(h) agree not to transfer to another organization without prior written consent of all distributors above him in his organization, including respondent corporation,

(i) agree to have a financial interest in only one Koscot distributorship at a time and that he cannot be part of two separate distributorships,

(j) agree not to enter into any agreement with a distributor in another Koscot organization to make a division of profits, assets, or new recruits in violation of the "Koscot Marketing Konzept."

5. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. has entered into contracts, agreements, combinations or understandings with its distributors whereby respondent:

(a) Prohibits a corporation from becoming a Koscot distributor,

(b) requires that the organization of a distributor, who quits or loses his status as a distributor, becomes a part of the organization of the distributor immediately preceding him on Koscot's organizational chart.

6. Respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. discriminates in price, directly or indirectly, between different purchasers of its products of like grade and quality by selling said products at lower prices to some purchasers than to other purchasers, many of whom have been and now are in competition with the purchasers paying the higher price. For example, director-distributor purchases his products directly from respondent corporation at approximately: (a) 22.2 percent discount as compared with the cost to a supervisor-distributor, (b) 41.7 percent discount as compared with the cost to a beauty advisor.

There are approximately 7,988 director-distributors and approximately 10,726 supervisor-distributors in the program.

The supervisor-distributor who purchases his products directly or indirectly from respondent corporation, purchases at approximately a 25 percent discount as compared with the cost to a beauty advisor.

In addition, respondent corporation has agreed to pay the director-distributor a 2 percent override on the purchases of the entire

organization of each supervisor-distributor recruited by said director-distributor when such supervisor-distributor works up or buys in and becomes a director himself. Thereafter, although both director-distributors buy from respondent corporation, only the first will receive the 2 percent override from respondent corporation.

COUNT I

Alleging violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the allegations of Paragraphs One through Six hereof are incorporated by reference in Count I with respect to respondents, as if fully set forth herein.

PAR. 7. Respondents make various oral and written statements to prospective investors regarding the sale of their cosmetics, toiletries and associated items and the recruitment of additional participants in their marketing program. Typical and illustrative of said statements and representations, but not all inclusive thereof, are the following:

1. To become a Director a Supervisor * * * must go out, create a new Supervisor's initial order, and bring this order to *you*, the Director, before you *release* this Supervisor to become a Director * * *. When this new Supervisor entered the program, he ordered \$2000 in retail products. This Supervisor created the order, so he receives the 25% commission on products. But *you* are the Director, so *you* earn the 10% Director's commission of \$200.

As soon as this Supervisor's initial order is received by the company, the company sends *you* the 65% commission on this \$3000 additional inventory. This is \$1,950! You now have earned a total of \$2,850!

Create this volume once a month and at the end of the year you will have earned over \$34,000.

2. As a Director with one Supervisor in your organization, your job is to help this Supervisor become successful. See that he and his retail manager are thoroughly trained and make certain he fully understands the program. When he is ready to enjoy additional benefits, help him create a new Supervisor's initial order for cosmetics and he will become a Director.

Continue to help the one Supervisor you will always have. Help him sell only one Supervisor's order per month for your organization and you will earn over \$26,000 per year! But work with your Supervisor full-time to make him a success! Do this twice a month and your income will exceed \$52,000 per year!

3. Let's assume you decide to recruit girls to be trained as Beauty Advisors * * *. Let's look at your third month in the business. Again sponsor only eight girls who produce the part-time volume of only \$300 a month. This new group will produce \$2,400 their first 30 days. The last group you sponsored has learned the benefits of our incentive plan. They have learned that by increasing their efforts and continuing to service their customers they can produce a monthly volume of \$900 each. When this occurs, this group will give you an additional \$7,200 in volume.

Your first group of girls may have increased their volume even *more*, but suppose they are producing only \$900 each per month or \$7,200 for the group. Then your total monthly volume is \$16,800!

At this point you will *certainly* want to become a Director and enjoy the benefits of a 65% discount! You continue to sponsor eight girls a month and train them to produce the

necessary volume, and you will be giving yourself an \$1,800 a month *raise* in income every month.

PAR. 8. Respondents' multilevel marketing program, as represented by the above-quoted statements, contemplates an endless recruiting of participants since each person entering the program must bring in other distributors to achieve the represented earnings. The demand for prospective participants thus increases in geometric progression whereas the number of potential investors available in a given community or geographical area remains relatively constant. Consequently, a person coming into the program at a later stage will be unable, in a substantial number of instances, to find additional investors because the recruiting of participants into the program at an earlier stage by others has exhausted the number of prospective participants. It is self-evident that respondents' marketing program must of necessity fail when the market for potential distributors has become saturated.

Although some participants in respondents' multilevel merchandising program may realize a profit, all participants do not have the income potentiality represented by respondents, such as described in Paragraph Seven through recruiting other participants and the resultant finder's fees, commissions, overrides, rebates and other compensation arising out of the sale of respondents' products. In reality, some participants in the program will receive little or no return on their investment.

Respondents' multilevel merchandising program is organized and operated in such a manner that the realization of profit by any participant is predicated upon the exploitation of others who have virtually no chance of receiving a return on their investment and who had been induced to participate by misrepresentations as to potential earnings. Therefore, the use by respondents of the aforesaid program in connection with the sale of their merchandise was and is an unfair act and practice, and was and is false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 9. In the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, and for the purpose of inducing the purchase of their products, and the purchase of distributorships and participation in their multilevel marketing program, the respondents have made, and are now making numerous statements and representations in certain promotional materials, including, but not limited to, film strips, newsletters, information manuals, marketing plan booklets, meeting scripts, and other materials.

Typical and illustrative of said statements and representations, but not all inclusive thereof, are those set out below, as well as those in the distributor's training manual.

1. The world's largest cosmetic company sponsors over 200,000 girls a year. Knowing

1106

Complaint

this, with a full-time effort in our program, don't you believe you can sponsor 2 girls a week?

2. There are ordinary men and women in KOSCOT like you and me who are earning five and even ten thousand dollars per month!

3. Ladies and gentlemen, this is over \$50,000 a year and now *we are* talking about a great deal of money aren't we? Do you know what excites me about this figure? Many KOSCOT Distributors are presently earning this kind of money and more! The point you should consider is this: When we can do so much, surely you can do as well or even better when you exert the necessary effort.

PAR. 10. By and through the use of the above-quoted statements and representations, as well as the exposition of the "Koscot Marketing Konzept," as found in the distributor's business manual, and other statements and representations of similar import and meaning, but not expressly set out herein, respondents and their agents and representatives, represent, and have represented, directly or by implication, to prospective participants, that:

1. It is not difficult for participants in the Koscot program to recruit and retain distributors and sales personnel to work home routes and sell respondents' products door-to-door enabling said participants to recoup their investment and to earn the represented profits set forth herein.

2. Participants in the Koscot marketing program have the potentiality and reasonable expectancy of receiving large profits or earnings.

3. The Koscot marketing program is commercially feasible for all participants and the supply of available entrants and investors is virtually inexhaustible.

PAR. 11. In truth and in fact:

1. It is difficult for participants in the Koscot program to recruit and retain distributors and sales personnel to work home routes and sell respondents' products door-to-door, hence, many participants cannot even recoup their investment, much less earn the represented profits set forth herein.

2. Participants in respondents' marketing program do not have the potentiality and reasonable expectancy of receiving large profits or earnings (for the reasons hereinbefore set forth).

3. The Koscot marketing program is not commercially feasible for all participants and its operation exhausts the supply of available entrants and investors as hereinbefore explained.

Therefore, the statements and representations as set forth in Paragraphs Nine and Ten have been and are, false, misleading and deceptive.

PAR. 12. Respondents' merchandising program is in the nature of a lottery in that participants are induced to invest substantial sums of money on the possibility that by the activities and efforts of others, over whom they exercise no control or direction, they will receive the

profits described in Paragraphs Seven and Nine herein. The realization of such financial gain is not dependent on the skill and effort of the individual participant, but is the result of elements of chance including the number of prior participants and the degree of saturation of the market which exists when the participant is induced to make his investment.

The use by respondents of a multilevel marketing program, which is in the nature of a lottery, is contrary to the public policy of the United States and is an unfair act and practice and an act of unfair competition within the intent and meaning of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 13. 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 public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that said statements and representations were and are true and into the investment of substantial sums of money to participate in the respondents' multilevel marketing program and the purchase of substantial quantities of respondents' products by reason of said erroneous and mistaken belief.

PAR. 14. The aforesaid acts and practices of the respondents, as herein alleged; were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors in commerce and unfair methods and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

COUNT II

Alleging violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the allegations of Paragraphs One through Fourteen hereof are incorporated by reference in Count II as if fully set forth herein.

PAR. 15. The acts and practices, courses of conduct and methods of competition engaged in, followed, pursued or adopted by respondents, as alleged hereinabove, have had and continue to have the purpose and effect of substantially lessening, restraining, preventing and excluding free and open competition by, between, and among respondents' distributors in the marketing, sale and distribution of respondents' products throughout the United States in the following manner:

a. By fixing, maintaining and otherwise controlling the prices at which respondents' products are resold in both the wholesale and retail markets.

b. By fixing, maintaining or otherwise controlling the various fees, bonuses, rebates, or overrides required to be paid by one distributor or class of distributors.

c. By restricting the sellers from whom respondents' distributors

may purchase their products and the customers to whom they may sell their products.

d. By restricting their distributors to reselling respondent corporation's products only in certain categories of retail outlets.

e. By unreasonably restricting the freedom of respondents' distributors to market their products in the manner of their own choosing.

Said acts, practices, courses of conduct and methods of competition are prejudicial and injurious to the public; have a tendency to hinder and prevent competition and have actually hindered and restrained competition, and constitute unfair acts or practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce within the meaning and intent of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

COUNT III

Alleging violation of Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act, the allegations of Paragraphs One through Five and subparagraph (6) of Paragraph Six hereof are incorporated by reference in Count III as if fully set forth herein.

PAR. 16. The difference in net cost among the various distributors of respondents' products, each of whom is in competition with other distributors of respondents' products, results in substantial discrimination in the net prices for products sold to the nonfavored customers, who are both direct purchasers and indirect purchasers of respondents' products.

In addition, the various fees, overrides, or other payments result in discriminations among the direct and indirect purchasing distributors who are in competition with one another. These monies are direct and indirect payments by respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc. and are in effect discriminations in the net price of products to the various distributors.

The effect of respondent Koscot Interplanetary, Inc.'s discrimination in net price as alleged herein may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in the line of commerce in which its favored purchaser is engaged, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition between the favored and nonfavored purchasers or with the customers of either of them, except to the extent that competition has been lessened by the acts and practices alleged in Counts I and II hereof.

The aforesaid acts and practices of respondents constitute violations of the provisions of Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act as amended.

COUNT IV

Alleging violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the allegations of Paragraphs One through Fourteen hereof are incorporated by reference in Count IV with respect to respondents, as if fully set forth herein:

PAR. 17. In the course and conduct of their business as aforesaid, respondents' multilevel merchandising program is organized and operated in a manner that results in the recruitment of many participants who have virtually no chance to recover their investments of substantial sums of money in respondents' program and who have been induced to participate by misrepresentations as to potential earnings. Respondents have received the said sums and have failed to offer to refund and refused to refund such money to participants that were unable to recover their investment.

The use by the respondents of the aforesaid program and their continued retention of the said sums, as aforesaid, is an unfair act and practice and an act of unfair competition within the intent and meaning of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 18. The aforesaid acts and practices of the respondents, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondents' competitors in commerce and are unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Appearances

For the Commission: *Quentin P. McColgin* and *David C. Keehn*.

For the respondents: *Jerris Leonard* and *Kenneth Michael Robinson*, *Leonard, Cohen & Gettings*, Wash., D. C. for *Koscot Interplanetary, Inc.*, *Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc.*, *Glenn W. Turner*, *Malcolm Julian*, *Ben Bunting* and *Hobart Wilder*.¹

INITIAL DECISION BY DONALD R. MOORE, ADMINISTRATIVE
LAW JUDGE

MARCH 20, 1975

CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	P. 1117
FINDINGS OF FACT	P. 1120

¹ A supplemental memorandum of law was submitted on behalf of *Koscot Interplanetary, Inc.*, by *Levy, Levy & Ruback*, New York, N. Y., as special bankruptcy counsel. Various other counsel participated at earlier stages of the proceeding but subsequently withdrew. Regarding respondents *Terrell Jones*, *Michael Delaney*, and *Raleigh P. Mann*, see *infra*, pp. 3-4, 15[pp. 1119, 1127, herein].

	Page No.
I. <i>Respondents and Their Business</i>	1120
A. The Corporate Respondents	1120
B. The Individual Respondents	1123
C. Jurisdictional Findings	1128
II. <i>Unfair and Deceptive Practices</i>	1129
A. Introduction	1129
B. "Endless Chain"	1132
C. Other Misrepresentations	1134
Distributor Earnings	1134
Status of Koscot	1136
Opportunity Meetings and GO-Tours	1136
Company Support of Retail Sales	1138
Product Availability	1138
Training	1144
Advertising	1147
D. "Wholesale v. Retail"	1150
E. Liability of Individual Respondents	1153
III. <i>Restraints of Trade</i>	1155
A. Price Fixing and Other Restrictive Practices	1155
B. Price Discrimination	1156
CONCLUSIONS	1157
<i>Rationale of the Order</i>	1159
Introduction	1159
Restitution Provisions	1160
ORDER	1167

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The complaint in this proceeding, charging violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45, and of Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13, was issued on May 24, 1972, and was thereafter duly served on all respondents except Terrell Jones (see *infra*). The complaint, containing four counts, charges as unlawful certain of respondents' practices in connection with the sale and distribution of toiletries and cosmetics and the recruitment of distributor-investors.

Count I of the complaint charges that respondents' "multi-level marketing program" was not only inherently deceptive and unfair but also involved numerous misrepresentations. Count II alleges that agreements between respondent Koscot and its distributors were in unlawful restraint of trade. Count III alleges that respondents discriminated in price among various classes of customers, in violation of the Clayton Act as amended. Count IV charges in effect that

respondents' retention of funds obtained through misrepresentation constituted an unfair practice.

Respondents filed answers on Aug. 22, 1972, and on Sept. 7, 1972, which put in issue most of the material allegations of the complaint.²

After extensive prehearing procedures, including several prehearing conferences, hearings were held between July 30, 1973, and Oct. 18, 1974, in Washington, D.C., New York City, Kansas City, Mo., and Orlando, Fla. At these hearings, testimony and other evidence were offered in support of and in opposition to the allegations of the complaint. The testimony and evidence presented—aggregating 5224 pages of transcript and thousands of pages of documentary exhibits—have been duly recorded and filed.

Forty-one witnesses were called to testify in support of the allegations of the complaint, including the seven individual respondents, one additional former officer of respondent Koscot, two officials of Avon Products, Inc., three expert witnesses (marketing and economics), and 28 distributors or former distributors of respondent Koscot.

Four of the individual respondents—Glenn W. Turner, Malcolm Julian, Ben Bunting, and Hobart Wilder—were excused from testifying after each pleaded his constitutional right to remain silent on the ground that answers to questions propounded or proposed on the subject matter of this proceeding might tend to incriminate him. These Fifth Amendment pleas were made in the light of a pending criminal proceeding in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida (*Koscot Interplanetary Incorporated, et al.*, Criminal No. 73-71). (See Tr. 912-91).

Respondents called no witnesses in defense but offered some documentary evidence, primarily relating to the status of respondent Koscot as a result of its petition for an arrangement under Chapter 11 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act.

Hearings were in recess from October 1973 until August 1974, because certain witnesses whose testimony was required to complete the case-in-chief in support of the complaint were prohibited from testifying by protective orders issued on Oct. 17, 1973, by the Honorable Gerald B. Tjoflat, United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, in connection with the criminal case styled *United States v. Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., et al.*, No. 73-71-Orl-Cr. On Aug. 1, 1974, such protective orders were modified so as to permit the testimony in question, and hearings in support of the complaint were resumed on Aug. 19, 1974, and concluded on Aug. 22, 1974. After

² The answer filed on Aug. 22, 1972, on behalf of the corporate respondents and respondents Turner, Julian, and Wilder was later amended to reflect that it was also the answer of respondent Michael Delaney (order granting motion to amend answer, Sept. 11, 1972).

