

Complaint

74 F.T.C.

dividually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, do forthwith cease and desist from furnishing a false guaranty that any fur product is not misbranded, falsely invoiced or falsely advertised when the respondents have reason to believe that such fur product may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce.

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 the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail and manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

ALVIC FABRICS CORP. ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION
OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE
TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACTS

Docket C-1467. Complaint, Dec. 10, 1968—Decision, Dec. 10, 1968

Consent order requiring a New York City converter of greige textile fabrics to cease misbranding its textile fiber products.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Alvic Fabrics Corp., a corporation, and Ellis R. Nichols and Victor Kurnit, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts and Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Textile Fiber Products Identification 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 Alvic Fabrics Corp. is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

Respondents Ellis R. Nichols and Victor Kurnit are officers of said corporation. They formulate, direct and control the acts, practices and policies of the corporate respondent including the acts and practices hereinafter referred to.

Respondents are converters of greige textile fabrics for the women's wear manufacturing trade, with their office and principal place of business located at 469 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, and in the importation into the United States, of textile fiber products; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, after shipment in commerce, textile fiber products, either in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled or otherwise identified to show each element of information required under the provisions of Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and in the manner and form as prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were fabrics with labels on or affixed thereto which failed:

(a) To disclose the true generic name of the fibers present; and

(b) To disclose the true percentage of the fibers present by weight.

(c) To disclose the name, or other identification used and registered by the Commission of the manufacturer of the product or one or more persons subject to Section 3 of the said Act, with respect to such product.

(d) To disclose the name of the country where textile fiber products imported by them were processed or manufactured.

PAR. 4. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in the following respects:

1. Fiber trademarks used in conjunction with the required information did not appear in immediate conjunction with the generic names of the fibers nor did such trademarks and generic names appear in type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness, in violation of Rule 17(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

2. A fiber trademark was used on a label without a full and complete fiber content disclosure in accordance with the Act and Regulations the first time the fiber trademark appeared on the said label, in violation of Rule 17(b) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

3. Samples, swatches, or specimens of textile fiber products subject to the Act and used to promote or effect sales of such textile fiber products, were not labeled to show their respective fiber content and other required information, in violation of Rule 21(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 5. The acts and practices of respondents as set forth above were, and are, in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder and constituted, and now constitute, unfair and deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition 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 Bureau of Textiles and Furs proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondents with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act; and

The respondents and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an agreement containing a consent order, an admission by the respondents of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the aforesaid draft of complaint, a statement that the

signing of said agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by respondents that the law has been violated as alleged in such complaint, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission's Rules; and

The Commission having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that the respondents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and the Commission having thereupon accepted the executed agreement and placed such agreement on the public record and having duly considered the comments filed thereafter pursuant to § 2.34(b) of its Rules, now, in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in such Rule, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Alvic Fabrics Corp. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, with its office and principal place of business located at 469 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York.

Respondents Ellis R. Nichols and Victor Kurnit are officers of said corporation and their address is the same as that of said corporation.

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

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondents Alvic Fabrics Corp., a corporation, and its officers, and Ellis R. Nichols and Victor Kurnit, individually and as officers of said corporation, and respondents' representatives, agents and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the introduction, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or the importation into the United States, of any textile fiber product; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber product which has been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation, or causing to be transported, after shipment in commerce, of any textile fiber product, whether in its original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the

Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, do forthwith cease and desist from misbranding such products by:

1. Failing to affix a stamp, tag, label, or other means of identification to each such product showing in a clear, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

2. Using a fiber trademark in conjunction with the required information on labels affixed to said textile fiber products without the generic name of the fiber appearing on said labels in immediate conjunction therewith and in type or lettering of equal size and conspicuousness.

3. Using a fiber trademark on any label, without a full and complete fiber content disclosure being made in accordance with the Act and Regulations, the first time the fiber trademark appears on the label.

4. Failing to label samples, swatches, or specimens of textile fiber products subject to the Act, and which are used to promote or effect sales of such textile fiber products, in such a manner as to show their respective fiber contents and other required information.

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 the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

IN THE MATTER OF

SAM SESKIN DOING BUSINESS AS
IMPERIAL SALES COMPANY, ETC.

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

Docket C-1468. Complaint, Dec. 11, 1968—Decision Dec. 11, 1968

Consent order requiring a Hollywood, Fla., distributor of "Una-Trim," a weight-reducing product, to cease making unordered shipments to retail druggists and naming them in advertising without their prior approval.

1466

Complaint

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission having reason to believe that Sam Seskin, an individual doing business as Imperial Sales Company, and The Forward Company hereinafter referred to as respondent, has violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Sam Seskin is an individual doing business as Imperial Sales Company and The Forward Company with his office and place of business located at 1515 South 14th Avenue, Hollywood, Florida.

PAR. 2. Respondent is now and for some time last past has been engaged in the advertising, offering for sale, sale and distribution of a weight reducing product called Una-Trim to retailers for resale to the consuming public.

PAR. 3. In the course and conduct of his business, respondent now causes and for some time last past has caused, his product, when sold, to be shipped from his place of business in the State of Florida to purchasers thereof located in various other States of the United States, and maintains and at all times mentioned herein has maintained, a substantial course of trade in said product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. In the course and conduct of his business as aforesaid, respondent has engaged in the practice of making unordered and unauthorized shipments of his product to retail drugstores located in the various States of the United States, and in the further practice of inserting or causing the insertion of advertisements in newspapers of general circulation in the communities where the retail drugstores, to which the aforesaid unordered and unauthorized shipments were made, are located. The aforesaid advertisements announced the availability of respondent's products at the local retail drugstores named therein, and to which the aforesaid unordered and unauthorized shipments have been made without prior consent, approval or permission to use the name of such drugstores in such advertisements. Said advertisements have the false appearance of having been inserted in the said newspapers by the local retail drugstores named therein.

The acts and practices as hereinabove set forth were and are unfair and deceptive.

PAR. 5. In the conduct of his business, and at all times mentioned herein, respondent has been in substantial competition, in commerce, with corporations, firms, and individuals in the sale of products of the same general kind and nature as that sold by respondent.

PAR. 6. The aforesaid unfair and deceptive acts and practices of respondent have had, and now have, the tendency and capacity to induce, and have induced, retail drugstores and members of the purchasing public to purchase substantial quantities of respondent's product.

PAR. 7. The aforesaid acts and practices of respondent, as herein alleged, were and are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and of respondent's competitors and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The 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 the copy of a draft of complaint which the Bureau of Deceptive Practices 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 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 Act, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its

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

1. Respondent Sam Seskin is an individual doing business as Imperial Sales Company and as The Forward Company, with his office and principal place of business located at 1515 South 14th Avenue, Hollywood, Florida.

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

ORDER

It is ordered, That the respondent Sam Seskin, an individual doing business as Imperial Sales Company or as The Forward Company or under any other name or names, and respondent's agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the advertising, offering for sale, sale or distribution of the product "Una-Trim" or any other product in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from :

1. Shipping or sending any merchandise to any drugstore or retail establishment without having previously obtained the written and express authorization or consent to the complete terms and conditions of sale or consignment, and resale, of any merchandise by the person, company or corporation to whom such merchandise is sent.

2. Placing any newspaper advertisement, or causing the dissemination of an advertisement in any other manner, for the purpose of publicizing such product, which advertisement uses the name of any drugstore or retail establishment without having previously obtained the written and express authorization or consent of the druggist or retail establishment whose name appears in the advertisement.

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

Complaint

74 F.T.C.

IN THE MATTER OF

TUFTWICK CARPET MILLS, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION
OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE
TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACTS

Docket C-1469. Complaint, Dec. 11, 1968—Decision, Dec. 11, 1968

Consent order requiring a Cartersville, Ga., carpet manufacturer to cease misbranding and falsely advertising its textile fiber products and failing to keep required fiber content records.

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Tuftwick Carpet Mills, Inc., a corporation, and Edward P. Chamberlain, 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 Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by its in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Tuftwick Carpet Mills, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Georgia, with its office and principal place of business located at 18 South Gilmer Street, Cartersville, Georgia.

Individual respondent Edward P. Chamberlain is an officer of said corporate respondent. He formulates, directs and controls the acts, practices and policies of said corporate respondent, including the acts and practices hereinafter referred to. The office and principal place of business of said individual respondent is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

Respondents are engaged in the manufacture and sale of carpeting.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now and for some time last past have been engaged in the introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, and offering for sale, in commerce, and in the transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, and in the importation into the United States, of textile fiber products; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, textile fiber products, which

have been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; and have sold, offered for sale, advertised, delivered, transported and caused to be transported, after shipment in commerce, textile fiber products, either in their original state or contained in other textile fiber products; as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

PAR. 3. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded by the respondents within the intent and meaning of Section 4(a) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in that they were falsely and deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, invoiced, advertised, or otherwise identified as to the name or amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products (carpeting) with labels which set forth the fiber content as "Acrylic Tuft Shag," thereby representing the entire carpet to be as described, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said carpet contained substantially different fibers and amounts of fibers than represented.

PAR. 4. Certain of such textile fiber products were further misbranded by respondents in that they were not stamped, tagged, labeled, or otherwise identified to show each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such misbranded textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products with labels which failed:

1. To disclose the true generic names of the fibers present; and
2. To disclose the true percentage of such fibers.

PAR. 5. Certain of said textile fiber products were misbranded in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act in that they were not labeled in accordance with the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder in that samples, swatches or specimens of textile fiber products subject to the aforesaid Act, which were used to promote or effect sales of such textile fiber products, were not labeled to show their respective fiber content and other information required by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, in violation of Rule 21(a) of the aforesaid Rules and Regulations.

PAR. 6. Certain of said textile fiber products were falsely and deceptively advertised in that respondents in making disclosures

or implications as to the fiber content of such textile fiber products in written advertisements used to aid, promote and assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of said products failed to set forth the required information as to fiber content as specified by Section 4(c) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and in the manner and form prescribed by the Rules and Regulations promulgated under said Act.

Among such textile fiber products, but not limited thereto, were textile fiber products (floor coverings) which were falsely and deceptively advertised by means of a price list, distributed by respondents throughout the United States in that the true generic names of the fibers in such products were not set forth.

PAR. 7. Respondents have failed to maintain proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by them, in violation of Section 6 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

PAR. 8. The acts and practices of respondents, as set forth above were, and are, in violation of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Rules and Regulations promulgated thereunder, and constituted, and now constitute, unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts or practices, in commerce, under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Federal Trade Commission having initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the respondents named in the caption hereof, and the respondents having been furnished thereafter with a copy of a draft of complaint which the Bureau of Textiles and Furs proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge respondents with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Textile Fiber Products Identification 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 respond-

ents have violated the said Acts, and that complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect, and having thereupon accepted the executed consent agreement and placed such agreement on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days, now in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in § 2.34(b) of its Rules, the Commission hereby issues its complaint, makes the following jurisdictional findings, and enters the following order:

1. Respondent Tuftwick Carpet Mills, Inc., is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Georgia, with its office and principal place of business located at 18 South Gilmer Street, Cartersville, Georgia.

Respondent Edward P. Chamberlain is an officer of said corporation and his address is the same as that of said corporation.

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

ORDER

It is ordered, That respondents Tuftwick Carpet Mills, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, and Edward P. Chamberlain, 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, delivery for introduction, manufacture for introduction, sale, advertising, or offering for sale in commerce, or the importation into the United States of any textile fiber product; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported, of any textile fiber product, which has been advertised or offered for sale in commerce; or in connection with the sale, offering for sale, advertising, delivery, transportation or causing to be transported, after shipment in commerce of any textile fiber product, whether in its original state or contained in other textile fiber products, as the terms "commerce" and "textile fiber product" are defined in the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

A. Misbranding textile fiber products by:

1. Falsely or deceptively stamping, tagging, labeling, invoicing, advertising or otherwise identifying such

products as to the name or amount of the constituent fibers contained therein.

2. Failing to affix a stamp, tag, label or other means of identification to each such product showing in a clear, legible and conspicuous manner each element of information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

3. Failing to affix labels to samples, swatches or specimens of textile fiber products used to promote or effect the sale of such textile fiber products showing in words and figures plainly legible all the information required to be disclosed by Section 4(b) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

B. Falsely and deceptively advertising textile fiber products by making any representations, directly or by implication, as to the fiber content of any textile fiber product in any written advertisement which is used to aid, promote or assist, directly or indirectly, in the sale or offering for sale of such textile fiber product, unless the same information required to be shown on the stamp, tag, or label or other means of identification under Sections 4(b) (1) and (2) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act is contained in the said advertisement, in the manner and form required except that the percentages of the fibers present in the textile fiber product need not be stated.

C. Failing to maintain and preserve proper records showing the fiber content of the textile fiber products manufactured by said respondents, as required by Section 6 of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and Rule 39 of the Regulations promulgated thereunder.

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 the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report, in writing, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with this order.

1475

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

VENT-AIR LENS LABORATORIES, INC., ET AL.

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT IN REGARD TO THE ALLEGED
VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT*Docket 8715. Complaint, Oct. 3, 1966—Decision, December 16, 1968*

Order placing on Commission's docket for review an initial decision dismissing charges of deceptive sales practices against a manufacturer of contact lenses and dismissing the complaint.

COMPLAINT*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Act, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Vent-Air Lens Laboratories, Inc., a corporation, and Lawrence Lewison, Marvin Shore and Shirley Lewison, individually and as officers of said corporation, hereinafter referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Vent-Air Lens Laboratories, 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 76 Madison Avenue, in the city of New York, State of New York.

Lawrence Lewison is president, Marvin Shore is controller and Shirley Lewison is treasurer of the corporate respondent. These individuals direct, formulate and control the acts, practices and policies of the corporate respondent, including those hereinafter referred to. Their business address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been, engaged in the manufacture, sale and distribution of contact lenses under the name Vent-Air Contact Lenses. Respondents distribute said contact lenses through wholly owned outlets and through franchised outlets. Contact lenses are designed to correct errors and deficiencies in the vision of the wearer, and are, devices, as the term "device" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

* Published as amended by Hearing Examiner's order of June 7, 1967, which designated the corporate name of respondent as Vent-Air Lens Laboratories, Inc., instead of Vent-Air Contact Lens Laboratories, Inc.

