1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES I FOR THE DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Civil Action No. 1:13-cv-00003
10		OIVII / IOIOI 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
11	Plaintiff,	
12	V.	
13	\	
14	LEON MAX, INC., a corporation, also odoing business as Max Studio, 3100 New York Drive	
15	Pasadena, CA 91107	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES,	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.

delicious racer back tank cut from **acco**-wonderful bambooand cotton jerseyBesides its earth-friendly nature, the beauty of bamboo is that it is luxuriously soft, and its absorbent properties are just rightfor sweating it out at yog&ilates or on the run" (emphasis added). In the fabric descriptof the same product, Defendant has stated that the tank is "50% BAMBOO, 50% COTTON."

- b. Similarly, in the productlescription for the "Silk & Bamboo Broadcloth Shirred Shell," Defendant has claimed, "Soft shirring on a delicate condriendly bamboo and silk fabric lends this top its ether teatl," while the fabric description for the product has stated that it is "650AMBOO, 35% SILK." (emphasis added).
- 9. In addition, on its www.maxstudio.com wettes Defendant has sold textile fiber products labeled as "bamboo."
- and a "Bamboo Seersucker Stripe Scoop Yokes D'r from the www.maxstudio.com website.

 Both items were purchased directly from, and shipped by, Defendant. The label on the plastic packaging containing the "Football Tee" stated the fabric composition was "50% Bamboo 50% Cotton." The fiber content label sewn into the shirt absendent that the fiber content was "50% Bamboo 50% Cotton." A hangtag attached the shirt stated that was "Bamboo" and that "Bamboo is a wonderful new fiber that is thous, absorbent and also has anti-bacterial properties." Similarly, the fiber content label with into the "Bamboo Seersucker Stripe Scoop Yoke Dress" stated that the fiber content ref shell was "99% Bamboo 1% Spandex" and the lining was "100% Cotton." The dress also had the same "Bamboo" hangtag as the shirt.
- 11. Textile fiber products marketed and to Defend and as bamboo, including those described in Paragraphs 8 through 10 algoretrayon and not actual bamboo fiber woven into fabric.
- 12. Rayon is the generic name for a typeredjenerated or manufactured fiber made from cellulose. Rayon is manufaced by taking purified cellulose from a plant source, also called a cellulose precursor, and convertingtion in viscous solution by dissolving it in one or //

//

19. Enclosed with the Warning Letter wasyanspsis of previous litigated decisions issued by the Commission, as well as instructtonsontact Commissionstaff or to visit the Commission's website at http://www.ftc.gov/bambtooobtain complete copies of the Textile Act, Textile Rules, and theommission's Final Orders and pinions in the proceedings described in the synopsis.

- 20. As detailed in the synopsis enclosed in Wharning Letter, in aeries of litigated decisions, the Commission determent, among other things, that:
 - a. both manufacturers and sellers of texhiber products must comply with the Textile Act and the Textile Rulesee H. Myerson Sons, et, 278 F.T.C. 464 (1971); Taylor- Friedsam Co., et al.69 F.T.C. 483 (1966); ransair, Inc., et al.60 F.T.C. 694 (1962); and
 - b. it is an unfair or deceptive act oraptice to falsely or deceptively stamp, tag, label, invoice, advertise, or otherwise identify any textile **filtred** uct regarding the name or amount of constituent fibers contained the **seig**, Verrazzano Trading Corp., et al., 91 F.T.C. 888 (1978); I. Myerson Sons, et al., 78 F.T.C. 464 (1977a), vlor-Friedsam Co., et al., 69 F.T.C. 483 (1966) ansair, Inc., et al.60 F.T.C. 694 (1962).
- 21. The Warning Letter also notified Defendation potential liability for civil penalties under Section 5(m)(B) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.Q 45(m)(1)(B), for knowingly engaging in acts or practices determined by the Commission to be unfair or deceptive and unlawful, as described in Paragraph 20 of this Complaint.
- 22. Even after receiving the Warning Letterefendant continued to market and sell rayon textile fiber products advertised and labeled as "bamboo." As a result, on April 13, 2010, the Commission issued a civil investigativendend ("CID") to Defendant, seeking documents and information relating to its advertising, labeliand sales of such textile products, including samples of any such products that Defendanteended were composed of actual bamboo fiber and not of rayon. Defendant produced no such bearaged has not otherwise asserted that any of the textile fiber products it sells are "bamboo."

- 23. Despite the Commission public announcements and the Warning Letter,

 Defendant continued to engage inactices, such as those distanced in Paragraphs 8 through 10 above.
- 24. The practices described in Paragraphlsrough 10 above are violations of the Textile Act and the Textile Ruleand are deceptive acts or primes in violation of Section 5(a)(1) of the FTC Act 15 U.S.C. § 45(a)(1).

VIOLATIONS OF THE TEXTIL E ACT AND THE TEXTILE RULES

- 25. The Textile Act governsinter alia, the labeling and adversing of textile fiber products manufactured, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in commerce 5 U.S.C. § 70a.
- 26. Under the Textile Act, a textile fiber opduct is "misbranded if it is falsely or deceptively stamped, tagged, labeled, invoiced, aided; tor otherwise identified as to the name or amount of constituent fibers contained therein." 15 U.S.C. § 70b(a).
- 27. Pursuant to section 70e of the TextAct, 15 U.S.C. § 70e(c), the Commission promulgated the Textile Rules, which state:
 - a. all textile fiber products must caraffixed labels stating the recognized generic names of the constituentatis, 16 C.F.R. §§ 303.15; 303.16(a)(1);
 - b. no generic name for a manufactured fibreay be used until such generic name has been "established or otherwessegnized by the Commission," 16 C.F.R. § 303.8;
 - c. "[w]ords, coined words, symbols or depictions, (a) which constitute or imply the name or designation of a fiber whishnot present in the product . . . [may] not be used in such a manner as to represent or imply that suchs fibresent in the product." 16 C.F.R. § 303.18. Any termedsin advertising, including internet advertising, that constitutes connotes the name or presence textile fiber is deemed to be an implication of fiber content, 16 C.F.R. § 303.40; and
 - d. any information or representation inded in advertising or labeling of a textile fiber product that in interesting under the Textile Act or the Textile Rules "shall in no way be false, deceptive, or misleading to fiber content and shall not include any

28 | //

34. In prior litigated decisions, the Commission has determined that it is an unfair or deceptive act or practice to offer for saleself textile fiber products that are falsely or deceptively labeled as to the name or amount of constituent fiber contained therein. The Commission also has determined that it is an unfair or deceptive act or practice to falsely or deceptively advertise textile fiber products indifferent not limited to, falsely or deceptively advertising the name or amount of constituent ficontained within a textile fiber productive. Paragraph 20.

COUNT II

- 35. As set forth in Paragraphs 17 through at least sinceceiving the Warning Letter on February 2, 2010, Defendant has had actual knowledge that offering for sale or selling falsely or deceptively labeled textile products and that falsely or deceptively advertising textile fiber products are unfair or deceptive acts or practices subject to civil penalties.
- 36. As set forth in Paragraphs 8 through 10fethelant has offered for sale and sold textile products labeled as "bamboo" and has reprited, directly or indectly, expressly or by implication, that certain tetile fiber products it advettes and sells are "bamboo."
- 37. In truth and in fact, as set forth Praragraph 11, in numerous instances these textile fiber products are not below fiber but instead rayon regenerated cellulose fiber.
- 38. Defendant has engaged in the acts and tipores described in Paragraphs 36 and 37 with the actual knowledge, as forth in Paragraph 35, that substants and practices have been determined by the Commission in a final cease and tobersiler, other than a consent order, to be unfair and deceptive under Section 5(a) of the FTC Act. Defendant, therefore, has violated Section 5(m)(1)(B) of the FTC Act. 15 U.S.C.§ 45(m)(1)(B).

CONSUMER INJURY

39. Consumers have suffered and will continue to suffer substantial injury as a result of Defendant's violations. In addition, Defendants been unjustly enriched as a result of its unlawful acts or practices. Abseintunctive relief by this Court pefendant is likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust **ehr**inent, and harm the public interest.

1	4. Award Plaintiff the costs bringing this action, awell as such other and		
2	additional relief as the Court maytdemine to be just and proper.		
3			
4	DATED: January 3, 2013		
5			
6	Of Counsel:	Respectfully submitted,	
7	JAMES A. KOHM Associate Director for Enforcement	STUART F. DELERY Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General	
8 9	ROBERT S. KAYE Assistant Director for Enforcement	MAAME EWUSI-MENSAH FRIMPONG Deputy Assistant Attorney General	
10	KORIN EWING FELIX MEGAN A. BARTLEY	MICHAEL S. BLUME Director	
11	Attorneys Federal Trade Commission	Director	
12	600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Mail Drop M-8102B	/s/ Shannon L. Pedersen SHANNON L. PEDERSEN	
13	Washington, D.C. 20580 (202) 326-3556; kewing@ftc.gov	Trial Attorney Consumer Protection Branch	
14	(202) 326-3424; mbartley@ftc.gov	U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 386	
15		Washington, DC 20044 Tel: (202) 532-4490	
16		Fax: (202) 514-8742 Shannon.L.Pedersen@usdoj.gov	
17		Griaimiem <u>a</u> m eacreem e acasjigev	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27 28			
ZO	II		