FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Dkt. C–2456]

Amerada Hess Corporation, et al.;
Prohibited Trade Practices and
Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Set Aside Order.

SUMMARY: This order reopens a 1973 consent order—which required that the Clarco Pipe Line be divested and prohibited Amerada, VGS Corporation and Clarco Pipe Line Company from acquiring assets related to the transportation or refining of crude oil produced in either Mississippi or Alabama without prior Commission approval—and sets aside the consent order pursuant to the Commission’s Sunset Policy Statement, under which the Commission presumes that the public interest requires setting aside competition orders in effect for more than 30 years.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Matter of Amerada Hess Corporation, et al. The prohibited trade practices and/or corrective actions are removed as indicated.


Order Reopening Proceeding and Setting Aside Order

Commissioners: Janet D. Steiger, Chairman, Mary L. Azcuenaga, Roscoe B. Starek, III, Christine A. Varney.

On September 12, 1994, Amerada Hess Corporation (“Amerada Hess”) filed a Request to Reopen and Vacate Order (“Request”) in this matter. 1

Amerada Hess requests that the Commission set aside the 1978 consent order in this matter, pursuant to Rule 2.51 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 2.51, and the Commission’s July 22, 1994, Statement of Policy with Respect to Duration of Competition Orders and Statement of Intention to Solicit Public Comment with Respect to Duration of Consumer Protection Orders (“Sunset Policy Statement”). 2

Leon Hess, also a respondent in this matter, joined in Amerada Hess’s Request, by letter dated September 21, 1994. Southland Oil Company, successor to respondent VGS Corporation, filed a Statement in Support of Request to Reopen and Vacate Order on October 21, 1994. In addition, on October 20, 1994, Hunt Refining Company, the purchaser of assets from respondent Clarco Pipe Line Company, filed a petition requesting, among other things, that the Commission reopen the proceeding and vacate the order as to Hunt (“Petition”).

Amerada Hess’s Request, Hunt’s Petition and the information supplied by Leon Hess and Southland Oil Company were placed on the public record pursuant to Section 2.51 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 16 CFR 2.51. 3 No comments were received.

The Commission in its July 22, 1994, Sunset Policy Statement said, in relevant part, that “effective immediately, the Commission will presume, in the context of petitions to reopen and modify existing orders, that the public interest requires setting aside orders in effect for more than twenty years.” 4

The Commission’s order in Docket No. C–2456 was issued on September 18, 1973, and has been in effect for more than twenty-one years. Consistent with the Commission’s July 22, 1994, Sunset Policy Statement, the presumption is that the order should be terminated.

Nothing to overcome the presumption having been presented, the Commission has determined to reopen the proceeding and set aside the order in Docket No. C–2456.

Accordingly, it is ordered that this matter be, and it hereby is, reopened;

It is further ordered that the Commission’s order in Docket No. C–2456 be, and it hereby is, set aside, as of the effective date of this order.

2 The Sunset Policy Statement is published at 59 FR 45,286 (Sept. 1, 1994).
3 The fifth respondent named in the order died in 1989.
4 Sunset Policy Statement, 59 FR at 45,289.
In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a North Carolina corporation and its officer from representing that bee pollen products are effective as a cure or in mitigating certain conditions and physical ailments, and from misrepresenting the existence, contents, validity, results, conclusions, or interpretations of any test or study. In addition, the consent order requires the respondents to notify all sellers of the products, for the last 12 months, about the settlement with the Commission.

DATES:  January 17, 1995.

ACTION: Consent order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a North Carolina corporation and its officer from representing that bee pollen products are effective as a cure or in mitigating certain conditions and physical ailments, and from misrepresenting the existence, contents, validity, results, conclusions, or interpretations of any test or study. In addition, the consent order requires the respondents to notify all sellers of the products, for the last 12 months, about the settlement with the Commission.

DATES:  Complaint and Order issued January 17, 1995.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Tuesday, November 8, 1994, there was published in the Federal Register, 59 FR 55665, a proposed consent agreement with analysis In the Matter of Bee-Sweet, Inc., et al., for the purpose of soliciting public comment. Interested parties were given sixty (60) days in which to submit comments, suggestions or objections regarding the proposed form of the order.

No comments having been received, the Commission has ordered the issuance of the complaint in the form contemplated by the agreement, made its jurisdictional findings and entered an order to cease and desist, as set forth in the proposed consent agreement, in disposition of this proceeding.

1 Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission’s Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580.