

reliable evidence to substantiate such claims, and from misrepresenting the existence or results of any test or study. In addition, the consent order requires the respondent to pay \$200,000 in consumer redress.

DATES: Complaint issued August 30, 1995. Order issued October 30, 1996.¹

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Milgrom, Federal Trade Commission, Cleveland Regional Office, 668 Euclid Avenue, Suite 520-A, Cleveland, OH. 44144. (216) 522-4210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Tuesday, July 9, 1996, there was published in the Federal Register, 61 FR 36065, a proposed consent agreement with analysis In the Matter of RustEvader Corporation, 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.

A comment was filed and considered by the Commission. 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.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interprets or applies sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45)

Benjamin I. Berman,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-33283 Filed 12-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[Dkt. C-3699]

Telebrands Corp., et al.; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.
ACTION: Consent order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a Virginia-based mail order company and its officer from representing that their antenna improves television and radio reception, provides the best, crispest, clearest or most focused television reception achievable without cable installation, and requires any claim concerning the relative or absolute performance,

¹ Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.

attributes, or effectiveness of any product intended to improve a television's or radio's reception, sound, or image to be truthful and substantiated by competent and reliable evidence.

DATES: Complaint and Order issued December 13, 1996.¹

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald D'Amato, Federal Trade Commission, New York Regional Office, 150 William Street, 13th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10038-2063. (212) 264-1223.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Tuesday, October 8, 1996, there was published in the Federal Register, 61 FR 52797, a proposed consent agreement with analysis In the Matter of Telebrands Corp., 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 have been received, the Commission has ordered the issuance of the complaint in the form contemplated by the agreement, made it jurisdictional findings and entered an order to cease and desist, as set forth in the proposed consent agreement, in disposition of this proceeding.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interprets or applies sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45)

Benjamin I. Berman,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-33279 Filed 12-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[Dkt. C-3680]

Young & Rubicam Inc.; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.
ACTION: Consent order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a New York-based advertising agency from making any pollution-removal claims for Ford Motor Company's MicronAir Filtration System or any similar cabin air filtration system, unless such representations are true and the respondent possesses reliable and competent scientific evidence to substantiate such representations.

¹ Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.

DATES: Complaint and Order issued August 22, 1996.¹

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Badger, Federal Trade Commission, San Francisco Regional Office, 901 Market Street, Suite 570, San Francisco, CA 94103, (415) 356-5270.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On Thursday, April 18, 1996, there was published in the Federal Register, 61 FR 16922, a proposed consent agreement with analysis In the Matter of Young & Rubicam Inc., 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.

A comment was filed and considered by the Commission. 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.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interprets or applies sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45)

Benjamin I. Berman,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-33287 Filed 12-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

[Dkt. C-3686]

Zygon International, Inc.; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.
ACTION: Consent Order.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices and unfair methods of competition, this consent order prohibits, among other things, a Washington-based company and its owner, that manufacture and advertise learning accelerating, memory enhancing, weight loss, and vision improving products and devices, from making any claims concerning the performance, benefits, efficacy, or safety of any product or service they market, unless they possess competent and reliable evidence to substantiate such claims, and requires the respondents to pay \$195,000 into escrow accounts for consumer redress programs.

¹ Copies of the Complaint and the Decision and Order are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, H-130, 6th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.