

# **COMPETITION COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN**

## **ENQUIRY REPORT**

---

(Under the provisions of Section 37(2) of the Competition Act, 2010)

**IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY M/S PAKISTAN LEATHER  
INTERNATIONAL (JKT) AGAINST M/S PAKISTANI LEATHER JACKET  
HOUSE AND M/S LEATHER INN PAKISTAN FOR DECEPTIVE  
MARKETING PRACTICES**

**BY**

**Faiz ur Rehman, Riaz Hussain & Fatima Shah  
Dated: September 24, 2018**

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. This report concludes the enquiry initiated by the Competition Commission of Pakistan (the ‘**Commission**’) under section 37(2) of the Competition Act, 2010 (the ‘**Act**’) pursuant to a formal complaint filed with the Commission by M/s Pakistan Leather International (JKT) (the ‘**Complainant**’) against the following two entities namely:

M/s Pakistani Leather Jacket House (the ‘**Respondent No. 1**’) and  
M/s Leather Inn Pakistan (the ‘**Respondent No. 2**’)  
(collectively referred to as the ‘**Respondents**’).

- 1.2. The Complainant alleged that the Respondents are disseminating false and misleading information to consumers by fraudulently using the Complainant’s registered trademark, trade dress and logo on its marketing material, which is also capable of harming the business interest of the Complainant.
- 1.3. Keeping in view the above, the Commission initiated an Enquiry in accordance with sub-Section (2) of Section 37 of the Act by appointing Mr. Faiz ur Rehman, Assistant Director (OFT), Mr. Riaz Hussain, Assistant Director (OFT) and Ms. Fatima Shah, Management Executive (OFT), as the enquiry officers (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**Enquiry Committee**’). The Enquiry Committee was directed to conduct the enquiry on the issues raised within the complaint and to submit an enquiry report by giving its findings and recommendations, *inter alia*, on the following:

*Whether the allegations levelled in the complaint filed by the Complainant constitute a, prima facie, violation of Section 10 of the Act?*

## 2. THE COMPLAINT

- 2.1 The Complainant is a sole proprietor entity, which started its business in early 90’s with the name of Pakistan Leather International (JKT). In its complaint it was submitted that the Complainant is a regular tax payer of the country, having its registered office in Saddar, Rawalpindi.
- 2.2 It was further submitted by the Complainant that its trademark is duly registered in Pakistan with the Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan (IPO) (*A copy of the trademark registration with IPO-Pakistan is attached as Annexure - A*).
- 2.3 Upon application for certification of the copyrights for Artistic Work entitled *Pakistan Leather International*, the IPO has granted a certificate of registration of copyright bearing No. 35780 to the Complainant in August, 2017. (*A copy of the Certificate of registration of Copyright with IPO-Pakistan is attached as Annexure - B*).

2.4 The allegations levelled in the complaint are stated as under:

- i. That the Respondent No.2 has established its business with the same trade name, logo and is using the same packaging for trade as that of the Complainant.
- ii. That the Respondent No. 1 has also established its business with the same tradename, logo and is using the same packaging for trade as that of the Complainant.
- iii. That a comparison between the packaging of the Complainant and the Respondents reveals major similarities and is highly likely to deceive and cause confusion in the minds of consumers.
- iv. The Complainant's packaging is given hereunder for reference:



2.5 That the Respondents have been using the Complainant's registered trademark without any authorization and damaging its credibility and reputation. The unauthorized, illegal and continued use of the Complainant's trade mark can be seen in the Respondents' shops boards, visiting cards, shopping bags, invoices, billing receipts, etc., which is being done with an intention to deceive the consumers by fraudulent use of the Complainant's trademark and product packaging.

2.6 That the Complainant repeatedly contacted the Respondents through the representatives of local trade unions and conveyed its reservations and objections about their deceptive conduct. That the Respondents are misleading consumers by use of the unauthorized/illegal Complainant's registered trademark and artistic work on their publishing material, creating confusion and hence, are responsible for damaging the reputation of the Complainant.

2.7 In the spirit of fair business practices and to protect the rights of consumers, the Complainant humbly requested the Commission to take action against the Respondents for violation of Section 10 of the Act.

### **3. SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS**

#### **A. Reply of Respondent No. 1:**

- 3.1 In order to proceed further, the Complaint was forwarded to the Respondent No.1 vide letter dated April 02, 2018, for its comments. The reply of Respondent No. 1 was received 26<sup>th</sup> of April, 2018, which comprised of the following main points:
- i. That the Respondent No. 1 is a regular tax payer of the country and is running business in the field of retail sale of clothing, footwear and leather articles under the name of Pakistani Leather House, Kashmir Road, Saddar, Rawalpindi Cantt.
  - ii. That the Respondent No.1 along with other undertakings are running business of same nature as of the Complainant, whereas M/s SM Packaging are our joint service provider like most of certain other local undertakings for printing and supplying bags, visiting cards, bill books, shopping bags, etc., for the past many years.
  - iii. That for the past couple of years, the Complainant had been creating unnecessary problems in the smooth running of its business. The malicious intent of the Complainant had forced it to file such baseless complaints at different forums before as well.
  - iv. In this regard, the Complainant already agitated this matter before the concerned police station to restrain the Respondent No. 1. The Complainant also raised the issue before local business community (Trade Unions) and requested it to intervene and resolve the matter. The local community had decided/resolved the issue on March, 2017, in compliance of which the Respondent No. 1 had discontinued the use of old/previous shopping bags, visiting cards and bill books which was similar to the Complainant's artistic work.
- 3.2 The Respondent No. 1 had also discontinued to print its publishing material from M/s SM Packaging in compliance with the decision of the local trade union.
- 3.3 The Respondent No. 1 further submitted that prior to the filing of instant complaint, the Complainant had knocked the door of Federal Investigation Agency (FIA) and the official from the FIA police lines office conducted its enquiry. The FIA absolved the Respondent No. 1 of the allegations of the Complainant in August/September, 2017.
- 3.4 The Respondent No. 1 denied allegations of the Complainant regarding the use of the monogram and company name of the Complainant.
- 3.5 The averments made by the Complainant were denied as stated above. The Respondent No.1 submitted that the visiting cards and shopping bags were not in its use since March, 2017. Thus, no fraud, deception and/or any forgery as alleged by the Complainant had ever been committed by the Respondent No.1.
- 3.6 That the Respondent No. 1 had never threatened the Complainant in any manner whatsoever. The Respondent No.1 further denied the allegation levelled by the Complainant that the similar artistic work of the Complainant had been forged, or any violation of copyrights of the Complainant had been committed.

- 3.7 In light of the above, the Respondent No.1 provided certain documents in support of its defense. The Respondent No. 1 also requested the Commission to suspend the proceedings initiated against it and to dismiss the complaint in the interest of justice.

**B Reply of Respondent No 2:**

- 3.8 In order to seek comments of Respondent No.2, the Complaint was also forwarded to it, vide letter dated April 02, 2018. Its reply was received by the Enquiry Committee vide letter dated 21<sup>th</sup> of May, 2018, which comprised of the following main points:
- i. That the Complainant had submitted a false application on baseless allegations which were not true. The Complainant had filed an application with the FIA levelling same allegations before as well, and after investigation, the Respondent No.2 was not found guilty of any violation.
  - ii. That the Complainant always accuses its competitors and wastes their time and resources by involving them in such kind of cases. Respondent No. 2 further submitted that the Complainant offered substandard and repaired products to its customers and ultimately faced a loss in business.
  - iii. The Respondent No. 2 submitted merchandising material used for publicity, including cash memo, jacket logo, shopping bags and visiting cards before the Enquiry Committee.

**4. REJOINDER BY THE COMPLAINANT**

- 4.1 The comments/replies received from Respondents were forwarded to the Complainant for filing its rejoinder, if any. The requisite rejoinder was filed by the Complainant on 20-06-2018. The Complainant through its rejoinder to the reply/comments of the Respondents submitted that it had proceeded to acquire the relevant trademark and copyrights registration to protect its business, namely “Pakistan Leather International (JKT)”. The infringement of its trademark and copyrights by Respondent No 1 and Respondent No 2 had already been brought to the knowledge of the Hon’ble Commission. The Respondents had been engaged in the practice of using identical/closely resembling trademarks of the Complainant’s registered trademark.
- 4.2 In its rejoinder to the reply of Respondent No 1, the Complainant admitted that a meeting of local traders union was convened to resolve the matter, but the local traders union failed to resolve the matter in that meeting. Therefore, the matter still remained unresolved.
- 4.3 It was stated that the invoices of M/s SM Packages for bill books and visiting cards produced as evidence of change of name and artistic work still display the infringing trademark “Pakistani Leather”. This signified that the Respondent No. 1 was still engaged in the use of the same infringing trademark, bearing identical and close resemblance to its registered trademark “Pakistan Leather International (JKT)”.

- 4.4 It was submitted that the Respondent No. 1 had denied using the identical trademark and also claimed that after the local traders union meeting, they had discontinued the use of resembling trademark and copyrights. However, both of its claims were self-contradictory. It was requested that the Respondent No. 1 be asked to furnish proof in support of its contention.
- 4.5 That the Respondent No. 1 had denied using closely resembling or identical trademark and copyrights to that of Complainant, yet it also admitted that the prior used visiting cards and shopping bags were in the Complainant's possession. That this statement was itself an admittance of the fact that Respondent No. 1 had been engaged in the infringement of the Complainant's protected trademark and copyrights.
- 4.6 It was further stated that the Respondent No. 1 was not eligible to any of the prayers made in its reply owing to the fact that its own submissions were all self-contradictory, where it accepted as well as denied engaging in infringement of their protected trademark and copyrights. Furthermore, a violation at any point in time was still a violation subject to remedy under the law.
- 4.7 It was also submitted that the list of witnesses provided by the Respondent No. 1 was not without bias. The first two names bearing witness to the reply, i.e., Sheikh Muhammad Ejaz, and Sheikh Fayyaz Muhammad are the real brothers of Sheikh Shahid Jan of Pakistani Leather Jacket House. Therefore, their witnesses were not without a bias and must be discarded on grounds of conflict of interest.
- 4.8 Moreover, as regards to the third witness, i.e., Mr. Zafar Qadri, no evidence had been provided by the Respondent No. 1 in the form of an affidavit or otherwise to the same that the general secretary to the local union had admitted to being witness to the issue and merely representing a name did not prove as such.
- 4.9 The submitted evidence still bore a trademark which is a close derivative of the registered trademark of the Complainant and therefore, was still liable to remedy under the Act. Moreover, the supplied NTN certificate was irrelevant to the facts of the case.
- 4.10 The Complainant reiterated that initially there was no other business engaged in the sale and manufacture of leather products in the building where it has been running its business in the name of Pakistan Leather International (JKT), whereas another shop in the name of Respondent No. 2 had recently been established near the Complainant's famous outlet. Since its name closely resembled that of the Complainant's existing business name and also the registered trademark, it caused confusion in the minds of the customers who in fact try to reach the Complainant's outlet due to its quality product and vast experience in the business for the last twenty five years. Apart from this, the Respondent No. 2 had been using the colors green and white mainly on its artistic work, which caused more resemblance with the Complainant's registered trademark and copyright, causing confusion among the customers.
- 4.11 The NTN certificate and RCCI membership certificate of the Leather Inn Pakistan produced by the Respondent No. 2 were irrelevant to the facts of the case and proved nothing in defense of the Respondent No. 2. Similarly the cash memo of the Respondent No. 2 displayed the infringing trademark and copyright at the top, thereby continuing violation of the

Complainant's protected rights. The shopping bags, jackets, logos and visiting card of the Respondent No. 2 also continued to display the infringing trademark and copyrights.

- 4.12 The Respondent No. 2 had failed to deny or prove otherwise being engaged in the violations highlighted in the complaint. It had merely tried to display the Complainant's complaint as false and frivolous without providing any evidence in support of its claim.

## 5. ANALYSIS

- 5.1 The mandate of this enquiry report is to determine whether, as per the allegations made by the Complainant, the Respondents are engaged in violation of Section 10 (1), read with Section 10 (2) (d) of the Act, i.e.,

*(d) fraudulent use of another's trademark, firm name, or product labelling or packaging;*

This, if proven, would also lead towards violation of Section 10 (1), read with Section 10 (2) (a) of the Act, i.e.,

*(a) the distribution of false or misleading information that is capable of harming the business interests of another undertaking;*

- 5.2 For the purpose of this enquiry, it is essential to understand in detail the meaning of the concepts of 'trademark' and 'trade dress'. According to the Trademark Act, 1940, trademark has been defined as, "(1) 'trade mark' means a mark used or proposed to be used in relation to goods for the purpose of indicating or so as to indicate a connection in the course of trade between the goods and some person having the right, either as proprietor or as registered user, to use the mark whether with or without any indication of the identity of that person";<sup>1</sup>, where a mark is defined as, "(f) 'mark' includes a device, brand, heading, label, any combination thereof;"<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, a trademark is a distinguishable sign, design or expression which differentiates goods and services of the producer from that of its competitors.

- 5.3 Additionally, the International Trademark Association defines trade dress as, "Trade dress is the overall commercial image (look and feel) of a product that indicates or identifies the source of the product and distinguishes it from those of others. It may include the design or shape/configuration of a product; product labeling and packaging; and even the décor or environment in which services are provided. Trade dress can consist of such elements as size, shape, color and texture, to the extent that such elements are not functional. In many countries, trade dress is referred to as 'get-up' or 'product design'."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.acif.org.pk/Files/TradeMarkAct\\_1940.pdf](http://www.acif.org.pk/Files/TradeMarkAct_1940.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.acif.org.pk/Files/TradeMarkAct\\_1940.pdf](http://www.acif.org.pk/Files/TradeMarkAct_1940.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.inta.org/TrademarkBasics/FactSheets/Pages/Trade-Dress.aspx>



5.4 The Complainant’s marketing material under consideration includes one rectangular product bag with white border without product logo. The background color of the bag is green and white and on top of the bag “Pakistan Leather International” is written in white font color. The Complainant has used picture of the national flag on one side of the bag. The trade name of the Complainant has, “Pakistan Leather International” written in Urdu on top of the other side of the bag with the same label design i.e. green background with white font color. The product (leather jackets) is usually sold in plastic bags. For ease of reference, the color combination, images, shapes, texts and their locations on the packaging will be referred to as ‘trade dress’ in this enquiry report.

5.5 Before discussing the submissions of the Complainant and Respondents, it is important to understand the stance of international competition legislation in the matters regarding “Parasitic Copying” or “Copycat Packaging”. There is no specific definition of Copycat packaging, however, an appropriate definition could be:

*“Copycat packaging is the practice of designing the packaging of a product in a way that gives it the general look and feel of a competing, well-known brand (typically the market leader). Copycat packaging is distinct from counterfeiting, since normally it does not infringe intellectual property rights. The risk posed by copycat packaging is consumer confusion, and consequently distortion of their commercial behavior”<sup>4</sup>.*

5.6 In the below mentioned paragraphs, the facts and evidence against the Respondents are discussed in order to reach the conclusion regarding the issues at hand.

<sup>4</sup> Giuseppe Abbamonte, “Copycat Packaging, Misleading Advertising and Unfair Competition”



## IN THE MATTER OF RESPONDENT NO.1

- 5.7 As mentioned in Para 2.4 above, the primary allegation against Respondent No. 1 is that it has been using the Complainant's registered trademark without any authorization and damaging its credibility and reputation. The unauthorized, illegal and continued use of the Complainant's trademark can be seen in the Respondent's shops boards, visiting cards, shopping bags, invoices, billing receipts, etc. with an intention to deceive the consumers through fraudulent use of the Complainant's trademark, and product packaging.
- 5.8 In response, the Respondent No. 1 submitted its reply/comments to the complaint, the summary whereof is mentioned in para 3.1 above. In principle, the Respondent No.1 has denied all the averments made by the Complainant in the complaint. In addition, it also submitted that after the decision of local trade union in March, 2017, the Respondent No. 1 discontinued the use of old/previous shopping bags, visiting cards and bill books.
- 5.9 In response to the comments/reply of the Respondent No. 1, the Complainant filed a rejoinder, wherein it was submitted that the Respondent No. 1 had denied using the Complainant's identical trademark and had also claimed that after meeting of the local trade union, it had discontinued the use of resembling trademark. Both of its claims are self-contradictory. Furthermore, the invoices of the M/s SM Packages for bill books and visiting cards produced as evidence of change of name and artistic work still display the infringing trademarks "Pakistani Leather". This signifies that the Respondent No. 1 is still engaged in the use of the same infringing trademark bearing identical and close resemblance to the Complainant's registered trademark "Pakistan Leather International" (JKT).
- 5.10 It is evident from the information provided by the Complainant that it had existence prior to the establishment of the Respondent No.1 in the leather products category. The Complainant has been using the trademark (word) 'Pakistan Leather International' as a trademark, and business name since 1992. The trademark of the Complainant was registered in 2014, under registration number 369052 with the Trade Mark Registry. On the other hand the Respondent No. 1 submitted that it has been using trade name 'Pakistani Leather Jacket House' since 1995.
- 5.11 In response to the comments/reply of the Respondent No. 2, the Complainant filed a rejoinder wherein it was submitted that the Respondent No. 2 was using the color green and white on its artistic work, which caused resemblance with the Complainant's registered trade mark and copy right causing confusion among the customers. Similarly the cash memo of the Respondent No. 2 displays the infringing trademark and copyright at the top, thereby continuing violation of the Complainant's protected rights. The shopping bags, jackets, logos and visiting card of the Respondent No. 2 also continue to display the infringing trademark and copyrights.
- 5.12 In order to establish whether parasitic copying may have occurred, it is important to compare elements of the Complainant's and Respondent's packaging to assess similarities.
- 5.13 The comparison of Complainant and Respondent No. 1's packaging is depicted below:

Complainant's Packaging (Front)	Respondent No. 1's Packaging (Front)
	

Complainant's Packaging (Back)	Respondent No. 1's Packaging (Back)
	

5.14 As per the above mentioned packaging of the Complainant and Respondent No. 1, it is clearly identifiable that the Respondent No. 1 identically copied the Complainant's product labeling and creative design, including placement of various details of the shopping bags and language used by the Complainant.

- 5.15 The back side of the Complainant's packaging displays the information in Urdu which has confusing resemblance in elements of color scheme, layout style, design labels and font usage except the tag 'England may kahe bhe pohchany ka bandobast hay'.
- 5.16 In view of the facts, it is safe to infer that the Respondent No. 1 has imitated the Complainant's packaging and the conduct of the Respondent No. 1 falls under the ambit of Parasitic Copying, which means;

*"Indeed parasitic copying typically consists in reproducing the main presentational features of market leading products (such as the shape of the product or of its packaging, color combination and graphic arrangement) but usually there is just enough difference to avoid a clear cut trade mark infringement. Still they often generate deception or confusion among consumers"*

- 5.17 In light of the above analysis, the Respondent No. 1 appears to be in violation of Section 10(1) of the Act, in terms of Section 10(2)(d), which prohibits "fraudulent use of another's product labeling or packaging;" where its conduct appears to be infringing upon the rights of the Complainant through fraudulent use of Complainant's packaging, color scheme, design and get up of products, trying to pass off its product as that of the Complainant.
- 5.18 Since parasitic copying is adopted by copycats with the purpose of boosting sales by passing off its goods as that of the original creator, the underlying motive not only causes confusion in the mind of an ordinary consumer, but also causes loss of sales to the original creator.
- 5.19 In view of the above, it is evident that the use of Complainant's trade dress by the Respondent No.1 is without any authorization, misleading in nature and capable of harming the business interests of the Complainant is in violation of Section 10 of the Act.

## **IN THE MATTER OF RESPONDENT NO.2**

- 5.20 As mentioned in Para 2.4 above, the primary allegation against Respondent No. 2 is that it has been using the Complainant's registered trade mark without any authorization and damaging its credibility and reputation. The unauthorized, illegal and continued use of the Complainant's trademark can be seen in the Respondent No 2's shops boards, visiting cards, shopping bags, invoices, billing receipts, etc. with an intention to deceive the consumers by fraudulent use of the Complainant's trademark, and product packaging.
- 5.21 In response, Respondent No. 2 submitted its reply/comments to the complaint, the summary whereof is mentioned in para (iv) to (vi) above. Respondent No. 2 submitted that a false application on baseless allegations had been filed by the Complainant. It further submitted that the Complainant always accused its competitors and wasted their time and resources by keeping them involved in such kind of cases.
- 5.22 In response to the comments/reply of the Respondent No. 2, the Complainant filed a rejoinder wherein it was submitted that trade name of the Respondent No. 2 closely resembles the Complainant's registered trademark which causes confusion in the mind of customers who



actual try to reach the Complainant's outlet due to its quality product and vast experience in the business for the last twenty five years. Apart from this, the Respondent No. 2 is using the colors green and white mainly on its artistic work, which causes more resemblance with the Complainant's registered trademark and copyright causing confusion among the customers. Similarly, the cash memo, shopping bags, jackets, logos and visiting cards displays the infringing trademark and copyrights.

5.23 The comparison of the Complainant and Respondent No. 2's packaging is depicted below.

Complainant's Packaging (Front)	Respondent No. 2's Packaging (Front)
	
Complainant's Packaging (Back)	Respondent No. 2's Packaging (Back)
	

5.24 Upon comparison of the above images, we are of the view that the packaging of the Complainant and that of the Respondent No. 2 is different from each other. The Complainant does not have an exclusive right on the trade name, 'Pakistan Leather International' and letters P, L and I separately. The Respondent No. 2 has been using its own trade name, 'Leather Inn

Pakistan' on its marketing material which is different from the Complainant's registered trade name. Furthermore, the artistic work which includes expressions/style/getup of the work used by the Respondent No. 2 is also different from the Complainant and causes no confusion in the mind of an ordinary consumer. Based on these facts, it can be safely concluded that the allegations made against Respondent No. 2 have not been proven and it is not found involved in use of the Complainant's registered trademark, product labeling, packaging and the overall trade dress.

- 5.25 Keeping in view the above discussion, it appears that, *prima facie*, no violation under any provision of the Act can be attributed against the Respondent No. 2.

## **6. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS**

- 6.1 This enquiry report is aimed at examining whether the allegations of the Complainant, that the Respondents are fraudulently using the Complainant's trademark, firm name, or product labeling or packaging, are valid or not.
- 6.2 The Complainant applied for the registration of copyright under the Copyright Ordinance, 1962. The copy of the copyright registration certificate was attached with the Complaint which supported its claim. The copyright registration certificate proves that the Complainant is the first and rightful owner of the subject trade dress.
- 6.3 In light of the facts, no evidence was found depicting the unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark by any of the Respondents.
- 6.4 However, the Respondent No. 1 is imitating Complainant's trade dress. The slight alterations made by the Respondent No. 1 are insignificant and the trade dress by the Respondent No. 1 still resembles greatly to that of the Complainant. Analyzing it as a whole, the Respondent No. 1 has been found in use of a similar/identical trade dress due to which its product packaging appears similar to that of the Complainant's product packaging.
- 6.5 In contrast, Respondent No. 2 has created a unique trade dress which has no resemblance with the Complainant's trade dress. Therefore, it is not found in violation of Section 10(2)(d) of the Act.
- 6.6 Therefore, keeping in view the above, it has been observed that the Respondent No. 1 is involved in copycat or parasitic packaging by using the similar trade dress as that of the Complainant's, which can induce consumers into buying its product instead of the Complainant's product. The likelihood of deception is reinforced considering the fact that the firm names of the Complainant and the Respondent No. 1, Pakistan Leather International (JKT) and Pakistani Leather Jacket House, respectively, although not the same, but yet quite similar, have the ability to confuse the buyer into taking one for the other. This probability increases considering the fact that the two outlets are located nearby in Saddar Rawalpindi. Thus, the Respondent No.1 has been found involved in violating the provisions of Section 10(1) of the Act, in terms of Section 10(2)(d) of the Act.

- 6.7 Furthermore, this conduct of the Respondent No. 1 does not only constitute fraudulent use of the Complainant's trade dress, but it is also capable of harming the business interest of the Complainant, in violation of Section 10(1) of the Act, in terms of Section 10(2)(a) of the Act.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 The deceptive marketing practices, as discussed in this enquiry report, have a direct impact on the public at large. It is in the interest of the general public that the undertakings should be stopped from advertising their products/services in an unfair and misleading manner and be encouraged to resort to the advertising practices that are transparent and give consumers true and correct information. *Prima facie*, violations under the Act in terms of the findings of this enquiry report warrant initiation of proceedings against M/s. Pakistani Leather Jacket House under Section 30 of the Act and the complaint against M/s Leather Inn Pakistan may be dismissed under the circumstances and in light of the relevant provisions of law.

(Faiz-ur-Rehman)  
Assistant Director  
Enquiry Officer

(Riaz Hussain)  
Assistant Director  
Enquiry Officer

(Fatima Shah)  
Management Executive  
Enquiry Officer