

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

January28, 2014

Mark Barton State of Ohio

Re: In the Matter of Ganley Ford West, Inc., FTC File No. 122 3269

Dear Mr. Barton:

Thank you for commenting on the Federal Trade Commission's proposed consent agreement in the above ferenced proceeding. The Commission has placed your comment on the public record pursuant to Rule 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 C.F.R. § 4.9(b)(6)(ii), and has given it serious consideration.

As we understand your comment, you question why the proposed order does not apply to all retail automobile dealerships, but only to Ganley Ford West, Inc. You do not propose any revisions to the draft complaint or consent agreement. You correctly state that this proposed order only applies to Ganleyecause Ganley is the named respondent in this law enforcement action However, Section 5 of theederal TadeCommission Act,15 U.S.C. § 45, prohibits unfair or deceptiveacts or practices and ajest to all businesses and individuals over whom the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdictioThus, if the Commission had reason to believe that other dealerships engage in similar practicesidation of Section 5, it could bring action against them as well. filter consideration of your comment, the Commission has determined that the relief set forth in the consent agreement is appropriate and sufficient to remedy the violations alleged in the Complaint.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that the pubmenformalt De Commission has determined that the pubmenformal time commission has determined that the pubmenformal time commission has determined that the pubmenformal time commission has determined that the pubmen formation has determined that the pubment of has determined that the p

\_\_\_\_\_. It helps the Commission's analysis to hear from a variety of sources in its work, and we thank you again for your comment.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark Secretary