PRODUCT: 22 4-ounce bottles of *National R Solution* at Washington, D. C.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Indications: For use as a mild astringent application in inflammation of mucous membranes of the urethra" and "Indications: For use as a mild astringent application in inflammation of mucous membranes" were false and misleading since the article would not be effective for the treatment of the conditions stated and implied.

DISPOSITION: December 28, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

2587. Misbranding of P. P. P. U. S. v. 5 Cases * * *. (F. D. C. No. 25096. Sample No. 850–K.)

LIBEL FILED: On or about July 28, 1948, Southern District of Florida.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 26, 1948, by Rodeco Products, from Augusta, Ga.

PRODUCT: 5 cases, each containing 24 bottles, of P. P. P. at Tampa, Fla. Examination showed that the product consisted essentially of water, alcohol, potassium iodide, and extracts of plant drugs.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was effective in the treatment of rheumatic conditions, pimples, boils, old sores, and many blood conditions, whereas it was not effective in the treatment of such conditions.

DISPOSITION: August 19, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

2588. Misbranding of Dolcin tablets. U. S. v. 109 Bottles * * *. (F. D. C. No. 21961. Sample No. 64547–H.)

LIBEL FILED: December 10, 1946, District of New Jersey; amended libel filed September 11, 1947.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about November 8, 1946, by the Dolcin Corp., from New York, N. Y.

PRODUCT: 109 100-tablet bottles of *Dolcin tablets* at Newark, N. J. Examination indicated that the tablets consisted essentially of 2.6 grains of aspirin and 3.4 grains of calcium succinate.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the labels of the article and in a circular enclosed with the article were false and misleading. The statements represented and suggested that the article was effective and adequate for the relief, treatment, and cure of all types of arthritis and rheumatism. The article was not effective and adequate for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: The Dolcin Corp. appeared as claimant and filed an answer denying that the product was misbranded as alleged in the libel. Thereafter, the claimant requested permission of the court to withdraw its claims and answer since it had changed the labeling of the product to omit the representations complained of in the libel and was therefore of the belief that no useful purpose would be served by contesting the case. On December 6, 1948, the court granted the claimant's request and entered a decree of condemnation and destruction.