

relief, or have any value for all forms of arthritis and rheumatism, or that they are beneficial, effective, or have any value in the cure, mitigation, relief, or treatment of muscular aches, pains, soreness, stiffness, and swellings or any other symptoms which may accompany any form of arthritis or related diseases;

(b) Directly or indirectly doing or causing to be done any act with respect to any such drug, while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, which results in the drug being misbranded within the meaning of 502(a) of the Act, specifically including, but not limited to the following acts while the drug is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce:

1. The use in the sale of the drug of any of the above written, printed or graphic matter, or of any other written, printed, or graphic matter containing any of the above claims or representations;
2. Representing in any manner, that the drug is useful in the prevention, treatment, mitigation, or cure of any disease, condition, or symptom, that is not stated and/or enumerated in the labeling of the drug together with precise directions for effective and safe use in each such disease, symptom or condition; and

(c) Directly or indirectly introducing or causing to be introduced into interstate commerce, any such drug with labeling that does not include a statement and enumeration of all diseases, conditions, and symptoms, for which the article is intended to be used together with precise directions for effective and safe use in each such disease, condition, or symptom.

The decree of injunction further ordered that defendant should give notice of the provisions of this decree to certain of her associates; that the effective date of the injunction should be 3-13-61; that the defendant's application for a further stay pending appeal was denied; and that all costs of court were taxed against the defendant.

Subsequently, on 3-23-61, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi overruled the defendant's motion for a new trial and, on 3-25-61, the court overruled the defendant's motion for a stay of the final injunction. The defendant appealed the latter ruling, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit dismissed this appeal. On 10-10-61, the defendant's motion to retax costs was granted in part in that the defendant was excepted from payment of the costs of multilithing the transcript of the record of the trial.

6552. Various drugs. (Inj. No. 400.)

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION FILED: On 3-20-61, S. Dist. Calif., against Hamid Bey, t/a Bey Vita Products Co. and Coptic Fellowship of America, Los Angeles, Calif.

NATURE OF BUSINESS: The defendant was engaged in the business of promoting, through lectures and through the dissemination of letters, and other written, printed, and graphic matter, the interstate sale of the following articles: *Bey Saffto* composed of unsaturated fatty acids derived from safflower oil, and vitamin B₆; *Bey VA* composed of vitamin A—from lemon grass oil; *Bey Natural VC* composed of vitamin C—from rose hips with rutin; *Bey VE* composed of alpha-tocopherol; *Ro-Qee-Jel capsules* composed of royal jelly, vitamin B₁, vitamin B₁₂; *Bey Vita Natur-Cal* composed of calcium, phosphorus, and vitamin D; *Bey Vita RG Soya Lecithin* composed of oil-free lecithin derived from soya bean oil; *Bey Vita yeast tablets* composed of yeast containing vitamins B₁ and B₂; *Bey Proto-X* composed of amino acids with vitamins B₁₂