

Oceanic Vitex at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 1, 1935, by the Neu-Life Laboratories, from Sacramento, Calif., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of seaweed.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the labeling contained false and fraudulent representations regarding its effectiveness as a nerve and gland food; its effectiveness to promote normal health and prevent and correct 90 percent of all bodily ailments; its effectiveness in the treatment of headache, neuralgia, neuritis, nervous prostration, low vitality, anemia, indigestion, liver and kidney troubles, irritability, rheumatism, insomnia, low blood pressure, constipation, goitre, asthma, eczema, catarrh, colds, influenza, scrofula, glandular disturbances, colitis and colonic disturbances; and its effectiveness as a restorative of vibrant health and vitality.

On October 17, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25118. Misbranding of Udga Tablets. U. S. v. 20 Boxes, et al., of Udga Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35770. Sample nos. 30363-B. 30538-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On July 18, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 20 boxes, 35 bottles, and 100 sample packages of Udga Tablets at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in part on or about March 25, 1935, and in part on or about May 29, 1935, by Udga, Inc., from St. Paul, Minn., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the tablets each contained approximately 9 grains of sodium bicarbonate, approximately 9 grains of bismuth subnitrate, and approximately 8 grains of magnesium oxide.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the labeling contained false and fraudulent representations regarding its alleged effectiveness in the treatment of acidosis, chronic gastritis, nausea, indigestion and kindred ailments of the stomach, stomach ulcers and other ills traceable to excess acid, stomach pains, vomiting, acid stomach, acid dyspepsia, gnawing pains, belching, its alleged effectiveness to relieve pain or discomfort immediately, to neutralize superfluous hydrochloric acid, establish proper chemical balance, promote normal digestive function, coat the stomach lining and to afford nature the protection it needs, to reduce inflammation and irritation, and to relieve stomach distress.

On September 7, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25119. Misbranding of Atholin. U. S. v. 66 Bottles of Atholin. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35787. Sample no. 38375-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On July 19, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 66 bottles of Atholin at Trenton, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 8, 1935, by the Hilliard Products Co., Inc., from Wilmington, Del., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially, per 100 milliliters, of boric acid (0.68 gram), benzoic acid (0.72 gram), salicylic acid (0.39 gram), aluminum chloride (0.90 gram), alcohol (72.7 percent by volume), water, and perfume.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, were false and fraudulent: (Bottle) "For Treatment of Pimples, Acne, Eczema"; (retail carton) "Skin Treatment For Pimples, Acne, Eczema"; (wholesale carton) "Skin Treatment For Pimples, Acne, Eczema."