Used for simple headaches, neuralgia"; (metal container) Designs of figures in bathing suits followed by statements, "Miss Perfect Form" and "Mr. Feel Bully." The charge recommended by this Department was that the statements and designs on the labels, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, were false and fraudulent.

On June 19, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22647. Misbranding of aspirin tablets. U. S. v. 126 Bottles of Tru Tablets of Aspirin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32753. Sample no. 69879-A.)

This case involved a shipment of aspirin tablets, the labeling of which bore unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On May 25, 1934, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 126 bottles of aspirin tablets at Scranton, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Tru Lax Manufacturing Co., from Newark, N. J., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Tru Tablets of Aspirin Tru Lax Manufacturing Co. Newark, N. J."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effect, appearing on the display carton and individual bottle label, were false and fraudulent: "For * * * Acute Rheumatism * * * Pains of Nervous origin, also for the relief of Gout, Sciatica, Tonsilitis, Influenza."

On June 30, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22648. Misbranding of Epsaline Tablets. U. S. v. 208 Bottles of Epsaline Tablets. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32509. Sample no. 67907-A.)

This case involved a product labeled to convey the impression that its therapeutic action was derived chiefly from Epsom salt, but which derived its principal laxative effect from the laxative drugs, aloin and phenolphthalein.

On April 6, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 208 bottles of Epsaline Tablets at Syracuse, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about February 20, 1934, by the Gold Seal Products Co., from Columbus, Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it contained in each tablet: Aloin, phenolphthalein (2/5 grain), and Epsom salt (7½ grains).

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements on the carton and bottle label, were false and misleading in view of the actual composition of the article: "Epsaline Tablets Epsom Salt Tablets Compound", "Two tablets as effective as a tablespoonful of Epsom Salt"; "To be used in place of the ordinary disagreeable Epsom Salts"; (carton only) "The nasty bitter taste is eliminated."

On June 15, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22649. Adulteration and misbranding of Katropine Antiseptic Nasal Jelly. U. S. v. 141 Packages and 105 Packages of Katropine Antiseptic Nasal Jelly. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 32549, 32550. Sample nos. 67460-A, 67542-A.)

Examination of the drug product involved in this case showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling. The label also bore unwarranted claims for germicidal characteristics.