831. Misbranding of mercurochrome. U. S. v. 60 Dozen Bottles of Mercurochrome. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7841. Sample No. 78842–E.)

On June 30, 1942, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 60 dozen bottles of mercurochrome at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 9, 1942, by the Certified Pharmacal Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the statement "Contents 9 cc.," borne on the label was false and misleading as applied to an article in bottles containing less than 9 cubic centimeters.

On August 10, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

832. Misbranding of Epsom salt. U. S. v. 130 Packages of Epsom Salt. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7990. Sample No. 19481–F.)

The packages of this product contained a smaller amount than declared on the label.

On July 28, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of New Hampshire filed a libel against 130 packages of Epsom salt at Concord, N. H., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 30, 1942, by the Allied Salt & Chemical Co., from Boston, Mass.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the statement "Five Pounds" borne on the carton was false and misleading as applied to an article that was short weight. The article was labeled in part: "Five Pounds * * * Epsom Salt."

On September 8, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

833. Misbranding of Faunce's Tooth Paste. U. S. v. 30 Packages of Faunce's Tooth Paste. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7843. Sample No. 77051–E.)

On June 30, 1942, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 30 packages of Faunce's Tooth Paste at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 9, 1942, by Benjamin R. Faunce, from Riverside, N. J.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, salt, glycerine, and material derived from bile, flavored with peppermint.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the treatment of pyorrhea-bleeding gums, bad odor, tartar, and discoloration, and would act as a prophylactic pus solvent, were false and misleading since it was not effective for such purposes and would not act as a prophylactic pus solvent.

On August 3, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

834. Misbranding of Hanford's Balsam of Myrrh. U. S. v. 22 Packages of Hanford's Balsam of Myrrh. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7888. Sample No. 70592–E.)

On July 15, 1942, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida filed a libel against 22 packages of Hanford's Balsam of Myrrh, at Jacksonville, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 11 and May 14, 1942, by G. C. Hanford Mfg. Co., from Syracuse, N. Y.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of alcohol, water, myrrh, benzoin, and chlorthymol.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements on the bottle label, carton, and accompanying circular which represented and suggested that it would be efficacious for sprained ankle, caked udder, and swellings; would be effective for preventing sunburn; would be effective in the treatment of frostbites, athlete's foot and minor skin irritations; would be effective as a soothing application for bunions; would be effective when used as eardrops; and when other treatments failed would be effective for cuts, lacerations, and bruises, and for horses badly galled or calked; that it possessed remarkable soreness removing qualities and would heal without leaving a scar, were false and misleading since it would not be effective for the purposes claimed, did not possess remarkable soreness removing qualities and would not heal without leaving a scar.

On August 28, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.