835. Misbranding of Menestrex. U. S. v. 11 Bottles of Menestrex. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7896. Sample No. 71562–E.)

On July 17, 1942, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky filed a libel against 11 bottles of Menestrex at Paducah, Ky., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 22, 1941, by the Rex Laboratory, from Nashville, Tenn.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it contained 3.43 grains of quinine sulfate and 0.35 grain of potassium permanganate per capsule.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the labeling which represented and suggested that it was an effective treatment for painful, scanty, or functionally delayed menstruation and was a scientific preparation, were false and misleading since it would not be an effective treatment for such conditions and was not a scientific preparation.

On September 15, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

836. Misbranding of Pine Glow Bath and Rainbo Bath. U. S. v. 291 Bottles of Pine Glow Bath and 261 Bottles of Rainbo Bath. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7881. Samples Nos. 95124–E, 95125–E.)

On July 14, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Nevada filed a libel against the above named products at Reno, Nev., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 16, 1942, by the Rainbobath Laboratories from San Francisco, Calif.

Analysis of the Pine Glow Bath showed that it consisted essentially of water, the sodium salt of a sulfonated oil, and volatile oils, including oil of pine needles. Analysis of a sample of the Rainbo Bath showed that it was essentially a lime-sulfur solution.

The Pine Glow Bath was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article when placed in the bath water would be efficacious in overcoming insomnia and was an aid to health and would be efficacious for muscular rheumatism and gout and for eliminating toxic poisons and for toning up the circulatory and nervous systems; would be efficacious in the treatment of the skin and complexion; would increase the white corpuscles in the blood and cause toxins and other impurities to pass out through the pores of the skin and would benefit the entire respiratory tract and would be efficacious for weight reduction, whereas it would not be effective for such purposes.

The Rainbo Bath was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was colloidal sulfur, that when placed in the bath water the user would obtain the benefits derived from the treatments given at hot springs and spas, and that it would be efficacious in the treatment in the diseases, conditions, and symptoms mentioned and described in the labeling, and would be efficacious for reducing, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a colloidal sulfur, and it would not be efficacious or useful for the purposes and in the manner stated, represented and suggested in the labeling.

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

837. Misbranding of Bi-Sal Tablets. U. S. v. 129 Bottles of Bi-Sal Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 7783. Sample No. 91809–E.)

On July 7, 1942, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas filed a libel against 129 bottles of Bi-Sal tablets at Dallas, Texas, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 7, 1942, by the Oxford Products, Inc., from Cleveland, Ohio.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that the tablets contained phenolphthalein (½ grain per tablet) extracts of plant drugs, including nux vomica and a laxative drug, and an extract of bile.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the name "Panogestic Enzymes with Bile Salts Compound" was misleading since it was essentially a laxative and its physiologic activity was due principally to phenolphthalein, which is neither an enzyme nor a bile constituent but is a coal tar derivative; (2) in that the statement on the carton "This Combination is used * * * in certain forms of Gall Bladder and Bile Dust Infections," was false and misleading, since it represented and suggested that the article would be effective in the treatment of gall bladder and bile dust infection, whereas it was not