

for Colicky-Like Gas Pains Peculiar to Women (similar statements in foreign language)," since the article was not efficacious for such purposes. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that its container was so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading

On March 4, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**380. Misbranding of Colusa Natural Oil. U. S. v. 12 Bottles of Colusa Natural Oil. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2264. Sample No. 16069-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated hereinafter.

On or about July 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 12 2-ounce bottles of Colusa Natural Oil at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 21, 1940, from Hollywood, Calif., by C. W. Colgrove; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of crude petroleum oil.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it was efficacious in the treatment of athlete's foot or ringworm; that it was efficacious to relieve painful and irritating itching and unsightly blemishes on hands; that it was efficacious in the treatment of eczema, psoriasis, acne, foot burns and cuts and poison oak; that it was efficacious on surface skin irritations acting as a stimulant increasing circulation and thereby aiding in the healing; that it possessed penetrating qualities and reducing properties which would help relieve the discomfort and pain; and that it possessed detergent and mild antiseptic action which would inhibit the spreading of skin irritations and help restore the normal skin surface, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On August 3, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**381. Misbranding of Colusa Natural Oil. U. S. v. 257 1-ounce Bottles of Colusa Natural Oil. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2263. Sample No. 16068-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On or about July 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 257 1-ounce bottles of the above-named product at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 16, 1939, by the Swan Manufacturing Co. from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination showed that it was crude petroleum oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing on the label were false and misleading since they represented that it was efficacious for the purposes recommended, whereas it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended: "For external use in the relief and treatment of \* \* \* cuts, eczema, psoriasis, acne, skin blemishes, pyorrhea, varicose veins \* \* \* and hay fever."

On August 3, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering destruction of the product.

**382. Misbranding of Durets. U. S. v. 40 Packages of Durets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2161. Sample No. 14678-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding the conditions indicated hereinafter.

On June 5, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 40 packages of Durets at Reading, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 25, 1940, by James Lawrence Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of tablets, each containing theophylline ( $\frac{1}{2}$  grain), methenamine (1 grain), sodium biphosphate (2.3 grains), and starch.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it would help to drive out poisonous body wastes; would relieve loss of sleep; was efficacious in the treatment of backache, headache, mental depression, excessive tiredness, pains in the groin, burning, frequent, smarting, painful, or