

possess. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label, "Each Capsule Contains Not Less Than \* \* \* Vitamin D 1,000 units \* \* \* Vitamin Concentrate Capsules containing vitamins \* \* \* G (B<sub>2</sub>)," were false and misleading when applied to an article containing less than 1,000 units of vitamin D and an inconsequential amount of riboflavin (vitamin G or B<sub>2</sub>).

The article was also alleged to be adulterated and misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 3642.

On November 25, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**628. Adulteration of vitamin B complex capsules. U. S. v. 25,000 Capsules of Vitamin B Complex Improved. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.** (F. D. C. No. 6039. Sample No. 53411-E.)

Examination of this product showed that it contained not more than 200 U. S. P. (International) units of vitamin B<sub>1</sub> per capsule, whereas it was represented as containing 333 International Units of vitamin B<sub>1</sub> per capsule.

On October 20, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California filed a libel against 25,000 capsules of vitamin B complex at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 15, 1941, by Miller Laboratories from Cleveland, Ohio; and charging that it was adulterated in that its strength differed from and its quality fell below that which it was represented to possess. The article was invoiced as "Vitamin B complex Improved, B<sub>1</sub>-333 Units Int."

On December 30, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**629. Adulteration and misbranding of Vitagen. U. S. v. 21 Cases of Vitagen. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered distributed to various charitable institutions.** (F. D. C. No. 5683. Sample No. 65595-E.)

This product was approximately 70 percent deficient in vitamin A and approximately 50 percent deficient in vitamin C.

On September 12, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado filed a libel against 21 cases of Vitagen at Denver, Colo., which originally had been consigned by College Laboratories, Inc., from Denver, Colo., to Seattle, Wash., and had been returned alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 22, 1941, from Seattle, Wash.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that valuable constituents, namely, vitamins A and C, had been wholly or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "two teaspoons of Vitagen contains approximately: 2810 international units of A, 450 units of C," were false and misleading when applied to an article of lower vitamin content.

On November 14, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be distributed to various charitable institutions.

**DRUGS ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF FALSE AND MISLEADING CLAIMS IN THE LABELING**

**630. Misbranding of Zalco-Septic. U. S. v. Sylvia Zalk (Zalco Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20.** (F. D. C. No. 4143. Sample Nos. 8286-E, 75133-D.)

This product did not possess the antiseptic properties claimed for it.

On July 28, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed an information against Sylvia Zalk, trading as the Zalco Co. at St. Paul, Minn., alleging shipment on or about February 1 and September 25, 1940, from the State of Minnesota into the State of North Dakota, of quantities of Zalco-Septic that was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Zalco-Septic (Antiseptic Solution)."

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of water, alcohol, and small proportions of menthol, eucalyptol, thymol, methyl salicylate, and boric acid. Bacteriological examination showed that it was not antiseptic.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Zalco-Septic (Antiseptic Solution) \* \* \* Nasal Douche: Add one part of Zalco-Septic to 4 or 5 parts of warm water \* \* \* Feminine Hygiene: Add 1 part of Zalco-Septic to 10 parts of warm water," borne on the bottle label, were false and misleading since they represented that when used in the dilutions recom-

mended, it was an antiseptic within the meaning of the law; whereas it was not an antiseptic within such meaning, and it did not purport to be and was not represented as an antiseptic for inhibitory use as a wet dressing, ointment, dusting powder, or such other use as involves prolonged contact with the body.

On November 4, 1941, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

**631. Misbranding of dextrose in physiologic sodium chloride solution. U. S. v. 7 Cases of Dextrose. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4818. Sample No. 49411-E.)**

This product, which was intended for intravenous injection, was found to contain lead.

On May 24, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana filed a libel against 7 cases of the above-named product at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 6 and April 19, 1941, by Hospital Liquids, Inc., from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the statement "Dextrose 5 percent in Physiologic Sodium Chloride Solution Sterile and Non-Pyrogenic" was false and misleading since the label failed to reveal that the article contained lead and was unsuitable for intravenous injection.

On July 8, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**632. Misbranding of Bleything Concentrated Vegetable Compounds. U. S. v. 34 Packages of Concentrated Vegetable Compound Bleything Formula No. 201-A and 22 Packages of Concentrated Vegetable Compound Bleything Formula No. 201-B. Decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5468. Sample Nos. 65836-E, 65837-E.)**

On August 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado filed a libel against the above-named products at Denver, Colo., which had been consigned by Bleything Laboratories, alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about January 4 and May 4, 1941, from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Examination of samples of the articles showed that Formula No. 201-A consisted of tablets weighing approximately 8 grains each, which contained dried plant material yielding less than 1 grain of total mineral constituents; and that Formula No. 201-B consisted of tablets weighing approximately 8 grains each, which contained dried plant material yielding less than 1½ grains of total mineral constituents.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that designations in the labeling which constituted devices implying that Formula No. 201-A would supply something which would combat excessive acidity and acidosis; and that Formula No. 201-B would supply minerals which ward off alkalinity and alkalosis, were false and misleading since the articles could not be relied upon by physicians and were not effective for such purposes.

They were also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 3424.

On October 17, 1941, Bleything Laboratories having signed an acceptance of service and authorization for taking of final decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**633. Misbranding of Earles Vital Vim. U. S. v. 8 Cases of Wheat Germ. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. F. D. C. No. 4770. Sample No. 47271-E.)**

On May 19, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 8 cases, each containing 24 18-ounce packages, of a product labeled "Earles Vital Vim \* \* \* Pure Wheat Germ" at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. H. Earles Co. on or about April 25, 1941; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it was essentially wheat germ as labeled.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in the labeling which represented that it was efficacious to restore and maintain health and vigor; that it would be efficacious in the prevention and treatment of overweight, underweight, fatigue, colitis, constipation, neuritis, arthritis, stomach troubles, indigestion, high blood pressure, hardening of the arteries, and sleeplessness; that it would be efficacious to strengthen the digestive organs, assist intestinal activity, and bring about good digestion and proper assimilation; and that it