

was not estrogenic substance as it occurs in and is extracted from gravid mare's urine.

DISPOSITION: September 6, 1946. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$500 against the defendants jointly, on each of the 4 counts of the information.

2107. Adulteration and misbranding of sodium morrhuate and misbranding of estrogenic substance. U. S. v. Estro Chemical Co., Inc., Joachim Ansel, and Morton G. Falk. Pleas of guilty. Estro Chemical Co., Inc., fined \$1,000; Joachim Ansel, \$500; and Morton G. Falk, \$750. (F. D. C. No. 16596. Sample Nos. 54693-F, 87020-F, 4071-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: March 27, 1947, Southern District of New York, against the Estro Chemical Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., Joachim Ansel, and Morton G. Falk.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about October 2 and November 27, 1944, and February 8, 1945, from the State of New York into the States of Illinois, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

LABEL, IN PART: "Sodium Morrhuate 5%," or "Estrogenic Substance."

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Sodium morrhuate.* Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess since it purported and was represented to contain 5 percent of sodium morrhuate, but contained a small amount. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statement "Sodium Morrhuate 5%" borne on the label was false and misleading.

Estrogenic substance. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statement "Containing Estrone and Estradiol derived from natural sources" on the label of one lot, and the statement "This is a mixture of natural estrogens containing estrone and estradiol" on the label of the other lot were false and misleading since the article did not contain any estrone.

DISPOSITION: April 3, 1947. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the corporation was fined \$1,000; Joachim Ansel, \$500; and Morton G. Falk, \$750.

2108. Adulteration and misbranding of rubbing compound and mouth wash. U. S. v. Lloyd Johnson (Lura-Glo Laboratories). Defendant's motion to dismiss denied. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$1,100. (F. D. C. No. 17876. Sample Nos. 25549-H, 27251-H, 27822-H, 36220-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: June 11, 1946, Southern District of California, against Lloyd Johnson, trading as the Lura-Glo Laboratories, Oakland, Calif.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: Between the approximate dates of January 2, 1945, and July 8, 1945, from the State of California into the States of Utah, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

LABEL, IN PART: "LG Rubbing Compound Isopropyl Alcohol 70% by Volume," or "LG Antiseptic Mouth Wash An excellent aid for the relief of sore throat, sore mouth * * * sore gums."

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Rubbing Compound.* Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it was represented to possess in that it was represented to contain 70 percent by volume of isopropyl alcohol, but contained a smaller amount. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Isopropyl Alcohol 70% by Volume," was false and misleading.

Antiseptic Mouth Wash. Adulteration, Section 501 (c), its strength differed from and its quality fell below that which it was represented to possess. The article was represented to be an antiseptic, but was not an antiseptic within the meaning of Section 201 (c), since it was not a germicide when used in the dilution recommended in the labeling; 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. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Antiseptic," was false and misleading; the label statement, "Contains * * * 5% Alcohol," was false and misleading since the article contained more than 5 percent of alcohol; and the label statement, "Aid for the relief of sore throat, sore mouth * * * sore gums," was false and misleading since the article would not be an effective treatment for sore throat, sore mouth, and sore gums.

DISPOSITION: October 15, 1946. The defendant's motion to dismiss having been denied, a plea of nolo contendere was entered and the court imposed a fine of \$1,100.