

ment Waving: 15 units at Phoenix and 21 units at Tucson, Ariz.; 65 units at Bridgeport, 88 units at Bristol, 29 units at Darien, 89 units at Greenwich, 36 units at Meriden, 68 units at New Britain, 40 units at New Canaan, 38 units at New Haven, 28 units at Newington, 82 units at Stamford, 21 units at Waterbury, 127 units at West Hartford, and 58 units at Westport, Conn.; 1,116 units at Chicago, 18 units at Cicero, 189 units at Evanston, 85 units at Glencoe, 81 units at Highland Park, 1 unit at La Grange, 57 units at Lake Forest, 25 units at Northfield, 5 units at North Winnetka, 89 units at Oak Park, 20 units at Ravinia, 60 units at River Forest, and 12 units at Winnetka, Ill.; 46 units at Frederick, Md.; 45 units at Battle Creek, 291 units at Detroit, 56 units at Flint, 199 units at Grand Rapids, 24 units at Grosse Pointe, 112 units at Jackson, and 72 units at Pontiac, Mich.; 16 units at Elizabeth, 70 units at Englewood, 34 units at Maplewood, 20 units at Montclair, 35 units at Morristown, 67 units at Passaic, and 123 units at Ridgewood, N. J.; 822 units at Jackson Heights, L. I., 96 units at Kingston, 45 units at Newburgh, 70 units at New Rochelle, 1,147 units, 377 cartons each containing 12 bottles of curling solution, and 834 bottles of curling solution at New York, 83 units at Poughkeepsie, and 60 units at Scarsdale, N. Y.; 270 units at San Antonio, Tex.; 82 units at Salt Lake City, Utah; 82 units at Richmond, Va.; and 19 units at Seattle, Wash.

The libels alleged that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Heatless Permanent Wave Co. from San Francisco, Calif., within the period from on or about January 12, 1940, to on or about April 19, 1941; and charged that it was adulterated in that it contained a poisonous or deleterious substance, ammonium hydrogen sulfide, which might have rendered it injurious to users under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

Between May 24 and December 30, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**72. Adulteration of heatless method of permanent waving. U. S. v. 19 Cartons and 270 Units of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent Waving. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction.** (F. D. C. Nos. 4305, 4710 to 4713, incl. Sample Nos. 35187-E to 35190-E, incl., 56225-E.)

On April 11 and May 8, 1941, the United States attorneys for the Southern District of New York and the Western District of Texas filed libels against the following quantities of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent Waving: 19 cartons at New York, N. Y., and 270 units at San Antonio, Tex., all lots of which had been consigned by the Heatless Permanent Wave Co. from San Francisco, Calif., within the period from on or about December 24, 1940, to on or about March 20, 1941.

The libels charged that the article was adulterated in that it contained a poisonous or deleterious substance, ammonium hydrogen sulfide, which might have rendered it injurious to users under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

On September 15 and November 18, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**73. Adulteration of heatless method of permanent waving curling solution. U. S. v. 4 Cases and 1 Case of Willat Sulfolene Curling Solution No. 2. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.** (F. D. C. No. 4352. Sample No. 62123-E.)

On April 21, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 4 cases each containing 12 bottles and 1 case containing 9 bottles of Willat Sulfolene Curling Solution No. 2 at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 12, 1941, by Sophia Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it contained a poisonous or deleterious substance, ammonium hydrogen sulfide, which might have rendered it injurious to users under such conditions of use as are customary or usual. The article was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Willat Sulfolene \* \* \* Distributor Heatless Permanent Wave Co. San Francisco, Calif."

On September 16, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**74. Adulteration of heatless method of permanent waving. U. S. v. 12 Units and 60 Units of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent Waving. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction.** (F. D. C. Nos. 4569, 4584. Sample Nos. 69403-E, 69418-E.)

On May 3, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed libels against the following quantities of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent

Waving: 12 units at Stamford and 60 units at Norwich, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 20, 1940, and February 6 and 24 and April 4, 1941, by Heatless Permanent Wave Co. and Ashford Distributing Co. from San Francisco, Calif., and Jackson Heights, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it contained a poisonous or deleterious substance, ammonium hydrogen sulfide, which might have rendered it injurious to users under such conditions of use as are customary or usual. The curling solution contained in each unit was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Willat [or "Willat Wave"] De Luxe Curling Solution."

On September 20, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**75. Adulteration of heatless method of permanent waving. U. S. v. 12 Units, 12 Units, and 12 Units of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent Waving. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction.** (F. D. C. Nos. 4562, 4565, 4566. Sample Nos. 56631-E, 56634-E, 56635-E.)

On May 3, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed libels against the following quantities of Willat Method of Heatless Permanent Waving: 12 units at Waterbury and 24 units at Hartford, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 25, 1940, and February 8, 1941, by Ashford Distributing Co. from Jackson Heights, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it contained a poisonous or deleterious substance, ammonium hydrogen sulfide, which might have rendered it injurious to users under such conditions of use as are customary or usual. The curling solution contained in each unit was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Willat [or "Willat Wave"] De Luxe Curling Solution."

On September 20, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**76. Alleged adulteration of Roux Lash and Brow Tint. U. S. v. 8 Packages, 12 Packages, and 26 Packages of Roux Lash and Brow Tint. Cases ordered removed to the District of New Jersey for consolidation and trial. Tried to the court and jury. Disagreement of jury and mistrial declared. Case retried before the court and a jury verdict for claimant. Judgment dismissing libel and ordering product returned to claimant.** (F. D. C. Nos. 56, 62, 63. Sample Nos. 25976-D, 33229-D, 33230-D.)

This product consisted of three preparations, "No. 1," "No. 2" (Black and Brown), and "Stain Remover," respectively. "No. 1" consisted of about 2 percent of pyrogallol, with a little sodium lauryl sulfate and about 16 percent isopropyl alcohol; the "No. 2 Black" consisted of about 9 percent ammoniacal silver sulfate, about 5 percent ammoniacal silver nitrate, and  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent free ammonia in water; and "No. 2 Brown" was half the strength of "No. 2 Black." The stain remover consisted of  $\frac{1}{2}$  percent solution of sodium hypochlorite.

On August 13 and 24, 1938, the United States attorneys for the District of New Jersey and the Northern District of Illinois filed libels against 8 packages of Roux Lash and Brow Tint (Black) at Newark, N. J., 12 packages of Roux Lash and Brow Tint (Brown), and 26 packages of Roux Lash and Brow Tint (Black) at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 14 and 23, 1938, from New York, N. Y., by the Roux Distributing Co.; and charging that it was adulterated.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained poisonous and deleterious substances, namely, pyrogallol, ammoniacal silver sulfate, and silver nitrate, which might have rendered it injurious to users under the conditions of use prescribed in the following labeling and under such conditions of use as are customary or usual: (Carton) "Caution This product contains a metallic salt. It is for external use only and must be used with care"; (circular) "10 Rules For Applying Roux Lash And Brow Tint The observance of the ten simple rules set forth here below will produce the best results with the greatest degree of efficiency. Read these rules carefully. \* \* \* Rule No. 1—Sit patron in upright position. Rule No. 2—Instruct patron to keep eyes closed during entire treatment. Rule No. 3—Wash the brows and lashes thoroughly with a good neutral soap, and dry by padding with soft absorbent cotton. Rule No. 4—Place a layer of vaseline on one side of the eyeshield and place this shield under the lower lashes with the vaseline side against the lower lid. Rule No. 5—Now cover all skin adjacent to brows and lashes with vaseline. Do Not Get Any Vaseline On The Hair Structures. Any Part Of The Brows Or Lashes That Becomes Covered With Vaseline Or Other Oily Substance Will Not Take Coloring. Rule No. 6—Wind a piece of absorbent cotton around the end of a