

**COSMETICS SEIZED BECAUSE OF FALSE AND MISLEADING  
STATEMENTS IN THE LABELING**

**84. Misbranding of Ambrosia Tightener. U. S. v. 218 Dozen Bottles of Ambrosia Tightener. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4089. Sample No. 21977-E.)**

The label of this product contained false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy for the purposes for which it was recommended.

On March 31, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California filed a libel against 218 dozen bottles of Ambrosia Tightener at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from New York, N. Y., on or about December 6, 1940, and January 3, 1941, by Hinze Ambrosia, Inc.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article was an astringent lotion consisting essentially of alcohol, water, zinc phenosulfonate, and perfume material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading, since it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended: (Label) "Tightener for large pores, wrinkles, oiliness"; and (circular) "Ambrosia, The Pore-Deep Cleanser \* \* \* Not only cleanses pore deep but contributes to the well being of your skin Ambrosia Tightener \* \* \* Tends To Prevent The Enlargement Of Pores. It Is Especially Useful To Lessen Oiliness And Aids In Clearing Up Pimples And Muddy Complexions Resulting From External Causes \* \* \* Stimulates The Skin. Ambrosia Cream Contains Ingredients That Resemble The Natural Sebaceous Oils And Fats Of The Human Skin. \* \* \* It Helps To Make Dry Skin Smooth And Thus Aids In Removing The Annoying Tiny Lines Caused By Skin Dryness."

On May 20, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**85. Misbranding of Camelline. U. S. v. 9 Dozen Bottles of Camelline. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6948. Sample No. 63431-E.)**

On March 7, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against the above-named product at Portland, Oreg., alleging that it had been shipped on or about August 28, 1941, by Walter M. Willett from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article showed that it consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, bismuth subcarbonate, alcohol, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements in an accompanying circular suggesting and representing that when used as directed, it was a natural aid to beauty and greater charm, would keep the skin delicate and youthful, would preserve the youthful creamy appearance of the skin, was a stimulating lotion, would protect the skin against wind and sun, "was beauty and youth," would protect the face against the ravages of weather, and would prevent the disagreeable effects of exposure to the sun and wind, were false and misleading since it would not accomplish such results.

It also was alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in notices of judgment published on drugs and devices.

On April 13, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**86. Misbranding of skin stimulant and texture oil. U. S. v. 114 Bottles of La Bonita Hollywood Skin Stimulant and 24 Bottles of La Bonita Hollywood Texture Oil. Decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 4865, 4866. Sample Nos. 65607-E, 65608-E.)**

The labeling of these products contained false and misleading statements regarding their efficacy.

On June 9, 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 the House of Hollywood, alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 2, 1941, from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

La Bonita Hollywood Skin Stimulant was alleged to be misbranded in that the name "Skin Stimulant" was false and misleading, since the article contained no ingredient capable of stimulating the skin.

La Bonita Hollywood Texture Oil was alleged to be misbranded in that the name "Texture Oil," together with the statements, "Pat into the neck and jaw

line using a brisk slapping motion with the back of the hand. Non-fattening," were false and misleading since they gave the impression that it would affect the structure of the skin; whereas it would not.

Both articles were alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in notice of judgment D. D. N. J. No. 509.

On June 27, 1941, the House of Hollywood of Los Angeles, Calif., having signed an acceptance of service and authorization for taking of final decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**87. Misbranding of Chin-Firm. U. S. v. 62 $\frac{2}{3}$  Dozen Packages of Chin-Firm. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4951. Sample No. 40820-E.)**

On June 18, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against the the above-named product at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that it had been shipped on or about April 1, 2, 10, and 11, 1941, by the Burtley Co. from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of a clay, water, and perfume.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes: "For the Chin and Throat Line Chin-Firm \* \* \* (crowsfeet). In a few minutes you will actually feel the tightening 'Uplift' effect of Chin-Firm \* \* \* for the relaxed or sagging muscles of the Chin and Throatline. Its stimulating 'uplift' effect \* \* \*."

On October 9, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**88. Misbranding of Chin-Up. U. S. v. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  Dozen 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ -Ounce Bottles and 10 5-Ounce Bottles of Chin-Up. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5147. Sample No. 22349-E.)**

The label of this product bore false and misleading statements regarding its alcoholic content and its value as a skin tightener.

On July 15, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California filed a libel against the above-named product at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that it had been shipped on or about June 3, 1941, by L. R. Kallman & Co. from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of alcohol (53.4 percent by volume), tannic acid, water, and perfume material.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label were false and misleading since it contained materially more than the declared amount of alcohol and since its use would not result in the elimination of crepy skin or flabby tissues of neck or chin: "Paint Chin-Up on Crepy Skin or Flabby Tissue of Neck or Chin \* \* \* You Can Actually Feel the Tightening Action of Chin-Up \* \* \* 39 Per Cent Alcohol."

On August 14, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**89. Misbranding of Natone Natural Oil for the Hair. U. S. v. 137 Retail Packages of Natone Natural Oil for the Hair. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5460. Sample No. 61352-E.)**

This product was not natural oil and would not promote hair growth as represented in the labeling.

On August 27, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against the above-named product, alleging that it had been shipped on or about June 20, 1941, by J. D. Bentley from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of saponifiable and unsaponifiable fat, perfume, water, and a small amount of phenol.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements (carton) "Natural Oil" and (bottle label) "Natural Oil \* \* \* to promote the growth of hair," were false and misleading since it was not a naturally occurring oil nor did it contain any ingredient capable of promoting growth of hair.

On October 15, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.