

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.