

than 2.67 percent of whole egg and that it had been colored to resemble egg, with D&C Yellow No. 10.

LABEL, IN PART: "Helene Curtis Egg Shampoo Highly Concentrated."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Egg Shampoo Highly Concentrated" was false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: August 27, 1948. The Helene Curtis Industries, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

169. Misbranding of LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo. U. S. v. 20 Bottles, etc.
(F. D. C. No. 24498. Sample Nos. 25545-K, 25546-K.)

LABEL FILED: March 19, 1948, Southern District of Iowa.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about January 19 and February 6, 1948, by LaMaur Products, Inc., from Minneapolis, Minn.

PRODUCT: 20 1-gallon bottles and 48 8-ounce bottles of LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo at Burlington, Iowa. Examination showed that the product contained not more than 0.8 percent of dry egg, which was equivalent to approximately one-fifth of an egg in each eight-ounce bottle.

LABEL, IN PART: "LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Egg * * * Shampoo" and the egg-shaped label were false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: April 29, 1948. LaMaur Products, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

170. Misbranding of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo. U. S. v. 11 Jars * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 24688. Sample No. 451-K.)

LABEL FILED: March 26, 1948, Middle District of North Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 5, 1948, by Caryl Richards, Inc., from Brooklyn, N. Y.

PRODUCT: 11 1-gallon jars of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo at Greensboro, N. C. Examination showed that the product was colored yellow with D&C Yellow No. 10 and that it contained not more than 0.56 percent of egg.

LABEL, IN PART: "Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statements "Eggfoam * * * With Egg * * * Eggfoam Shampoo incorporates the use of whole egg to produce a richer more luxurious shampoo treatment * * * Highly concentrated" were false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: June 28, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

171. Misbranding of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo. U. S. v. 17 Deals * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 25157. Sample No. 476-K.)

LABEL FILED: August 9, 1948, Western District of South Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 10, 1948, by Caryl Richards, Inc., from Brooklyn, N. Y.