

587. Misbranding of Bo-Go-Ha-Ma Mineral Springs Water. U. S. v. 32 Jugs of Mineral Water. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 6191. Sample No. 49865-E.)

On November 7, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana filed a libel against 32 gallon jugs of mineral water at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 20, 1941, by Stafford Mineral Springs Co. from Vosburg, Miss.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it was a mildly alkaline water similar to Washington tap water, except that it contained about twice the amount of dissolved mineral matter.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "It is * * * very soothing and healing to the kidneys and bladder" was false and misleading since it would be neither soothing nor healing to the kidneys.

It was also alleged to be adulterated under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 2830.

On December 24, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

588. Misbranding of mineral oil. U. S. v. 141 Bottles of Russian Type Mineral Oil. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4401. Sample No. 50228-E.)

This product was mineral oil of domestic origin. It was labeled in conspicuous type "Russian Type Mineral Oil," and in much smaller type "Made in U. S. A."

On April 19, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia filed a libel against the above-named product at Richmond, Va., alleging that it had been shipped on or about March 24, 1941, by Adde, Inc., from Baltimore, Md.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the conspicuous statement on the label, "Russian Type Mineral Oil," was misleading as applied to a domestic mineral oil.

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

589. Misbranding of Lurin. U. S. v. 296 Bottles of Lurin. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4808. Sample No. 62133-E.)

On May 22, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 296 bottles of Lurin at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 8 and 19, 1941, by the Lurin Co. from Cleveland, Ohio; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of aluminum hydroxide (2.1 grams per 100 cc.) and water flavored with peppermint oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that statements on the label, "Alcoholic Over Indulgence" and "Where Used in the Treatment of Active Peptic Ulcers," were false and misleading since it was not an adequate treatment for those conditions; (2) in that the statement on the label, "Combines with at least 12 times its volume of N/10 Hydrochloric Acid," was false and misleading since the volume of aluminum hydroxide that it contained was sufficient to combine with only 8.08 volumes of N/10 hydrochloric acid; and (3) in that the statement on the label, "Contents 8 Fl. Oz.," was false and misleading since it contained less than 8 fluid ounces.

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

590. Misbranding of Waft-Surgical. U. S. v. 2½ Dozen Packages of Waft-Surgical. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5430. Sample No. 27876-E.)

On August 26, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Indiana filed a libel against the above-named product at Evansville, Ind., alleging that it had been shipped on or about May 30, 1941, by the Federal Cosmetic Sales Corporation from Springfield, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Waft-Surgical Antiseptic-Disinfectant-Deodorant-Fungicide-Germicide-Parasiticide."

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, small amounts of turpeneol, and a yellow-green coloring material.

It was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that representations in the labeling that it would be efficacious as an antiseptic, disinfectant, fungicide, germicide