

- ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about November 1, 1948, by the Electric Cord Co., from New York, N. Y.
- PRODUCT:** 100 *Roll a Ray heat massage devices* at Chicago, Ill. Examination showed that the device consisted of a brown plastic molded case with a handle attached. The case enclosed a 60-watt light bulb and two rubber rollers placed at either end of the bottom part of the case. The rollers contacted the body for massaging purposes, and the light bulb furnished the heat. A plastic grid was fitted over the bulb to protect the body from contact with the lamp.
- LABEL, IN PART:** "Roll a Ray Heat Massage With Infra Red Division Of The O. A. Sutton Corporation Wichita, Kansas."
- NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "For Home Reducing and an Aid in the Relief of Discomforts Arising from Rheumatism, Lumbago, Muscular Aches, Physical Aches * * * for Health and Beauty * * * to remove fatty tissues. Many varied ailments respond to application of heat and massage * * * for loosening muscles and assisting in driving fatty tissues away" were false and misleading since heat and massage are not adequate treatments for such purposes.
- DISPOSITION:** May 10, 1950. The Fair Co., Chicago, Ill., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the court ordered that the devices be released under bond for modification and relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency. The devices were modified by replacing the bulbs contained therein with 30-watt bulbs and by inserting a foil reflector in the grid; they then were relabeled in compliance with the law.
- 3318. Misbranding of plastic suits. U. S. v. 488 Cartons * * *. (F. D. C. No. 29404. Sample No. 81210-K.)**
- LABEL FILED:** July 18, 1950, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about April 12 and 24 and May 4, 1950, by the Advance Mfg. Co., from Mount Vernon, Ind.
- PRODUCT:** 488 cartons each containing a *plastic suit* and a copy of a circular entitled "Fashion Form" at Philadelphia, Pa. Examination showed that the suit was a coverall made of plastic, with elastic bands at wrists, ankles, and neck. It was to be worn to induce perspiration.
- LABEL, IN PART:** (Carton) "Fashion Form Style 3800 Color Clear."
- NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements in the labeling of the device were false and misleading: (Carton) "Fashion Form" and (circular) "Fashion Form * * * An aid to reducing * * * You may find your health improved * * * your Fashion-Form is not only an aid to losing weight but also contributes to your general health by inducing perspiration." Such statements represented and suggested that the device when used as directed was effective for bringing about a reduction of body weight, resulting in improved health and fashionable form, whereas the device was not capable of fulfilling such promises of benefit.
- DISPOSITION:** October 9, 1950. Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the court ordered that the devices be released for relabeling, under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.