

or parasiticide in the dilutions suggested; that it would be of value as a wet dressing or irrigation in wounds in these dilutions; that it would penetrate the environment; that it would inhibit disease-producing micro-organisms; that it would be efficacious for the sterilization of surgical instruments and that it would be a reliable fungicide or germicide for animals, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes. (2) In that the label did not contain the common or usual names of the active ingredients.

On October 2, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**591. Misbranding of Hercules Congestors. U. S. v. 5 Hercules Congestors Model Regulator #500 and 6 Hercules Congestors Model Super 900. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5082. Sample No. 61021-E.)**

On July 7, 1941, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington filed a libel against the above-named articles at Seattle, Wash., alleging that they had been shipped on or about May 26, 1941, by Holdfast Truss Co. from Oakland, Calif.; and charging that they were misbranded.

Examination of samples showed that the articles consisted of a metal vacuum pump and a large glass tube bearing at one end a soft rubber collar and closed at the other end with a metal cap which was threaded to screw into the pump.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the following statements in a circular enclosed in each package by the dealer were false and misleading, "Organ Developer. This developer removes all obstructions in the organ, propels the blood rapidly through the disordered channels, and a quick and favorable result follows. \* \* \* This simple apparatus is called upon to increase the lost energy and remove the loss of strength. \* \* \* In most cases results come in a short time, while others of long standing require the patient use of the developer for five or six weeks"; and (2) in that the label failed to bear the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor.

On September 29, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**592. Misbranding of Ayds Candy. U. S. v. 73 Packages of Ayds Easy Reducing Plan Candy (and 5 other seizure actions against Ayds Candy). Default decrees of condemnation. Portion of product ordered destroyed; remainder ordered distributed to charitable institutions. (F. D. C. Nos. 2334, 3600, 3601, 3670, 3999, 4752. Sample Nos. 15617-E, 27514-E, 29201-E, 29202-E, 35926-E, 35935-E.)**

The labeling of this product bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy as a reducing agent.

Between July 11, 1940, and May 23, 1941, the United States attorneys for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Southern District of Ohio, and the Southern District of Alabama filed libels against 73 packages of Ayds Candy at Little Rock, Ark., 160 various-sized boxes at Cincinnati, Ohio, and 97 various-sized boxes at Mobile, Ala., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about May 4 to on or about December 10, 1940, by the Carlay Co., Fuller Laboratories, or Fuller Co., from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the name "Ayds," the designs of slender female figures, designs of slender female figures superimposed on obese female figures, a picture entitled "Before," showing obese woman and one entitled "After," showing, presumably, the same individual after having lost 40 pounds, and a poster with picture of a female figure with the words underneath "Now Weighs 130 Lbs. Weighed 160 Lbs.," appearing in the labeling of the various lots, together with statements in circulars accompanying the various shipments, were false and misleading in that the said words, designs, pictures, and statements created the impression in the mind of the reader that the article, when used as directed and in conjunction with and as a part of the so-called plans referred to in the circulars as No. 1 Plan and No. 2 Plan, would because of its composition and characteristics, be of substantial value in reducing body weight; that it would aid the consumer to reduce pleasantly and without effort and would aid the consumer to keep the weight down after having reduced to the desired weight; and that it would aid the consumer to cut down on the amount of food eaten without feeling pangs of hunger, distress, faintness or debilitation; whereas it would not be efficacious for the purposes suggested.

It also was alleged to be misbranded in violation of the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods.

Within the period from September 20, 1940, to August 19, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and those lots located at Cincinnati and Mobile were ordered distributed to various charitable institutions, and the remaining lots were ordered destroyed.

**593. Misbranding of Ayds Candy. U. S. v. 17 Boxes of Ayds Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4269. Sample No. 28268-E.)**

On April 9, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia filed a libel against 17 boxes of Ayds Candy, alleging that the article was in interstate commerce in the District of Columbia at the Vita Health Food Co., in the City of Washington, District of Columbia; and charging that it was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that representations in the labeling regarding its efficacy in effecting reduction of body weight in the consumer were false and misleading since they were incorrect; and (2) in that the combination of letters "Ayds Candy," appearing on the package label, constituted a false and misleading device since it meant to purchasers that the article was an appropriate and effective aid in reducing body weight—having acquired such meaning because of statements and designs appearing in a circular bearing the title legends "Now! Many Lose Weight by New, Easy Plan. Ayds Easy Reducing Plan and Candy": whereas the candy was not an effective and appropriate aid in reducing body weight.

It also was alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 2976.

On May 1, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**594. Misbranding of Slend-R-Form Candy. U. S. v. 91¼ Dozen Boxes of Slend-R-Form Candy (and 12 other seizure actions against Slend-R-Form Candy). Default decrees of condemnation. Portions of product ordered distributed to charitable institutions; remainder ordered destroyed. (F. D. C. Nos. 3599, 3916, 3924, 3998, 4017, 4201, 4678, 4768, 5048, 5239, 5240, 5749, 5758. Sample Nos. 5181-E, 11404-E, 22302-E, 38942-E, 39706-E, 43590-E, 44652-E, 47481-E, 52318-E to 52320-E, incl., 55422-E, 55604-E, 58291-E, 79928-E.)**

Between December 28, 1940, and September 17, 1941, the United States attorneys for the Eastern District of Missouri, Western District of Washington, Northern District of California, District of Oregon, Southern District of Ohio, Western District of Louisiana, Northern District of Oklahoma, Eastern District of Wisconsin, Southern District of Indiana, and the District of Minnesota filed libels against 9¼ dozen boxes of Slend-R-Form at St. Louis, Mo., 451 boxes at Seattle Wash., 140 boxes at San Francisco, Calif., 19 dozen boxes at Portland, Oreg., 140 boxes at Dayton, Ohio, 25 boxes at Appleton, Wis., 54 boxes at Lake Charles, La., 24 boxes at Tulsa, Okla., 126 boxes at Milwaukee, Wis., 16 boxes at Indianapolis, Ind., and 274 packages at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about October 28, 1940, to on or about August 7, 1941, by Riley Products, Inc., from Chicago, Ill. On March 10, 1941 the United States attorney for the District of Colorado filed a libel against 8 dozen boxes of Slend-R-Form Candy at Denver, Colo., which had been shipped by Riley Products, Inc., from Chicago, Ill., on or about December 3, 1940.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling regarding its efficacy in effecting a reduction of body weight in the consumer were false and misleading. The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in F. N. J. No. 2978.

Between January 30, 1941, and March 4, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered. The portions of the product located at Denver, Dayton, and Minneapolis were ordered distributed to charitable institutions and the remaining lots were ordered destroyed.

**595. Misbranding of Slend-R-Form. U. S. v. 58 Boxes of Slend-R-Form. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4290. Sample Nos. 24696-E, 37283-E.)**

On April 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 58 boxes of Slend-R-Form candy at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 2, 1941, by Thomas Martindale & Co. from Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was misbranded. This was a returned shipment and was part of a lot originally shipped to Philadelphia by Riley Products, Inc., from Chicago, Ill.