11, 1940; and charging that they were adulterated and that the Paulette Hair Dressing was also misbranded. The brilliantine was labeled in part: "Brilliantine Roland * * * Toiletries Moderne."

All of the products were alleged to be adulterated in that they consisted in part of filthy substances; and in that they had been prepared or packed under insanitary conditions whereby they might have become contaminated with filth.

The Paulette Hair Dressing was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Cont. 8 Fl. Ozs.," appearing on the label, was false and misleading since it was incorrect.

On December 9, 1940, and April 18, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

MISCELLANEOUS

64. Misbranding of Quinlan Pore Cream and Quinlan Skin Stimulant. U. S. v. 101 Jars of Quinlan Pore Cream and 597 Bottles of Quinlan Skin Stimulant. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 4393, 4395. Sample Nos. 56258–E, 56762–E.)

The labeling of these products contained false and misleading representations regarding their efficacy, as indicated below.

On April 18, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York filed a libel against 101 jars of Quinlan Pore Cream and 597 bottles of Quinlan Skin Stimulant at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the articles had been shipped within the period from on or about January 15 to on or about February 20, 1941, by Pond's Extract Co. from Clinton, Conn.; and charging that they were misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: "Quinlan Pore Cream [or "Quinlan Skin Stimulant"] Kathleen Mary Quinlan, Inc. Distributor * * * New York."

Analysis showed that the pore cream consisted essentially of petrolatum, zinc oxide, lanolin, water, and perfume; and that the skin stimulant consisted essentially of alcohol, water, glycerin, perfume, and coloring matter.

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented that they were efficacious for the purposes recommended; whereas they were not efficacious for such purposes: "Pore Cream * * * coarse pores and texture," and "Skin Stimulant."

On July 16, 1941, the case having been called and no claim or answer appearing of record, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

65. Misbranding of "nutrient" and "youth" creams. U. S. v. 12 Dozen Packages of California Nutrient Cream and 17½ Dozen Packages of Sue Sorrell Texture of Youth Cream. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3604. Sample Nos. 31525–E, 31526–E.)

These products contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients which would produce the improvement in skin nutrition or texture implied on their respective labels.

On December 28, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan filed a libel against the above-named products at Detroit, Mich., alleging that they had been shipped in interstate commerce by Jeanne Tredway from New York, N. Y., the nutrient cream on or about October 31 and December 3, 1940, and the texture of youth cream on or about June 27, 1940; and charging that they were misbranded.

Examination showed that both articles consisted essentially of hydrocarbon oils, lanolin, and perfume material. The nutrient cream was also found to contain sodium borate.

The California Nutrient Cream was alleged to be misbranded in that the designation "Nutrient Cream" was false and misleading.

The Sue Sorrell Texture of Youth Cream was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "* * * an aid in warding off fine lines and wrinkles," appearing on the label, was false and misleading.

On February 5, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.