It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in its labeling, "Double Strength Yeast Extract * * * A Scientific formula combining the essential properties of Yeast Vitamines * * * Made With Brewer's Yeast. These tablets contain vitamins B and G which are known to stimulate the appetite," were false and misleading since they represented that the article, by reason of its yeast content, was a valuable source of the vitamins of yeast and that the vitamins B and G provided by the yeast would stimulate the appetite, whereas the article was not a valuable source of the vitamins of yeast in that it contained only small quantities of vitamins ordinarily present in yeast, and the vitamins B and G provided by the yeast would not stimulate the appetite. The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that it contained strychnine and its label failed to bear the name and quantity thereof.

On October 15, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

992. Misbranding of Dr. Wolff's Pro-cys-kera Ointment. U. S. v. 21 Jars and 2 Jars of Dr. Wolff's Pro-cys-kera Ointment. Decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 8476. Sample No. 2093-F.)

Examination showed that this product consisted essentially of sulfur, salicylic acid, menthol, camphor, and ichthyol, incorporated in a base of saponifiable fat, lecithin, and cholesterin.

On October 1, 1942, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin filed a libel against 21 jars, each containing 1 ounce, and 2 jars, each containing 4 ounces, of the above-named product at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 3, 1942, from Chicago, Ill., by Dr. George F. Wolff; and charging it was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in its labeling which represented and suggested that it eradicated scalp disorders, and would nourish, strengthen, and promote the growth of the hair, penetrate the scalp and prevent infection, were false and misleading since it was not capable of eradicating scalp disorders and would not accomplish the results claimed.

On November 11, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

993. Misbranding of Formula "U." U. S. v. 73 6-Ounce Bottles and 18 12-Ounce Bottles of Formula "U." Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 8680. Sample No. 18765-F.)

Examination showed that this product consisted essentially of water, carbolic acid, sugars, thymol, sage, alum, borates, and aromatic substances.

On November 10, 1942, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against the above-listed amounts of Formula "U" at Newburg, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 5, 1942, by Universal Antiseptic & Research Laboratories, Inc., Bristol, Tenn.; and charging that it was misbranded.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements and cuts appearing in its labeling which represented and suggested that the article was an adequate treatment for major burns, varicose ulcers, and infected gums were false and misleading since the article was not an adequate treatment for such conditions.

On December 2, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

994. Misbranding of Adolorine. U. S. v. 31 Bottles of Adolorine. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 8922. Sample No. 31703-F.)

On November 25, 1942, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed a libel against 31 bottles of Adolorine at Wooster, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 15, 1942, by John I. Wean from Eustis, Fla.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination showed that the article consisted essentially of mustard oil, oil of thyme, and a low-boiling petroleum oil.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in its labeling which represented and suggested that it was an effective remedy for soreness of muscles and joints from strain or overwork, for sprains, bruises, relief for itching, and for nasal irritations, were false and misleading since the article was not an effective remedy for such conditions. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and its label failed to bear the common or usual name of each active ingredient since the