

than 2.67 percent of whole egg and that it had been colored to resemble egg, with D&C Yellow No. 10.

LABEL, IN PART: "Helene Curtis Egg Shampoo Highly Concentrated."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Egg Shampoo Highly Concentrated" was false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: August 27, 1948. The Helene Curtis Industries, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

169. Misbranding of LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo. U. S. v. 20 Bottles, etc.
(F. D. C. No. 24498. Sample Nos. 25545-K, 25546-K.)

LABEL FILED: March 19, 1948, Southern District of Iowa.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about January 19 and February 6, 1948, by LaMaur Products, Inc., from Minneapolis, Minn.

PRODUCT: 20 1-gallon bottles and 48 8-ounce bottles of LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo at Burlington, Iowa. Examination showed that the product contained not more than 0.8 percent of dry egg, which was equivalent to approximately one-fifth of an egg in each eight-ounce bottle.

LABEL, IN PART: "LaMaur Egg and Lanolin Shampoo."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Egg * * * Shampoo" and the egg-shaped label were false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: April 29, 1948. LaMaur Products, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

170. Misbranding of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo. U. S. v. 11 Jars * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 24688. Sample No. 451-K.)

LABEL FILED: March 26, 1948, Middle District of North Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 5, 1948, by Caryl Richards, Inc., from Brooklyn, N. Y.

PRODUCT: 11 1-gallon jars of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo at Greensboro, N. C. Examination showed that the product was colored yellow with D&C Yellow No. 10 and that it contained not more than 0.56 percent of egg.

LABEL, IN PART: "Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statements "Eggfoam * * * With Egg * * * Eggfoam Shampoo incorporates the use of whole egg to produce a richer more luxurious shampoo treatment * * * Highly concentrated" were false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: June 28, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

171. Misbranding of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo. U. S. v. 17 Deals * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 25157. Sample No. 476-K.)

LABEL FILED: August 9, 1948, Western District of South Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 10, 1948, by Caryl Richards, Inc., from Brooklyn, N. Y.

PRODUCT: 17 deals, each containing 4 quart jars and 6 8-ounce jars, of Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo at Spartanburg, S. C. Examination showed that the product was colored yellow with D&C Yellow No. 10 and that it contained not more than 0.4 percent of egg.

LABEL, IN PART: (Jar) "Caryl Richards Eggfoam Shampoo with Egg and Lanolin."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statements "Egg-foam * * * With Egg * * * Eggfoam Shampoo incorporates the use of whole egg to produce a richer more luxurious shampoo treatment * * * Highly concentrated" were false and misleading since the article was not an egg shampoo.

DISPOSITION: September 18, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

172. Misbranding of Queen Hair Dressing and Mack's Olive Oil Hair Pomade.
U. S. v. 59 Cases, etc. (F. D. C. No. 24729. Sample Nos. 460-K, 461-K.)

LIBEL FILED: April 16, 1948, Western District of North Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 4, 1948, by the Newbro Mfg. Co., from Atlanta, Ga.

PRODUCT: 59 cases, each containing 12 1½-ounce cans of Queen Hair Dressing and 299 dozen, 4-ounce cans, of Mack's Olive Oil Hair Pomade at Charlotte, N. C. Examination showed that the hair dressing consisted essentially of petrolatum, with not more than 2 percent of a saponifiable oil such as olive oil, and small proportions of salicylic acid, resorcinol, monoacetate, and perfume; and that the hair pomade consisted essentially of perfumed petrolatum, with a very small proportion of a saponifiable oil such as olive oil.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Hair dressing. Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statements "Olive Oil and Rezolium Hair Dressing * * * containing both the precious, magic-like Rezolium and olive oil * * * now with olive oil and Rezolium" were false and misleading since there is no such product as rezolium and since the article consisted essentially of petrolatum rather than olive oil.

Hair pomade. Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Olive Oil Hair Pomade" was false and misleading since the article was a petrolatum pomade.

DISPOSITION: June 16, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

173. Misbranding of Mack's Olive Oil Hair Pomade. U. S. v. 13 Cases * * *
(F. D. C. No. 25482. Sample No. 777-K.)

LIBEL FILED: September 1, 1948, Southern District of Florida.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about July 7, 1948, by the Newbro Mfg. Co., from Atlanta, Ga.

PRODUCT: 13 cases, each containing 72 4-ounce cans, of Mack's Olive Oil Hair Pomade at Jacksonville, Fla. Examination showed that the product consisted essentially of perfumed petrolatum, with a very small proportion of a saponifiable oil such as olive oil.

LABEL, IN PART: "Mack's Olive Oil Hair Pomade."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the label statement "Olive Oil Hair Pomade" was false and misleading since the article was a petrolatum pomade.

DISPOSITION: October 26, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.