

and allergic disorders, whereas the tablets would not be efficacious for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: November 24, 1950. Pleas of *nolo contendere* having been entered on behalf of the corporation to counts 1 and 2 and on behalf of the individual to count 2, the court imposed a fine of \$125 against each defendant. Count 1 against the individual was dismissed.

3315. Misbranding of Sodeene Osmotic Bath. U. S. v. 26 Cartons, etc. (F. D. C. No. 29388. Sample Nos. 71229-K to 71231-K, incl.)

LIBEL FILED: July 17, 1950, Southern District of California.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 20 and 28 and July 5, 1950, by the Consultants Laboratories of New Jersey and by H. H. Marshall, from Garden City, N. Y.

PRODUCT: 26 cartons, each containing 8 24-ounce packages, of *Sodeene Osmotic Bath* at Bellflower, Calif., together with a number of circulars entitled "Sodeene A New Type Of Therapy."

Examination indicated that the product consisted essentially of sodium carbonate, a wetting agent such as sodium lauryl sulfate, and an extract of plant material.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the accompanying circulars were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article was effective in the treatment of deep-seated infection, arthritis, sinusitis, rheumatic fever, inflammatory rheumatism, sciatica, neuritis, and many infections in the body fluids, including those of a virus nature, and that the article would be effective in bringing about a reabsorption of calcium deposits and in preventing polio, whereas the article was not effective in the treatment of the conditions stated and implied.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling, namely, the accompanying circular, contained statements which represented and suggested that the product had been approved by the Food and Drug Administration as effective in the treatment of the disease conditions stated, which statements were misleading since the Food and Drug Administration had not approved the product for the treatment of such disease conditions.

DISPOSITION: August 17, 1950. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

3316. Misbranding of Facializer device, DermaCulture Contour Mold device, DermaCulture Formula No. 103, cleansing lotion, herbal astringent, granular cleanser, DermaCulture Formula No. 102, and DermaCulture Formula No. 104. U. S. v. 1 Facializer Device, etc. (F. D. C. No. 27639. Sample Nos. 55233-K, 55252-K to 55256-K, incl., 55258-K, 55259-K.)

LIBEL FILED: August 22, 1949, Western District of Missouri.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about June 6 and December 2, 1948, and March 8, April 7, July 25, and August 5, 1949, by DermaCulture, Ltd., from Los Angeles, Calif.

PRODUCT: 2 *Facializer devices* with accessories, 20 *DermaCulture Contour Mold devices*, and a number of drugs at Kansas City, Mo., together with a manual entitled "DermaCulture NRB. 339." The drugs consisted of 26 2-ounce bottles of *DermaCulture Formula No. 103*, 24 bottles of *cleansing lotion*, 24 bottles of *herbal astringent* in 4-ounce, 8-ounce, and 1-pint sizes, 20 4-ounce jars of *granular cleanser*, 16 1-ounce bottles of *DermaCulture Formula No. 102*, and