The information also alleged that the articles were misbranded under the Insecticide Act of 1910, as reported in notice of judgment no. 1456 published under that act.

On June 26, 1936, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of $150 for violations of both acts.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25805. Adulteration and misbranding of Exserco Antiseptic Deodorant Disinfectant. U. S. v. Exterminating Service Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $100 and costs. (F. & D. no. 36054. Sample nos. 23844–B, 23900–B.)

This product fell below its professed strength with respect to antiseptic and disinfecting properties, and bore on the labeling curative and therapeutic claims which were adjudged to be false and fraudulent.

On December 24, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Exterminating Service Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended on or about April 9, 1934, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, of quantities of Exserco Antiseptic Deodorant Disinfectant that was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples showed that the article consisted essentially of soap, water, coal-tar neutral oils, and phenols.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, since it was represented to be an antiseptic and a disinfectant when used as directed; whereas it was not an antiseptic and was not a disinfectant when used as directed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding its therapeutic and curative effects, appearing on the bottle label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as an antiseptic and as a disinfectant; was effective as a treatment for hair and scalp; was effective as a douche; and was effective as a treatment and remedy for chapping, itching, and minor wounds.

The information also charged that the product was further adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910, reported in notice of judgment no. 1457 published under that act.

On April 13, 1936, a plea of guilty was entered on all counts and the court imposed a fine of $100 and costs for violations of both acts.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*

25806. Misbranding of Gyptol. U. S. v. Folsom Extract Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $10. (F. & D. no. 36950. Sample no. 36546–B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of an article described as "Gyptol", the label of which bore a false and misleading representation regarding its antiseptic properties, and false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative and therapeutic effects.

On March 2, 1936, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Folsom Extract Co., Inc., Lynn, Mass., charging shipment by said corporation on or about July 18, 1935, from the State of Massachusetts into the State of New Hampshire, of a quantity of an article described as "Gyptol" which was misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the product consisted of soap, phenols, coal-tar neutral oils, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "As an antiseptic * * * Teaspoonful to a quart of water * * * prevents infection", borne on the label, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was an antiseptic when used as directed; whereas it was not an antiseptic when used as directed. The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, appearing on the label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it would be effective to relieve pain, prevent infection, and quicken healing.

The information also alleged that the article was misbranded under the Insecticide Act of 1910, as reported in notice of judgment no. 1458 published under that act.

On August 17, 1936, a plea of guilty was entered to all counts, and the court imposed a fine of $10 on the counts charging violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*