NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 403 (a), the label statements, "Average amount per oz. (28.4 Grams) or 2 heaping tablespoons Vitamin B<sub>1</sub> (U. S. P. or International Units) 414.8 \* \* \* Niacin \* \* \* (Milligrams) 1.95," were false and misleading since 1 ounce (28.4 grams) or 2 heaping tablespoonfuls of the article contained not more than 250 U. S. P. or International Units of

vitamin B<sub>1</sub> and not more than 1.33 milligrams of niacin.

Further misbranding, Section 403 (a), the labeling was misleading since the statement, "Contains Vitamins \* \* \* G & E" represented and suggested that the article, when used as directed or as customarily consumed, would supply an appreciable amount of vitamin G, and that the need for vitamin E in human nutrition has been established; and the labeling failed to reveal the fact, material in the light of the above statement, that the article would supply an inconsequential amount of vitamin G and that the need for vitamin E in

human nutrition has not been established.

Further misbranding, Section 403 (j), the article purported to be and was represented for special dietary uses by man by reason of its vitamin properties in respect of vitamin A, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, riboflavin, and vitamin E, and by reason of its mineral properties in respect of iron, calcium, and phosphorus, and its label did not bear a statement, as required by regulations, of the proportion of the minimum daily requirements for vitamin A, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, and riboflavin which would be supplied by the article when consumed in a specified quantity during a period of 1 day, nor a statement of the proportion of the minimum daily requirements for iron, calcium, and phosphorus which would be supplied by the article when consumed in a specified quantity during a period of 1 day. Furthermore, the label failed to bear, as required by the regulations, the statement that "The need for vitamin E in human nutrition has not been established."

DISPOSITION: November 12, 1945. A plea of guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$25.

9187. Adulteration and misbranding of vitamin capsules. U. S. v. 7 Drums of ABDG Capsules. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 16434. Sample No. 16227-H.)

LIBEL FILED: June 22, 1945, Northern District of Illinois.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 3, 1945, by the Keith-Victor Pharmacal Co., from St. Louis, Mo.

PRODUCT: 7 drums containing 200,000 vitamin capsules at Chicago, Ill. Examination showed that the product contained not more than 50 percent of the declared amount of vitamin  $B_1$ .

LABEL, IN PART: "Sugar Coated Brown ABDG Spheroid Gelatin Capsules."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 402 (b) (1), a valuable constituent, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, had been in part omitted from the article.

Misbranding, Section 403 (a), the label statement, "Each Spheroid Contains: \* \* \* Vitamin B<sub>1</sub> (Thiamin Chloride USP) 333 I. U. 1 Mg.," was false and misleading.

Disposition: November 6, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

9188. Misbranding of Hi-Lo Vitamin and Mineral Tablets. U. S. v. 41 Bottles of Hi-Lo Vitamin and Mineral Tablets, and a quantity of printed matter. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 16639. Sample No. 29574-H.)

LIBEL FILED: June 25, 1945, Northern District of California.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: By Hi-Lo Products, from St. Louis, Mo. The tablets were shipped on or about July 12, 1944, and February 13, 1945, and the printed matter was shipped on or about May 22, 1944.

Product: 24 32-tablet bottles, 5 100-tablet bottles, and 12 300-tablet bottles of Hi-Lo Vitamin and Mineral Tablets at San Francisco, Calif., together with 4,000 circulars entitled "Why Run Around in Circles Trying to Get All the Vitamins Needed" and a window display poster entitled "Vitamins and Minerals are Foods."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 403 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading. The article was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in notices of judgment on drugs and devices, No. 1791, in which are set forth