FTC v. Met-RX USA, Inc.

©www.mlmlegal.com

Welcome to the MLMLegal.com Legal Cases Project. Here you will find hundreds of legal cases in the fields of MLM, Direct Selling, Network Marketing, Multilevel Marketing and Party Plan. The cases span federal and state courts as well as administrative cases from the FTC, FDA, IRS, SEC, worker's compensation, unemployment compensation, etc.

The intent of the MLMLegal.com Cases Project is strictly educational, and, to provide insight into the legal issues and cases for an industry that spans the globe in upwards of 150 countries with sales volume exceeding \$100 billion and distributor involvement in the tens of millions.

MLMLegal.Com does not promote or endorse any company. MLMLegal.Com offers no value judgments, either pro or con, regarding the companies profiled in legal cases.

Jeffrey A. Babener, principal attorney in the Portland, Oregon, law firm Babener & Associates, and editor of www.mlmlegal.com, represents many of the leading direct selling companies in the United States and abroad.

www.mlmlegal.com www.mlmlegal.com www.mlmlegal.com

FTC v. Met-RX USA, Inc.

Case: FTC v. Met-RX USA, Inc. (1999)

Subject Category: Federal agencies, FTC, Marketing

Agency Involved: Federal Trade Commission

Complaint Synopsis: Met-RX sold nutritional supplements, including a line of androgen supplements under the brand name "Substrate Solutions." The products were advertised to increase strength and muscle mass, and to be safe, produce no or minimal side effects, and did not pose the health and safety risks of anabolic steroids. One of Met-RX's androgen supplements also included caffeine and ephedrine. The FTC alleged that Met-RX had violated the FTC because they did not have a reasonable basis to substantiate their representations about the lack of side effects, noting the effects of ephedrine.

Consent Details: Met-RX was permanently enjoined from making claims that their product is safe, has minimal or no side effects, or the comparative or superior safety of a product without having competent and reliable scientific evidence to substantiate their representation, and was required to include warnings on products that contained androgen or ephedrine. Met-RX was also required to monitor their resellers to ensure that the resellers were not making claims that Met-RX was prohibited from making.

Practical Importance to Business of MLM/Direct Sales/Direct Selling/Network Marketing/Party
Plan/Multilevel Marketing: Even claims that a health product does not produce certain effects must be

substantiated by scientific evidence, including claims that a product is safer than an alternative, legal or not.

FTC v. Met-RX USA, Inc., Civil Action No. SAC V-99-1407 (C.D. Calif. 1999): Met-RX sold nutritional supplements, including a line of androgen supplements under the brand name "Substrate Solutions." The products were advertised to increase strength and muscle mass, and to be safe, produce no or minimal side effects, and did not pose the health and safety risks of anabolic steroids. The FTC alleged that Met-RX had violated the FTC because they did not have a reasonable basis to substantiate their representations.

http://www.mlmlegal.com/legal-cases/FTC v MetRXUSA.php