Represent: 0.0040 Gm. of the Alkaloids of Hyoscyamus," were false and misleading.

On May 29, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1270. Adulteration and misbranding of Ophthalets Epinephrine-Procaine Comp. U. S. v. 20 Boxes of Opthalets Epinephrine-Procaine Comp. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12373. Sample No. 55132-F.)

On May 16, 1944, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan filed a libel against 20 boxes, each containing 100 capsules, of the above-named product at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped between the approximate dates of January 27 and May 28, 1943, by the McNeil Laboratories, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article consisted of gelatin-coated capsules containing an opthalmologic ointment which was to be applied directly into the eye by clipping the tip end of the capsule and squeezing out the contents. Examination showed that the ointment contained not more than 1.30 percent of procaine.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess, "Procaine * * * 2.5%."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Procaine * * * 2.5%," was false and misleading.

On June 15, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1271. Adulteration and misbranding of Duchex. U. S. v. 18¼ Dozen Packages of Duchex. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 11998. Sample No. 67414-F.)

On March 13, 1944, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed a libel against 18¼ dozen packages of Duchex at Cleveland, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 9, 1944, by Hachmeister, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

Examination showed that the article consisted essentially of sodium bicarbonate, chloramine-T approximately 15 percent, and menthol. Bacteriological tests showed that the article was not a germicide.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and quality differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess, i. e., germicidal.

The article was alleged to be misbranded because of certain false and misleading statements in its labeling which represented and suggested that it was a germicide and would be effective in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of vaginal acidosis, nervousness, irritability, leucorrhea, pains of menstruation, and other physiological complications.

On June 24, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1272. Adulteration and misbranding of sutures. U. S. v. 89 Packages and 42 Packages (1,572 tubes) of Sutures (and 3 other seizure actions against sutures). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 11992, 12226, 12412, 12856. Sample Nos. 52177-F, 52179-F, 52593-F, 58476-F, 58477-F, 58493-F, 76775-F, 81625-F.)

Between March 13 and July 3, 1944, the United States attorneys for the District of Columbia, the Eastern District of New York, and the District of Massachusetts filed libels against the following quantities of sutures: 1,572 tubes at Washington, D. C., 8,640 tubes and 3,432 tubes at Brooklyn, N. Y., and 144 tubes at Brookline, Mass.; alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 14, November 15 and 20, and December 28, 1943, from Chicago, Ill., by the Salvus Products, Inc.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Salvus Sutures * * * Salvus Products Inc. Biochemists," or "Salvus Sutures * * * Davis & Pitann Ltd. Biochemists Chicago."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as catgut sutures, a drug the name of which is rceognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth therein since it was not sterile, but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements in its labeling,