

Lyssandros D. Ravazola and Theodore D. Ravazola (Ravazola Bros.), New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about August 11, 1919, from the State of New York into the State of Maryland, of a quantity of salad oil which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Woman with olive branch) "Net contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gal. Oil superior Quality St. Bertolino Brand Packed by Ravazola Brothers, N. Y. Winter pressed cottonseed salad oil slightly flavored with pure olive oil a compound."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of cottonseed oil and was short volume.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that cottonseed oil had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements "Oil superior Quality" and "Net Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gal.," together with the design and device of an olive branch bearing olive, not corrected by the statements in inconspicuous type in an inconspicuous place, "Cottonseed salad oil slightly flavored with pure olive oil," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and its ingredients, were false and misleading, and labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the article was olive oil, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On November 17, 1920, the defendants entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**8784. Adulteration and misbranding of saccharin (soluble). U. S. * * *
v. The Hymes Bros. Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. No.
12893. I S No. 5384-r.)**

On October 4, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Hymes Bros. Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant company, on or about October 16, 1918, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, from the State of New York into the State of Oklahoma, of a quantity of saccharin (soluble) which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained about 19 per cent of sugar.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and that it differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by tests laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of said investigation, in that the article contained approximately 19 per cent of sugar, whereas said Pharmacopœia does not provide that sugar is an ingredient of soluble saccharin; the standard of strength, quality, and purity of said article was not declared on the container thereof.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Saccharine (Soluble)," borne on the can containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients thereof, was false and misleading in that it repre-

sented that said article was soluble saccharin, to wit, a product containing no sugar, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not soluble saccharin, but was a product which contained approximately 19 per cent of sugar.

On October 6, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty, and a fine of \$75 was imposed by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

S785. Misbranding of Texas Wonder. U. S. * * * v. 6 Dozen Bottles of Texas Wonder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12918. S. No. C-1983.)

On June 17, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 6 dozen bottles of Texas Wonder, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Muskogee, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 7, 1920, by E. W. Hall, St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Oklahoma and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Texas Wonder A Remedy for Kidney and Bladder Troubles, Weak and Lame Backs, Rheumatism and Gravel. Regulates Bladder Trouble in Children;" (circular) "Read Carefully * * * In cases of Gravel and Rheumatic troubles it should be taken every night in 25-drop doses until relieved."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of copaiba, rhubarb, colchicum, guaiac, turpentine, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the foregoing statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent in that said drug contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On July 19, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

S786. Adulteration and misbranding of concentrated sweetener. U. S. * * * v. 1 Tin of Wood's Special Concentrated Sweetener. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12975. I. S. No. 9319-r. S. No. C-1980.)

On July 1, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 tin containing 5 pounds of a product labeled in part, "Wood's Special Concentrated Sweetener 500," remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Washington, Iowa, shipped on or about June 4, 1920, by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Iowa, and charging adulteration and misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Wood's Special Concentrated Sweetener 500-500 Soluble in Cold Water. Not Sold As a Drug, W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it contained an added deleterious ingredient, to wit, saccharin, which might render it injurious to health, and for the further reason that a mixture of sugar, corn