

**5875. Adulteration and misbranding of tincture of iodine. U. S. \* \* \* v. R. Clifford Hines. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 8457. I. S. No. 4536-m.)**

On October 9, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the police court of said District an information against R. Clifford Hines, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on February 9, 1917, a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Tinct. Iodine," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Alcohol (per cent by volume).....	77.30
Iodin (grams per 100 mils).....	4.80
Potassium iodid (grams per 100 mils).....	3.87

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 differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in the said Pharmacopœia official at the time of the investigation of the said article, in that it contained in 100 mils 4.8 grams of iodine and 3.87 grams of potassium iodid, whereas said Pharmacopœia provides that it shall contain in 100 mils of the article not less than 6.5 grams of iodine and not less than 4.5 grams of potassium iodid; and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the said article was not declared on the container thereof.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement borne on the label attached to the bottle, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, to wit, "Alcohol 94.9%", was false and misleading in that it represented that said article contained 94.9 per cent of alcohol, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did not, but contained a less amount, to wit, 77.30 per cent of alcohol; and for the further reason that it contained alcohol, and the label on the bottle failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein.

On October 9, 1917, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*