

**5162. Adulteration and misbranding of so-called purified wool fat. U. S. \* \* \* v. Six Crates \* \* \* of \* \* \* Purified Wool Fat. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 7493. I. S. No. 617-1. S. No. E-635.)**

On June 2, 1916, 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 6 crates, each containing 2 cans holding approximately 44 pounds of a product purporting to be purified wool fat, consigned by the Hilton Chemical Co., Baltimore, Md., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 27, 1916, and transported from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled: "Purified Wool Fat 'Lord Baltimore Brand' Lanum Anhydrous 44 lbs Net Neutral and Non-irritating Ointment and Cream Base Made in Baltimore Hilton Chemical Co. Incorporated Baltimore, Md."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel 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 test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, and neither the strength, quality, nor purity was stated upon the containers thereof. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was sold as lanum or purified wool fat, whereas it contained petroleum products and thereby fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was labeled, "Lanum" or "Purified Wool Fat," when it was not such, and said statements were false and misleading. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the name of another article, to wit, lanum or purified wool fat, when in fact it was not such.

On July 20, 1916, the said Hilton Chemical Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bond in the sum of \$300, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part, that after the release of the goods they should be shipped to the claimant company at Baltimore, Md., and that they should not be reshipped or sold or otherwise disposed of without a label approved by the proper official or officials of the Department of Agriculture.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*