

7548. Misbranding of Knoxit Liquid. U. S. * * * v. 48 Bottles of Knoxit Liquid, the Great Prophylactic. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10139. I. S. No. 6898-r. S. No. C-1186.)

On April 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 48 bottles of Knoxit Liquid the Great Prophylactic, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Nowata, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 25, 1918, by the Beggs Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Oklahoma, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Wholesale carton) "Knoxit the Great Gonorrhœa Remedy. Knoxit Safe, Sure, Guaranteed. Try It; Knoxit in Five Days;" (retail carton) "Knoxit the Great Prophylactic for Inflammation of the Mucous Membranes. Call For by Name Only. Avoid Substitutes. Prepared only by Beggs Manufacturing Co. Chicago-Toronto;" (on bottles) "Knoxit Liquid, the Great Prophylactic. * * * Prepared by Beggs Manufacturing Co. Chicago-Toronto;" (circular) "Knoxit Globules for the treatment of inflammation of mucous membranes * * *. If, however, the affection for which this remedy is used does not respond promptly to treatment, it is likely that the trouble is of such a character that it also requires a local application, in which case it would be advisable to use Knoxit Liquid in connection with Knoxit Globules."

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the packages, cartons, labels, and circulars accompanying the article bore the above-quoted statements, designs, and devices regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, and of the ingredients and substances contained therein, which were false and fraudulent in that the product contained no ingredients or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed for it, and for the further reason that it was a yellow aqueous solution containing chiefly glycerin, zinc acetate, and hydrastis, perfumed with oil of rose, which said ingredients or any combination of same were not capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed for it.

On June 25, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture 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.*

7549. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 93 1-Gallon Cans and 25 ½-Gallon Cans of Olive Oil (so-called). Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 10859. I. S. Nos. 14224-r, 14225-r. S. No. E-1633.)

On July 8, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, 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 93 1-gallon cans and 25 ½-gallon cans of olive oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Waterbury, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 26, 1919, by the Southern Importing Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Gallon