

Lake & Burns Co., Flensburg, Minn., and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Indiana, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents of each of said 42 sacks was not then and there plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of said sacks in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On December 26, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be sold by the United States marshal.

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

**7724. Misbranding of Zip. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3 Dozen Bottles and 68 Bottles of Zip. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. Nos. 10408, 10409. I. S. Nos. 7045-r, 7046-r. S. Nos. C-1244, C-1245.)

On May 22, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the condemnation and forfeiture of 3 dozen bottles and 68 bottles of Zip, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 28, 1917, and December 24, 1918, by Baker-Levy Chemical Co., Indianapolis, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Missouri, and alleging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the product made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of acetates and sulphates of zinc and lead, opium, berberine, plant extractives, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the statements appearing on the labels and in the circular accompanying the article, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article and of the ingredients and substances contained therein, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was a treatment, remedy, and cure for gonorrhœa, gleet, and leucorrhœa, for male and female, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On April 3, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree 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.*

**7725. Misbranding of Santal-Midy Capsules. U. S. \* \* \* v. 36 Dozen Bottles \* \* \* Santal-Midy Capsules. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.** (F. & D. No. 10410. I. S. No. 2172-r. S. No. W-376.)

On May 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 condemnation and forfeiture of 36 dozen bottles of Santal-Midy Capsules, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 5, 1919, by E. Fougere & Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the product made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of gelatin capsules containing santal oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statements appearing on the labels, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article and of the ingredients and substances contained therein, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was a treatment, remedy, and cure for gonorrhœa, gleet, discharges from the urinary organs, secretion in gonorrhœa in the acute stage, inflammation of the bladder when the bladder walls are inflamed and even when there is hemorrhage, hematuria, suppurative nephritis, catarrh of the bladder, chronic catarrh of the bladder, vesical catarrh of old age, stricture of the urethra and congestion of the prostate, acute cystitis when the urine is colored with blood, and inflammation of the neck of the bladder, elimination of the uric acid indicated by the red deposit in the urine resembling gravel, and urethral catarrh accompanied by cystitis, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On December 3, 1919, E. Fougera & Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of said proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

**7726. Misbranding of Cu-co-ba Tarrant. U. S. \* \* \* v. 237 Boxes and 142 Boxes Cu-co-ba Tarrant. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 10399, 10400. I. S. Nos. 12929-r, 12928-r. S. Nos. E-1432, E-1433.)**

On May 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 237 boxes and 142 boxes of Cu-co-ba Tarrant, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned on or about February 4, 1919, February 25, 1919, April 21, 1919, and March 15, 1919, by the Tarrant Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the product made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of cubeb and copaiba with magnesium oxid.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the statements appearing on the labels and in the circular accompanying the article, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article and of the ingredients and substances contained therein, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was a treatment, remedy, and cure for excessive and annoying discharges, inflammations and irritations of the bladder, kidneys, prostate, urethra, and vagina, gleet, gonorrhœa and leucorrhœa when uncomplicated with diseases of the uterus or appendages, chronic bronchitis, inflammations of vagina, bladder, and kidneys, irritation of prostate, leucorrhœa or whites, contagious disorder known as gonorrhœa or clap, inflammation of the vagina, and in inflammations of the bladder and kidneys with frequent desire to urinate, whereas, in truth and fact, it was not.

On October 6, 1919, the Tarrant Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon the payment of the