caffeine alk., whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said tablets did not contain 3½ grains of acetanilid and did not contain ½ of a grain of caffeine alk. but did contain a less amount, to wit, 2.89 grains of acetanilid and 0.34 grain of caffeine alk.

On March 2, 1923, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11391. Misbranding of Texas Wonder. U. S. v. 30 Bottles and 33 Bottles of Texas Wonder. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 12242, 12850. I. S. Nos. 135–r, 282–r. S. Nos. E–2026, E–2334.)

On March 10 and June 7, 1920, respectively, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 66 bottles of Texas Wonder, remaining unsold in the original packages at Savannah, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped by E. W. Hall, St. Louis, Mo., in part on or about February 21, 1920, and in part on or about May 24, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Georgia, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "A Remedy For Kidney and Bladder Troubles Weak and Lame Backs, Rheumatism and Gravel. Regulates Bladder Trouble in Children;" (circular headed "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 article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of copaiba, guaiac resin, extracts of rhubarb and colchicum, an oil similar to turpentine oil, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the above-quoted statements appearing on the carton and in the circular were false and fraudulent since the said article contained no ingredients or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed.

On March 6, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11392. Misbranding of candy. U. S. v. W. G. Baldwin & Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $10. (F. & D. No. 15582. I. S. Nos. 9121–t, 9167–t, 9217–t.)

On January 26, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against W. G. Baldwin & Co., a corporation, trading at Roanoke, Va., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, in various consignments, namely, on or about October 2, 1920, and April 7, 1921, respectively, from the State of Virginia into the State of Georgia, of quantities of candy which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Old Time — Home Made * * * Martha Washington Candies Hard Centers" (or "Vanilla Jets" or "Chocolate Centers") "Headquarters: 505 12th St., N. W. Washington, D. C.;" (stamped indistinctly on bottom of package with rubber stamp) "Guaranteed Net Weight 7 Ozs. or more" or "Guaranteed Net Weight 14¼ Ozs. or more."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On February 14, 1923, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11393. Misbranding of Sangvin. U. S. v. 33 Bottles and 18 Bottles of Sangvin. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 16883, 16897. I. S. No. 1014–v. S. Nos. E–4199, E–4205.)

On October 25 and 31, 1922, respectively, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the