14077. Adulteration of canned shrimp. U. S. v. 24¾ Cases of Canned Shrimp. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20723. I. S. No. 5457–x. S. No. E–5555.)

On December 18, 1925, 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 a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 24¾ cases of canned shrimp, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Worcester, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Houma Packing Co., Inc., Houma, La., and transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On February 2, 1926, 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.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14078. Adulteration of chestnuts. U. S. v. 9 Cases of Chestnuts. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 19412. I. S. No. 22138–v. S. No. C–4588.)

On December 23, 1924, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 9 cases of chestnuts, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by P. Pastene & Co., from Boston, Mass., November 19, 1924, and transported from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 12, 1925, 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.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14079. Misbranding of A. D. S. special kidney and bladder pills. U. S. v. 31 Packages of A. D. S. Special Kidney and Bladder Pills. Default decree of confiscation and destruction entered. (F. & D. No. 19449. I. S. No. 17716–v. S. No. C–4598.)

On December 30, 1924, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 31 packages of A. D. S. special kidney and bladder pills, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Lansing, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by the American Druggists Syndicate, Chicago, Ill., October 17, 1924, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the pills consisted of hexamethylenetetramine and extracts of plant drugs, including small quantities of resins and volatile oils mixed with magnesium carbonate, coated with sugar and calcium carbonate and colored blue on the surface.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article: "Kidney And Bladder Pills A Treatment Indicated In Simple Inflammatory Conditions Of The Kidneys and Bladder, Bladder Irritation, Non-retention of Urine, Scanty or Scalding Urine," were false and fraudulent, since the said article contained no ingredient or substance which had the curative or therapeutic effects claimed.

On May 12, 1925, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered, ordering that the product be confiscated, and destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*