

19195. Misbranding of B. O. and G. C. Wilson's neuropathic drops. U. S. v. 42 Bottles, et al., of B. O. and G. C. Wilson's Neuropathic Drops. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 27649, 27667. I. S. Nos. 42730, 42761. S. Nos. 5654, 5749.)

Examination of samples of the drug product herein described showed that the labeling bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess.

On or about January 12 and January 19, 1932, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 78 bottles of Wilson's neuropathic drops at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by Winsol (Inc.), Boston, Mass., in various consignments on or about November 16, December 1, and December 18, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Massachusetts into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of capsicum oleoresin, volatile oils including camphor and a mint oil, alcohol, and water.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was misbranded in that the following statements, appearing in the labeling regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of the article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effect claimed: (Bottle label) "Neuropathic * * * Chills, Cramps, Internal Pains, * * * Chillblains * * * Reduces many forms of internal and external inflammation;" (outside wrapper) "Neuropathic * * * Chills, Cramps, Cholera Morbus, Acute Indigestion, Internal Pains, * * * Chillblains * * * Neuropathic * * * its promptness in removing pain both external and internal * * * the Great Pain Cure of the age;" (circular) "Neuropathic * * * For Colic, Cramps, etc. * * * Indolent Sores, * * * for Rheumatism * * * other local Aches and Pains."

On February 26, 1932, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19196. Misbranding of Shults' Infallible ointment and Shults' veterinary ointment. U. S. v. 54 Jars of Shults' Infallible Ointment, et al. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27191. I. S. Nos. 37856, 37857. S. No. 5321.)

Examination of samples of a drug product, known as Shults' Infallible ointment and Shults' veterinary ointment (the same product under different designations), from the shipments herein described having shown that the labeling bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Delaware.

On October 30, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 54 jars of Shults' Infallible ointment, 25-cent size, and 30 jars assorted of Shults' Infallible ointment and Shults' veterinary ointment, 50-cent size, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Wilmington, Del., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Shults Ointment Co., from Chester, Pa., in part on or about May 8, 1931, and in part on or about August 1, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Delaware, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by this department showed that both the Infallible ointment and the veterinary ointment consisted essentially of lead oleate and a tarry oil, incorporated in an ointment base of wool fat and petrolatum.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of the article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: (Jar label, 25-cent size) "Infallible * * * The Great Specific for Inflammation For the treatment of Old Scrofulous Sores and Indolent Ulcers,