

**7411. Misbranding of Pabst's Okay Specific. U. S. \* \* \* v. 141 Bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 10152. I. S. No. 12922-r. S. No. E-1353.)

On May 6, 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 a libel of information praying the seizure and condemnation of 141 bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific, consigned on April 15, 1919, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pabst Chemical Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Wrapper) "Pabst's O. K. Okay Specific \* \* \* For Gonorrhœa, Gleet, Urethritis and Chronic Mucous Discharges. Causes No Stricture. Absolutely safe." (Bottle) "Pabst's O. K. Okay Specific \* \* \* For Gonorrhœa, Gleet, Urethritis and Chronic Mucous Discharges."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of copaiba, pennyroyal, buchu, and arbutin (indicating uva ursi or pipsissewa), alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel of information for the reason that the above-quoted statements, appearing on the wrappers and bottle labels, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, were false and fraudulent in that the article did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed for it. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that the statements contained in a circular accompanying the article, attached to and made a part of the libel, were false and fraudulent in that the article would not produce the curative and therapeutic effects claimed in said circular.

On June 23, 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.*

**7412. Adulteration and misbranding of gelatin. U. S. \* \* \* v. One Drum of Gelatin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 10155. I. S. No. 11371-r. S. No. C-1200.)

On April 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, 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 1 drum, containing 200 pounds of gelatin, at Lima, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 4, 1919, by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Technical," and it was offered for sale as "First Class Gelatine."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that glue had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, gelatin, and for the further reason that it contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, to wit, zinc, which might render the article injurious to health.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.