

**7435. Misbranding of Redsules. U. S. \* \* \* v. 6 Dozen Boxes of Redsules. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 10515. I. S. No. 2176-r. S. No. W-410.)**

On June 6, 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 seizure and condemnation of 6 dozen boxes of Redsules, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped on April 29, 1919, by H. Planten & Son, Brooklyn, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, 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 it consisted essentially of copaiba, with indications of santal oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements borne on the labels of the boxes (or cartons) and included in the circular and booklet accompanying the article, regarding the therapeutic effects of the article, to wit, (carton) "Redsules \* \* \* for the treatment of diseases pertaining to the kidneys, bladder and urinary organs," \* \* \* "(circular) "Redsules a medicine for the treatment of diseases pertaining to the kidneys, bladder, and urinary organs. \* \* \*," (booklet) "\* \* \* Gonorrhœa \* \* \* Gleet \* \* \*," were false and fraudulent in that the product contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed for it.

On December 3, 1919, the said H. Planten & Son, 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 the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be relabeled under the supervision of a representative of this department.

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

**7436. Misbranding of Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant and Compound Extract of Cubebs with Copaiba. U. S. \* \* \* v. 1 Gross Packages of \* \* \* Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant, 1½ Dozen Jars of Compound Extract of Cubebs with Copaiba, and 13 Dozen Packages \* \* \* Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. Nos. 10505, 10819. I. S. Nos. 15715-r, 15759-r, 15760-r. S. Nos. E-1474, E-1597.)**

On June 3, 1919, and July 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 1 gross packages of Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant, 1½ dozen jars of Compound Extract of Cubebs with Copaiba, and 13 dozen packages of Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant, consigned on February 24, 1919, and October 18, 1918, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Tarrant Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The Cu-Co-Ba Tarrant was labeled in part: (Wrapper and carton) "Cu-Co-Ba 'Tarrant' \* \* \* The Old Tarrant Extract of Cubebs and Copaiba in Capsule Form." (Circular) "Cu-Co-Ba 'Tarrant' \* \* \* Reduces excessive and annoying