

compounds, including magnesium and calcium compounds, and water (96 percent).

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that upon and within the package there appeared statements that falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a curative and therapeutic agent to increase the amount of hemoglobin and the number of red blood corpuscles in the blood; to act on the stomach and speed the flow of digestive juices, to strengthen the digestive muscles, and to help rid the body of harmful acids, to tone the kidneys and stimulate their action thus aiding them to remove excessive impurities from the system, to make the kidneys and bowels function better and cause all common ailments to vanish, and to prevent susceptibility to the ravages of various diseases.

On December 30, 1935, no claimant having appeared in either of the two cases, a default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered in each.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

26141. Adulteration and misbranding of Improved Unguentum (Ointment). U. S. v. 165 Packages of Improved Unguentum (Ointment). Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 36661. Sample no. 44718-B.)

This product was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and differed from the pharmacopoeial standard.

On November 25, 1935, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 165 packages of Improved Unguentum (Ointment) at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 14, 1935, by the American Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y., and alleging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was charged under the allegation that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and that it differed from the standard of quality and purity as determined by the test laid down in the said pharmacopoeia.

Misbranding of the article was charged under the allegation that it was offered for sale under the name of another article, namely, "Unguentum."

On May 27, 1936, the American Pharmaceutical Co. Inc., claimant, having failed to prosecute its claim, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

26142. Adulteration and misbranding of Farastan. U. S. v. 25 Gross Packages of Farastan. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond for relabeling. (F. & D. no. 36682. Sample no. 50324-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of Farastan which was represented as an iodo-cinchophen compound when it contained only a small proportion of an organic iodine compound.

On November 29, 1935, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 gross packages of Farastan at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 29, 1935, by Sharp & Dohme, Inc., from Philadelphia, Pa., and that it was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, since it was represented on the label of the packages and in an accompanying circular as "Mono-Iodo-Cinchophen Compound", and it consisted of cinchophen approximately 97 percent, and a small proportion of an organic iodine compound.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Mono-Iodo-Cinchophen Compound" was false and misleading in view of the actual composition of the article.

On December 12, 1935, the Farastan Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*