

dogs, cats, and foxes, which representations were false and misleading since the articles would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On November 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

DRUGS PACKED IN DECEPTIVE CONTAINERS⁵

537. Misbranding of nasal jelly. U. S. v. 1,332 Packages of Nasal Jelly. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond to be repacked. (F. D. C. No. 3959. Sample No. 60024-E.)

The cartons in which this product was packed were considerably longer and larger than was necessary to hold the tubes.

On March 14, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against 1,332 packages of nasal jelly at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 20, 1940, and January 3, 1941, by the Norwich Pharmacal Co., from Norwich, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that its containers were so made, formed, and filled as to be misleading. The article was labeled in part: "Nasal Jelly * * * Distributed by Fred Meyer * * * Portland, Oregon."

On May 9, 1941, the Norwich Pharmacal Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be repacked under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

NONSTERILE ABSORBENT COTTON

538. Adulteration and alleged misbranding of absorbent cotton. U. S. v. 48 Dozen Packages of Absorbent Cotton. Decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond for reconditioning. (F. D. C. No. 3823. Sample No. 43856-E.)

This product had been shipped in interstate commerce and was in interstate commerce at the time of examination, at which time it was found to contain viable micro-organisms.

On February 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas filed a libel against 48 dozen packages, each containing 3 ounces, of absorbent cotton at Wichita, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 21, 1940, by the Acme Cotton Products Co. from Dayville, Conn.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Bonita Absorbent Cotton."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in an official compendium but its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth in that compendium since it was not sterile; whereas the United States Pharmacopoeia requires that the article be sterile.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that statements appearing on the carton, "Sterilized After Packaging" and "For Surgical and Sanitary Uses," were false and misleading as applied to an article which was not sterile but was contaminated with viable aerobic and anaerobic or facultative anaerobic micro-organisms.

On April 26, 1941, the Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., having filed a claim, judgment was entered finding the product adulterated and ordering its condemnation, and it was ordered further that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be brought into compliance with the law under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

539. Adulteration and misbranding of absorbent cotton. U. S. v. 420 2-Ounce and 267 1-Ounce Packages of Absorbent Cotton. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4374. Sample No. 35863-E.)

This article had been shipped in interstate commerce and was in interstate commerce at the time of examination at which time it was found to be contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

On April 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana filed a libel against 687 packages of absorbent cotton at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about

⁵ See also Nos. 451, 477, 492, 504, 508, 523, 526, and 531 for deceptive packaging; and Nos. 429, 433, 434, 436, 437, 439, 443, 445, 449, 451, 452, 522, 523, 525, and 526 for failure to bear required quantity of contents statement.

February 27, 1941, by New Aseptic Laboratories from Columbia, S. C.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and its purity and quality fell below the standard set forth in that compendium since it was not sterile; whereas the pharmacopoeia defines absorbent cotton as sterilized.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing on the label "Sterilized after Packaging" and "Absorbent Cotton for First Aid Hospital and Home Use" were false and misleading as applied to an article which was not sterile and therefore was not suitable for first aid, hospital, and home use.

On June 10, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

PROPHYLACTICS

540. Adulteration and misbranding of prophylactics. U. S. v. 41 Gross of Prophylactics (and 21 other seizure actions against prophylactics). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 8322, 8333, 3353, 3367, 3369, 3386, 3387, 3388, 5605, 5755, 5771, 5798, 5799, 5813, 5843, 5881 to 5884 incl., 5894, 5908, 7080. Sample Nos. 5557-E, 5558-E, 10434-E to 10437-E, incl., 19662-E, 34740-E, 36368-E, 36369-E, 39501-E, 40674-E, 42958-E, 46750-E, 48610-E to 48621-E, incl., 50039-E, 50041-E, 51583-E, 51587-E, 51993-E, 51994-E, 62561-E, 62565-E, 74123-E, 74124-E, 74397-E, 74398-E, 74399-E.)

Samples of this product were found to be defective because of the presence of holes.

Between November 4, 1940, and March 20, 1942, the United States attorneys for the Southern District of New York, District of Columbia, Eastern District of Missouri, Western District of New York, District of Rhode Island, Western District of Pennsylvania, Northern District of Georgia, Southern District of Ohio, District of Massachusetts, Northern District of Illinois, District of Puerto Rico, and the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed libels against 545½ gross of prophylactics at New York, N. Y.; 80¾ gross at Washington, D. C.; 114 gross at St. Louis, Mo.; 84 gross at Buffalo, N. Y.; 195 gross at Providence, R. I.; 49 gross at Pittsburgh, Pa.; 487½ gross at Atlanta, Ga.; 123½ gross at Cincinnati, Ohio; 98 gross at Boston, Mass.; 48 gross at Fall River, Mass.; 98¼ gross at Chicago, Ill.; 11 gross at San Juan, P. R., and 20 gross at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Allied Latex Corporation from East Newark, N. J., within the period from on or about October 5, 1940, to on or about February 18, 1942; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled variously in part: "Prophylactic," "Smithies," "Thin-TEX," "Gems," "Liquid Latex," "Diana," "Seal-Test," "Dr. Robinson Rx 333," or "Kleenette."

The product in all lots was alleged to be adulterated in that its quality fell below that which it was represented to possess.

Portions of the product were alleged to be misbranded in that representations in the labeling that it was a prophylactic, would afford protection against disease, and was scientifically tested, were false and misleading.

Within the period from January 9, 1940, to May 1, 1942, no claimants having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.