

was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

**7204. Misbranding of Wilson's Solution Anti-Flu. U. S. \* \* \* v. 35 Cartons of Bottles Containing a Drug Solution or Product. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 9950. I. S. No. 7066-r. S. No. C-1126.)

On March 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, 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 35 cases of a certain drug product, Wilson's Solution Anti-Flu, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 11, 1918, by the Cooper Medicine Co., Dayton, O., and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Wisconsin, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Wilson's Solution Anti-Flu."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of oil of eucalyptus and methyl salicylate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the labels on the bottles bore a statement that the contents of each bottle contained a solution which was "a powerful antiseptic to be used as a preventive against influenza, colds and grip," and that such statement was false and fraudulent. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a mixture composed essentially of oil of eucalyptus and methyl salicylate, and that said solution contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed on the labels. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement on the label, that "A few drops inhaled from handkerchief disinfects nose and throat," was false and fraudulent in that the solution contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed on the labels. Misbranding was further alleged for the reason that the product was labeled, "For sore throat and soreness in chest, make rubbing ointment by mixing one-half teaspoonful with tablespoonful of vaseline. To make spraying solution for use of throat add 10 drops to one tablespoonful olive oil," and that said statements were false and fraudulent, and that said product contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing any of the curative or therapeutic effects claimed for it on the labels, when used alone or mixed with olive oil or vaseline.

On April 21, 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 should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**7205. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. \* \* \* v. 461½ Boxes of Oranges. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion of product ordered released on bond. Unfit portion ordered destroyed or denatured.** (F. & D. No. 9951. I. S. No. 15436-r. S. No. E-1276.)

On April 3, 1919, 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 of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 461½ boxes of oranges, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., consigned on March 8, 1919, alleging that the article had been shipped by the California Fruit Growers Exchange, Walnut, Cal., and transported from the State of

California into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, in that a large proportion of the oranges were frosted, and 60 per cent of them exhibited marked drying in 20 per cent or more of area.

On April 7, 1919, the San Antonio Fruit Exchange, Pomona, Cal., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned that the product should be resorted under the supervision of a representative of this department, such portion as might be found fit for manufacture into jelly and marmalade to be released to said claimant for that purpose, and the remainder to be destroyed or denatured.

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

**7206. Misbranding of Prescription 1000. U. S. \* \* \* v. 57 Packages of Drugs Labeled in Part "Prescription 1000." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 9954. I. S. Nos. 7907-r, 7908-r. S. No. C-1131.)

On March 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, 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 57 packages of drugs, labeled in part, "Prescription 1000," consigned on January 27, 1919, by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, O., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Louisville, Ky., alleging that the article had been shipped and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Kentucky, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "\* \* \* Prescription 1000 \* \* \* Internal \* \* \*" and "\* \* \* Prescription 1000 \* \* \* External \* \* \*."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of a slightly alkaline emulsion of copaiba, flavored with methyl salicylate, and that the Prescription 1000 External consisted essentially of a dilute aqueous solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the labels on the packages bore and contained false and fraudulent statements, designs, and devices regarding the curative and therapeutic effect of the article.

On June 3, 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 should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**7207. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. \* \* \* v. Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli (Crisafulli Bros.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25.** (F. & D. No. 9957. I. S. Nos. 13726-r, 13727-r.)

On July 17, 1919, 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 of the United States for said district an information against Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli, copartners, trading as Crisafulli Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on October 10, 1918, and June 21, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of quantities of an article, labeled in part "Table Oil \* \* \* Extra Fine Olive Oil," together with designs showing olive tree and branches with olives, and the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with." Said article was adulterated and misbranded.