

**S167. Misbranding of Píldoras Urisépticas. U. S. \* \* \* v. 12 Dozen Bottles of Píldoras Urisépticas. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11180. I. S. No. 17047-r. S. No. E-1697.)**

On November 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, 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 12 dozen bottles of Píldoras Urisépticas, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Ponce, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 19, 1918, by Davis & Lawrence Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the Territory of Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Píldoras Urisépticas \* \* \* Prepared by Davis & Lawrence Co. Manufacturing Chemists New York."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of methylene blue, copaiba, salol, and unidentified plant extractives, probably kava-kava.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that certain statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effect falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment of gonorrhœa, chronic or acute inflammation of the bladder or urethra, and other forms of secondary diseases which generally follow blennorrhagic infection, inflammation of the urethra induced by gonococcus, cystitis, as a diuretic, antiseptic, and dissolvent, and as a cure for all inflammations of the genito-urinary tract, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 5, 1920, the said Davis & Lawrence Co., 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 the said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

**S168. Misbranding of Helmitol. U. S. \* \* \* v. 38, 127, 33, and 2,342 Tubes of Helmitol. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. Nos. 11183, 11184, 11185, 11186. I. S. Nos. 17051-r, 17052-r, 17053-r, 17062-r, 17063-r. S. No. E-1702.)**

On September 18, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, 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 38, 127, 33, and 2,342 tubes of Helmitol, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, P. R., alleging that said article had been shipped by the Bayer Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., between March 28, 1919, and September 18, 1919, and transported from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Bayer Tablets \* \* \* Urinary Antiseptic."

Analysis of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the tablets consisted of Helmitol (anhydromethylene citrate hexamethylene tetramine) and talc.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof in that the labels of the article bore a statement, regarding it and the ingredients and

substances contained therein, which was false and fraudulent, that is to say, the label on said tubes and cartons was so arranged as to lead the public to believe that the tubes and cartons contained curative and therapeutic medicine capable of curing and preventing diseases and disorders in the urinary tract of whosoever should use it, whereas, in fact, it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On January 30, 1920, the Bayer Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the said claimant upon 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.

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

**S169. Misbranding of Pildoras Urisépticas. U. S. \* \* \* v. 10 Dozen Bottles and 1½ Dozen Bottles of Pildoras Urisépticas. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. Nos. 11273, 11274. F. S. Nos. 17027-r, 17069-r. S. Nos. E-1726, E-1733.)**

On September 26, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 10 dozen bottles and 1½ dozen bottles of Pildoras Urisépticas, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, and Ponce, P. R., respectively, alleging that the 10 dozen bottles were shipped by G. J. Fajardo, New York, N. Y., on or about April 20, 1918, and transported from the State of New York into the Territory of Porto Rico, and that the 1½ dozen bottles were offered for sale and sold at Ponce, P. R., on or about September 2, 1919, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part "Uriseptic Pills \* \* \* Prepared by Davis & Lawrence Co. Manufacturing Chemists, New York."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the pills consisted essentially of methylene blue, salol, cubebs, and kava-kava.

It was alleged in substance in the libels that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that certain statements, regarding its curative and therapeutic effect, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be antiseptic, antigonorrhœal, diuretic, and resolvent, and to be effective as a treatment of gonorrhœa, chronic or acute inflammation of the bladder or urethra, and other forms of secondary diseases which generally result from blennorrhagic infection, cystitis, and as a cure for all inflammations of the genito-urinary tract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 5, 1920, the said Davis & Lawrence Co., claimant, having consented to decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered in both cases, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the sum of \$100 each, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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