

**8602. Misbranding of Hinkle Capsules. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3 Dozen Packages of Hinkle Capsules. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10449. I. S. No. 7785-r. S. No. C-1254.)**

On May 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, 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 3 dozen packages of an article of drugs, labeled in part "Hinkle Capsules \* \* \* Manufactured only by the Hinkle Capsule Company, Inc., Mayfield, Ky.," consigned by said company on or about April 5, 1919, alleging that the article had been shipped from Mayfield, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Package) "Hinkle Capsules \* \* \* For the treatment of Gleet, Leucorrhœa, Kidney and Bladder Affections, Mucous Discharges, Etc.;" (circular) "\* \* \* catarrhal conditions of the urinary organs \* \* \* for the successful treatment of Urinary diseases \* \* \* In affections of the Genito-Urinary organs \* \* \* For the treatment of the more common Kidney and Bladder disorders \* \* \* in the relief of catarrhal condition of the urinary organs in advanced or chronic forms \* \* \* scalding discharge, acute inflammation and irritation of the mucous members, prostate gland \* \* \* Kidney and Bladder Disorders \* \* \* Catarrhal and mucous discharge \* \* \*."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the contents of the capsules consisted essentially of powdered cubeb and copaiba balsam, with small amounts of cannabis indica, pepsin, and santal oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the package and label bore and contained the aforesaid statements, regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of said drug, which were false and fraudulent in that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed, and in that said product was insufficient of itself for the successful treatment and cure of the ailments and diseases for which it was prescribed and recommended in the aforesaid statements.

On September 19, 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 be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**8603. Misbranding of Injection Zip. U. S. \* \* \* v. 12 Dozen Bottles of Injection Zip. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10531. I. S. No. 6596-r. S. No. C-1276.)**

On June 9, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, 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 Injection Zip, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Duluth, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Baker-Levy Chemical Co., Indianapolis, Ind., on or about October 30, 1918, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Minnesota, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of acetates and sulphates of zinc and lead, berberine, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that certain statements appearing on the bottle and carton containing the article and in the circular accompanying the article falsely and fraudulently represented it to be a tried preparation for gonorrhœa, gleet, and leucorrhœa for male or female and as a speedy relief for leucorrhœa (whites), whereas the article did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On July 16, 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 be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**S604. Misbranding of Short Stop Injection and Short Stop Capsules. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3½ Dozen Bottles of Short Stop Injection, First Stage, 3½ Dozen Bottles of Short Stop Injection, Second Stage, and 3 Dozen Bottles of Short Stop Capsules. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10826. I. S. Nos. 7797-r, 7798-r, 7799-r. S. No. C-1316.)**

On or about July 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, 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 3½ dozen bottles of Short Stop Injection, First Stage, and 3½ dozen bottles of Short Stop Injection, Second Stage, consigned April 19, 1918, and May 1, 1919, respectively, and 3 dozen bottles of Short Stop Capsules, consigned November 7, 1918, all consignments labeled in part, "Prepared by the Massman Chemical Co., Covington, Ky.," remaining unsold at Cincinnati, Ohio, alleging that the articles had been shipped from Covington, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the injection consisted essentially of a dilute aqueous solution of zinc phenol sulphonate, berberine sulphate, a trace of phenol, and a bismuth salt in suspension, and that the contents of the capsules consisted of methylene blue, sodium bicarbonate, and salol.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the cartons and bottles containing the article and the circulars around the article bore and contained certain statements, regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of said drugs, to wit, (Injection, First Stage) (bottle) "\* \* \* For Male and Female \* \* \* for Gonorrhœa and Gleet Prevents Stricture \* \* \* Tonic antiseptic \* \* \* warranted to relieve the most obstinate cases \* \* \*," (carton) "\* \* \* prevents contagion," (Injection, Second Stage) (bottle) "\* \* \* Prevents stricture \* \* \*," (Capsules) (carton) "\* \* \* for \* \* \* Leucorrhœa, Kidney and Bladder Affections, Chronic Seminal and Mucous Discharges \* \* \* Never Known To Fail. Absolutely Safe \* \* \*," (circular around all) "\* \* \* most obstinate cases relieved \* \* \* Capsules \* \* \* An internal remedy to \* \* \* prevent complications attending Gonorrhœa and Gleet \* \* \* Will prevent and soothe the attending inflammation and keep the disease from becoming chronic. Will prevent the posterior or far-back inflammation, Catarrh and inflammation of the bladder, Scalding or burning in passing water, Retention of urine, Chordee, Swelled Testicles, Gonorrhœal Rheumatism and Bubo. Soothe the inflammation, prevent relapses and keep the disease from becoming chronic \* \* \* Complications and relapse will be prevented and the inflammation entirely relieved \* \* \*," which were false and fraudulent in that said drug