

the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 396 boxes of oranges, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Mutual Orange Distributors, Redlands, Calif., on or about March 11, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Missouri, 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 large part, of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On April 1, 1922, the Mutual Orange Distributors, claimant, having denied the allegations of the libel, and the case having come on for final disposition before the court without a jury, a decree finding the issue in favor of the claimant was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10697. Misbranding of strawberries. U. S. * * * v. William F. Allen. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 16212. I. S. No. 5957-t.)

On June 29, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William F. Allen, Marion, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 17, 1921, from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, of a quantity of strawberries in crates which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On June 29, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10698. Misbranding of Abbott Bros. compound for rheumatism. U. S. * * * v. 3 Dozen Bottles of Abbott Bros. Compound for Rheumatism. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16306. I. S. No. 13963-t. S. No. W-1077.)

On May 10, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 bottles of Abbott Bros. compound for rheumatism, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Abbott Bros. Co., Berwyn, Ill., on or about February 7, 1922, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) " * * * For Rheumatism * * * ;" (carton) " * * * For Rheumatism * * * Muscular, Articular, Inflammatory, * * * Sciatica, Rheumatic Neuritis, and Stiffness and Soreness of the Joints and Muscles, * * * Lumbago and all Muscular and Nerve Pains of Rheumatic Origin * * * ;" (circular) " * * * for Rheumatism * * * "

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of 8 per cent of potassium iodid, 1½ per cent of extracts of plant drugs, including colchicum, 16.9 per cent of alcohol, and approximately 73 per cent of water, flavored with small quantities of aromatics, including methyl salicylate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements, appearing on the labels and packages and in the accompanying circulars, were false and fraudulent since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On June 1, 1922, 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 disposed of by the United States marshal according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*