

for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of meat which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained worms.

On October 20, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

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

11272. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. James B. Dorsey. Collateral of \$10 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 724-c.)

On December 19, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against James B. Dorsey, Germantown, Md., alleging that on November 24, 1922, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained water and was below standard.

On December 19, 1922, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the \$10 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

11273. Misbranding of Pratts cow remedy. U. S. v. 6 Packages of Pratts Cow Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14467. I. S. No. 4774-t. S. No. C-2805.)

On February 21, 1921, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, 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 6 packages of Pratts cow remedy, remaining in the original packages at Fort Worth, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pratt Food Co., Chicago, Ill., on or about June 17, 1920, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Texas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Pratts Cow Remedy is a tested remedy and preventive for Contagious Abortion, Barrenness (Failure to Breed), Garget, Milk Fever * * * For Barrenness * * * For Milk Fever And Garget * * * Prevents retained afterbirth * * * For Calves: For preventing or treating scours * * * Pratts Cow Remedy will assist in rendering the bull's service more sure, particularly where contagious abortion has appeared in the herd * * * For Accidental Or Contagious Abortion * * * To Prevent: In herds where cows have previously aborted, or in neighborhoods where disease exists * * * Contagious Abortion * * * Retained Afterbirth * * * Pratts Cow Remedy Is A Medicinal Specific for diseases of cows * * * preventive and remedy for cow troubles."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of salt, soda, Epsom salt, iron oxid, fenugreek, ginger, nux vomica, and gentian.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements were false and fraudulent in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed.

On February 12, 1923, 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.

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

11274. Misbranding of Arthur's emmenagogue pills. U. S. v. 5 Boxes of Arthur's Emmenagogue Pills. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 15332. S. No. C-3167.)

On August 20, 1921, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, 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 5 boxes of Arthur's emmenagogue pills, remaining in the original packages at Granbury, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Palestine Drug Co., St. Louis, Mo., about August 9, 1921 [1920], and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Texas, and charging mis-