It was alleged in the libel filed in the Eastern District of Arkansas, that the article was misbranded in that the following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects were false and fraudulent: (Carton) "The Old Young * * * The Young Stronger * * * relief of Impotency"; (carton leaflet) "Increasing Masculine Vitality. * * * Strengthening of Masculine Vitality."

Misbranding was charged in the libel filed in the Western District of Louisiana, for the reason that the following statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effect of the article were false and fraudulent: (Carton leaflet) "An Immediate Aid to the Relief of Impotency, or for Increasing Masculine Vitality A Stimulant, Immediate in Its Effect * * * Directions: Several minutes beforehand or upon retiring, apply the contents of one white capsule to the regenerative organs, massaging well into the skin. Further applications from white capsules may be made as often as desired or found necessary, but never until the sensations created by the first have completely disappeared. Doubly effective results may be obtained by application of the special Yobiana ointment in the pink capsule six to eight hours beforehand, continuing with use of white capsules as described above"; (leaflet) "Aid to the Relief of Impotency and the Strengthening of Masculine Vitality Immediate In Its Effect The Old Young The Young Stronger * * * immediate aid in the relief of impotency. * * * The description of the product on the outer wrapper, as well as the directions for its use, are expressed in language best intended to describe its purposes and yet relieve it of all suggestiveness or vulgarity. The salesman will be glad to explain in terms best suited to each particular case the merits of his product. * * * effective for adults of any age. * * * when directions are carefully followed should produce results equal to your greatest expectations."

On June 12 and July 25, 1933, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21207. Misbranding of Oculum. U. S. v. The Hancock Inoculatum Co., Inc. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $10. (F. & D. no. 28162. I. S. no. 47613.)

Examination of the drug preparation Oculum disclosed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed on the bottle and carton labels and in a circular shipped with the article.

On March 22, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Hancock Inoculatum Co., Inc., Salem, Va., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about March 28, 1931, from the State of Virginia into the State of Indiana, of a quantity of Oculum which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of turpentine colored with a yellow dye.

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that certain statements, designs, and devices appearing on the bottle and carton labels and in a circular shipped with the article, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a germicide for fowls and animals, as a preventive of disease, and as a treatment for sickness, in fowls and animals; effective as a germicide and tonic for poultry; effective as a remedy, preventive, and relief for cholera, roup, white diarrhea and sorehead, and to relieve gapes in poultry; effective to keep chicks and chickens well and to ensure healthy fowls and healthy eggs; and effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for sickness in animals, and bowel trouble in poultry.

On July 5, 1933, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21208. Misbranding of Bromo Paper. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Bromo Paper. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 30692. Sample no. 23455-A.)

Examination of the product involved in this case disclosed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.