

the intestinal tract clean or in keeping the flock in better health; that it would aid greatly in the prevention and treatment of blackhead and trichomoniasis in poultry; that it would prevent birds from becoming sick; that it would be effective in keeping birds in better condition, and thereby increase poultry profits; that it would be effective in the prevention or treatment of any form of coccidiosis or mycosis; and that it would aid in the elimination from poultry of any disease condition.

On November 17, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1199. Misbranding of Wayne Flushing Mash. U. S. v. 160 Bags of Wayne Flushing Mash. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to a Federal institution, for use as animal feed. (F. D. C. No. 11755. Sample No. 59532-F.)

On February 11, 1944, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan filed a libel against 160 bags, each containing 25 pounds, of the above-named product at Centerline, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by Allied Mills, Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind., between the approximate dates of October 28 and November 27, 1943; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination disclosed that the article consisted essentially of carbohydrates, protein, fats, bran, small amounts of the carbonates, sulfates, chlorides, iodides and phosphates of calcium, iron, sodium, and manganese.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in an accompanying circular which represented and suggested that the article would be effective in the prevention or treatment of coccidiosis and would be an aid in preventing disease in chickens were false and misleading since the article would not be effective in the prevention or treatment of coccidiosis or any other disease condition of chickens.

On March 14, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a Federal institution, for use as animal feed.

1200. Misbranding of flushing mash. U. S. v. 40 Bags of Flushing Mash. Decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 10988. Sample No. 50437-F.)

On or about October 22, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of Delaware filed a libel against 40 100-pound bags of flushing mash at Roxanna, Del., alleging that the article had been shipped from Cincinnati, Ohio, by Cooperative Mills, Inc., on or about August 13, 1943; and charging that it was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Cooperative Mills Quality * * * Flushing Mash."

Analysis disclosed that the article was essentially a feed mixture containing 17 percent crude protein, 13 percent crude fat, and 6 percent crude fiber.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on its label which represented and suggested that, when fed according to directions, it would be of value in the treatment or prevention of cecal or acute coccidiosis, were false and misleading since the article would not be of any value in the treatment or prevention of cecal or acute coccidiosis.

On January 22, 1944, the Southern States Cooperative having appeared as claimant through its subsidiary, the Cooperative Mills, Inc., judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

[Given pursuant to section 705 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act]

1201-1250

DRUGS AND DEVICES

The cases reported herewith were instituted in the United States district courts by the United States attorneys acting upon reports submitted by direction of the Federal Security Administrator.

WATSON B. MILLER, *Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 30, 1945.

CONTENTS *

	Page		Page
Drugs actionable because of potential danger when used according to directions.....	335	Drugs and devices actionable because of deviation from official or own standards.....	339
Products requiring certificate or release, for which none had been issued.....	337	Drugs actionable because of false and misleading claims.....	348
Drugs actionable because of failure to bear adequate directions or warning statements.....	338	Drugs for human use.....	348
Drugs actionable because of contamination with filth.....	339	Drugs for veterinary use.....	364
		Index.....	366

DRUGS ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF POTENTIAL DANGER WHEN USED ACCORDING TO DIRECTIONS

1201. Adulteration and misbranding of Nelson's Antacid Powder and misbranding of B-M Cold Caps. U. S. v. The Cleveland Druggists Specialties Co. (Great Lakes Laboratories), and Bernard A. Saltzman. Pleas of guilty. Fine of \$450 plus costs against each defendant. Payment of fine and costs of corporate defendant suspended. (F. D. C. No. 10541. Sample Nos. 6597-F to 6599-F, incl.)

On September 16, 1943, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio filed an information against the Cleveland Druggists Specialties Co., a corporation trading under the name of Great Lakes Laboratories, Cleveland, Ohio, and against Bernard A. Saltzman, president of the corporation, alleging shipment from the State of Ohio into the State of Missouri of a quantity of B-M Cold Caps, on or about January 2, 1943, and a quantity of Nelson's Antacid Powder, on or about May 25, 1942.

Analysis of the Cold Caps disclosed that the article was in the form of capsules which contained acetanilid, aspirin, caffeine, extracts of plant drugs, including a laxative drug and an alkaloid-bearing drug, and capsicum.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that each capsule contained 1.72 grains of acetanilid and would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage

*For omission of, or unsatisfactory, ingredients statements, see Nos. 1201, 1202, 1204, 1234, 1235, 1239; failure to bear adequate statements of quantity of contents, Nos. 1229, 1238, 1240, 1248; cosmetics, subject to the drug provisions of the Act, Nos. 1239, 1240.