

not contain any of the ingredients or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effect claimed.

On October 15, 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.*

**8560. Misbranding of Gillen's Cholera Remedy. U. S. \* \* \* v. 8 Cases of Gillen's Cholera Remedy. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11090. I. S. No. 9417-r. S. No. C-1418.)**

On August 15, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, 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 8 cases (6 containing 12 quart bottles each, 2 containing 24 pint bottles each) of Gillen's Cholera Remedy, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Gillen Remedy Co., Atlanta, Ga., on or about March 5, 1919, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Gillen's Hog Remedy for hogs and chickens \* \* \* for hogs when afflicted with cholera \* \* \* as a preventative for cholera and to remove worms and as a general tonic. \* \* \* for fowls when afflicted with cholera, sorehead and roup, and white diarrhoea in little chicks \* \* \* preventative for cholera, sorehead and roup \* \* \*."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of an aqueous solution of saponified tar oil and sodium sulphate.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded in violation of section 8 of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, for the reason that the preceding statements, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, were false and fraudulent.

On September 22, 1920, the United Stock Remedies Co., Atlanta, Ga., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the goods be relabeled according to law.

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

**8561. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. \* \* \* v. 15 Gallon Cans, 42 Half-gallon Cans, and 88 Quart Cans of Olive Oil. Judgment of dismissal. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11141. I. S. No. 2965-r. S. No. W-476.)**

On August 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of New Mexico, 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 15 gallon cans, 42 half-gallon cans, and 88 quart cans of olive oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Albuquerque, N. M., consigned by A. Giurlani & Bros., San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped on July 5, 1919, and transported from the State of California into the State of New Mexico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the labels on the cans containing the article bore certain state-