but continued for ten days to ensure thorough healing, * * * The following are a few of the many formulas of Capsules manufactured by us and prescribed by physicians in the treatment of Gonorrhea, Gleet, Catarrh of the Bladder, Urethritis. * * * 'Redsules'—Our latest specialty * * * Some extremely stubborn cases may be assisted to a more speedy termination by taking Redsules,' * * * prescribed in the treatment of Gonorrhoea, Gleet, Urethritis, Catarrh of the Bladder," whereas the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed for it, and the said statements were false and fraudulent.

On October 11, 1919, H. Planten & Son, Brooklyn, N. Y., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment was entered declaring the product to be misbranded, and it was ordered by the court that the article be delivered to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9172. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * v. 20 Cases, Half-Gallon Cans, and 5 Cases, Gallon Cans, of Olive Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 11518. I. S. No. 2947-r. S. No. W-541.)

On or about November 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 20 cases, half-gallon cans, and 5 cases, gallon cans, of olive oil, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by Francisco Bertoli & Co., New York, N. Y., on September 12, 1919, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded, in violation of section 8, paragraph 3, of the Food and Drugs Act, in that each of the gallon cans was labeled "Net 1 Gallon," and each of the half-gallon cans was labeled "Net ½ Gallon," whereas examination showed that the gallon cans and the half-gallon cans were short 4.8 per cent.

On December 9, 1919, Antonio Puccinelli, San Francisco, Calif., claimant, having consented to a decree and having filed a bond in the sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9173. Adulteration and misbranding of double distilled water. U. S. * * * v. Eads Water Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$80 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11627. I. S. Nos. 5576-r, 5902-r, 7707-r.)

On July 7, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Eads Water Co., a corporation, Kansas City, Mo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about July 8 and August 21, 1918, and May 16, 1919, from the State of Missouri into the State of Kansas, of quantities of double distilled water which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the presence of filthy and decomposed animal or vegetable substances.