colored tablets containing 31 per cent of metallic iron, 11 per cent of calcium carbonate, extract of nux vomica, and sugar; the Arthur's sextone tablets contained iron oxid, calcium carbonate, a compound of zinc, and extract of plant drugs, coated with sugar; the Arthur's emmenagogue pills, the Leslie's emmenagogue pills, and the Thomas' emmenagogue pills contained iron sulphate, aloes, and extract of plant drugs, coated with sugar and calcium carbonate, colored pink.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the above-quoted statements, appearing in the labeling of the said articles, were false and fraudulent in that the said articles contained no ingredients or combinations of ingredients capable of producing the said therapeutic effects.

During May, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10694. Adulteration and misbranding of walnut meats. U. S. * * * v. 108 Cases of Walnut Meats * * *. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond for reconditioning. (F. & D. No. 15760. I. S. Nos. 13828-t, 13830-t. S. No. W-1050)

On May 8, 1912, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, 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 108 cases of walnut meats, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by Sam Sutton, Los Angeles, Calif., on February 6, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was in package form and the quantity of contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 31, 1922, Richardson and Holland, a corporation, Seattle, Wash., claimant, having appeared and confessed judgment, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to said claimant for reconditioning under the supervision of this department, upon payment of the costs of the proceeding and the execution of bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10695. Adulteration of walnut meats. U. S. * * * v. 150 Cases of Walnut Meats * * *. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond for reconditioning. (F. & D. No. 15772. I. S. No. 11248-t. S. No. W-1054.)

On March 14, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, 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 150 cases of walnut meats, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped about February 5, 1922, by C. S. Holzman, Los Angeles, Calif., and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 10, 1922, Oscar Lucks, claimant, having entered his appearance for the goods, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to said claimant for reconditioning under the supervision of this department, upon payment of the costs of the proceeding and the execution of bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10696. Alleged adulteration of oranges. U. S. * * * v. 396 Boxes * * * of Oranges. Tried to the court. Decree ordering release of product to claimant. (F. & D. No. 16107. I. S. No. 18411-t. S. No. C-3484.)

On or about March 23, 1922, 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 396 boxes of oranges, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Mutual Orange Distributors, Redlands, Calif., on or about March 11, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted, in whole or in large part, of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable-

substance.

On April 1, 1922, the Mutual Orange Distributors, claimant, having denied the allegations of the libel, and the case having come on for final disposition before the court without a jury, a decree finding the issue in favor of the claimant was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10697. Misbranding of strawberries. U. S. * * * v. William F. Allen. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 16212. I. S. No. 5957-t.)

On June 29, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William F. Allen, Marion, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 17, 1921, from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, of a quantity of strawberries in crates which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On June 29, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

10698. Misbranding of Abbott Bros. compound for rheumatism. U. S.

* * * v. 3 Dozen Bottles of Abbott Bros. Compound for Rheumatism. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16306. I. S. No. 13963-t. S. No. W-1077.)

On May 10, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern 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 3 dozen bottles of Abbott Bros. compound for rheumatism, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Abbott Bros. Co., Berwyn, Ill., on or about February 7, 1922, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "* * * For Rheumatism * * *;" (carton) "* * * For Rheumatism * * * * Muscular, Articular, Inflammatory, * * * Sciatica, Rheumatic Neuritis, and Stiffness and Soreness of the Joints and Muscles, * * * Lumbago and all Muscular and Nerve Pains of Rheumatic Origin * * *;" (circular) "* * * for Rheumatism * * * *"

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of 8 per cent of potassium iodid, 1½ per cent of extracts of plant drugs, including colchicum, 16.9 per cent of alcohol, and approximately 73 per cent of water, flavored with small quantities of aromatics, including methyl salicylate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements, appearing on the labels and packages and in the accompanying circulars, were false and fraudulent since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On June 1, 1922, 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 disposed of by the United States marshal according to law:

C. W. Pugsley, Acting Secretary of Agriculture: