

On May 13, 1931, no claim having been interposed for the product, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18324. Misbranding of Quinseptikons. U. S. v. 2½ Dozen Boxes, et al., of Quinseptikons. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 26328, 26329. I. S. Nos. 29893, 29899. S. Nos. 4621, 4643.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Quinseptikons, from the shipments herein described having shown that the circular accompanying the article contained statements representing that the said article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

On May 4, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 20½ dozen boxes of the said Quinseptikons, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Tablax Co., New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., in various consignments, on or about March 20, March 27, and April 17, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted of suppositories containing 0.9 per cent salicylic acid, boric acid (13.5 per cent, quinine hydrochloride (5.3 per cent), and theobroma oil.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the circular, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: "Prophylactic * * * Quinseptikons are highly recommended by physicians as a preventive against infection, and for the treatment of vaginal diseases and conditions such as Leucorrhea, Vaginitis, * * * Inflammation, pain and tenderness. Also a prophylactic against venereal disease, and whenever their need may otherwise be indicated. * * * Directions * * * In Leucorrhea, Vaginitis and all conditions accompanied by discharges of any nature, insert one * * * at bedtime and one on arising. As a prophylactic against venereal infection, insert a * * * few minutes before sexual congress."

On May 25, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR H. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18325. Misbranding of Dr. Pirtle's Germ-Oil. U. S. v. 84 Bottles of Dr. Pirtle's Germ Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 25756. I. S. No. 8161. S. No. 3949.)

Examination of samples of a drug product, known as Dr. Pirtle's Germ Oil, from the shipment herein described having shown that the bottle label and accompanying circular bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Western District of Tennessee.

On January 19, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 84 bottles of Dr. Pirtle's Germ-Oil at Memphis, Tenn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Germ-Oil Co., from Jonestown, Miss., on or about November 15, 1929, and had been transported from the State of Mississippi into the State of Tennessee, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of a nonvolatile oil, turpentine oil, and sulphur.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects