

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing on its label, "Blue * * * Cross Adhesive Strips * * * For Sports Use For Home Use * * * Thoroughly cleanse wound with a recognized antiseptic. Remove crinoline. Be sure when applying Adhesive Strip that only gauze pad covers the wound," were false and misleading since such statements represented and suggested and created the impression that the article was a safe and appropriate bandage for first aid use on broken skin, whereas it was not a safe and appropriate bandage for such use since it was contaminated with living organisms.

On June 8, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1070. Adulteration and misbranding of first aid dressings. U. S. v. 475,000 Packages of First-Aid Dressings. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the law. (F. D. C. No. 8941. Sample Nos. 3452-F, 3453-F.)

On December 7, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas filed a libel against 475,000 packages of first-aid dressings at Kansas City, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 18 and 24, 1942, by Convenience, Inc., Greenville, S. C.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Small First-Aid Dressing U. S. Army Carlisle Model Sterilized."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity and quality fell below that which it purported and was represented to possess, namely, "Sterilized."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on its label, "Sterilized * * * Red Color Indicates Back of Dressing Put Other Side Next to Wound," were false and misleading since such statements created the impression that the article was sterile, whereas it was not sterile but was contaminated with living micro-organisms.

On December 7, 1942, Convenience, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of the decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the law under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1071. Adulteration and misbranding of zinc oxide ointment. U. S. v. 354 Jars of Zinc Oxide Ointment. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 9923. Sample No. 38279-F.)

On May 14, 1943, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 354 1-pound jars of zinc oxide ointment at Hines, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on February 13, 1943, by Trade Laboratories, Inc., from Newark, N. J.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be and was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its strength differed from the standard set forth therein since the compendium provides that zinc oxide ointment shall contain not less than 18.5 percent and not more than 21.5 percent of zinc oxide, whereas the zinc oxide content of the article was extremely variable, ranging from 12.8 percent to 22.65 percent, and its difference in strength from the standard set forth in the Pharmacopoeia was not plainly stated on its label.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the designation "Zinc Oxide Ointment U. S. P.," appearing in the labeling, was false and misleading.

On June 11, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1072. Adulteration and misbranding of zinc oxide ointment. U. S. v. 70 Jars of Zinc Oxide Ointment. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 10023. Sample No. 24694-F.)

Examination showed that this product contained not more than 15.43 percent of zinc oxide.

On May 27, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland filed a libel against 70 jars of zinc oxide ointment at Perry Point, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped from Long Island City, N. Y., on or about February 8, 1943, by Cole Laboratories, Inc.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Retort Pharmaceutical Co. * * * Long Island City, N. Y."