

taken in accordance with the directions on the label, 3 to 12 daily, would not produce any significant therapeutic or physiologic effect.

On July 9, 1943, the Basic Endocrines Sales Co., Inc., claimant, having filed an answer denying that the products were misbranded, and later having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1138. Misbranding of Anti-Uric. U. S. v. 19 Bottles of Anti-Uric. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 10113. Sample No. 37984-F.)

On June 29, 1943, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Indiana filed a libel against 19 bottles of Anti-Uric at South Bend, Ind., alleging that the article, which had been consigned by the Anti-Uric Company, had been shipped from San Francisco, Calif., on or about April 1, 1943; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination disclosed that the article consisted essentially of water, alcohol, sugar, and small amounts of extracts of plant drugs.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements on the bottle labels and in the circular entitled "What About Anti-Uric?" were misleading since such statements represented and suggested that the article was an effective eliminant and stimulant diuretic to the kidneys, and was effective in relieving rheumatic, neuralgic, sciatic, neuritic, and muscular pains, stiff and aching joints, back aches, upset stomach, extreme nervousness, and lumbago, whereas the article was not an effective eliminant and stimulant diuretic to the kidneys and was not effective in relieving the conditions mentioned.

On August 6, 1943, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1139. Misbranding of UtraJel. U. S. v. 34 Cartons of UtraJel (and 3 other seizure actions against UtraJel). Decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 10003, 10019, 10270, 10684. Sample Nos. 14847-F, 23363-F, 36208-F, 48204-F.)

Between May 24 and September 7, 1943, the United States attorneys for the District of Colorado, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Southern District of California, and the Northern District of Ohio filed libels against the following quantities of UtraJel: 34 cartons at Denver, Colo.; 10 packages at Philadelphia, Pa.; and 11 cartons at Los Angeles, Calif., each carton containing 4 tubes; and 8 boxes and 12 boxes at Cleveland and Lorain, Ohio, respectively; alleging that the article, which had been consigned by the Pynosol Laboratories, Inc., had been shipped from on or about April 19 to June 10, 1943, from Chicago, Ill.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis disclosed that the article consisted essentially of pine oil, soap, iodine, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the name "UtraJel" was false and misleading since it represented and suggested that the article was safe and appropriate for introduction into the uterus, whereas it was not safe or appropriate for introduction into the uterus, but was unsafe and dangerous, and capable of producing serious or even fatal consequences.

Between July 15 and October 13, 1943, Pynosol Laboratories, Inc., claimant, having filed answers in each of the libel proceedings, orders were entered directing that the Colorado, California, and Ohio cases be removed to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and consolidated for trial with the case originating in that district. On January 11 and 19, 1944, the claimant having withdrawn its claims and answers, judgments were entered in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, condemning the product and ordering it destroyed.

1140. Misbranding of Dextro Quinine. U. S. v. 40 Bottles of Quinine. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 9921. Sample No. 9600-F.)

On May 13, 1943, the United States attorney for the Western District of Louisiana filed a libel against 40 bottles, each containing 1 ounce, of Dextro Quinine at Monroe, La., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 27, 1942, from Philadelphia, Pa., via the Railway Express Agency; and charging that it was misbranded.

Examination showed that the article consisted of plant extractive material, about half of which had alkaloidal characteristics; and that the article was not quinine or a dextrorotatory isomer of quinine.