Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effect thereof, appearing in the labeling of the product, were false and fraudulent since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effect claimed. Misbranding was alleged in substance with respect to a portion of the article for the further reason that the name "Dr. E. W. Hall," appearing on the shipping case containing the article, was false, fraudulent, and misleading since E. W. Hall was not a physician.

On October 2, 1920, the cases having been consolidated into one proceeding and 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 destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9691. Adulteration and misbranding of saccharin. U. S. * * * v. 2 Cans, 10 Pounds Each, and 14 Cans, 1 Pound Each, of Soluble Saccharine. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9769. I. S. Nos. 6077–r, 6078–r. S. No. C–1078.)

On February 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, 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 2 cans, 10 pounds each, and 14 cans, 1 pound each, of soluble saccharin, at Pine Bluff, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., October 3 and 23 (September 23), 1918, respectively, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Arkansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Soluble Saccharine."

Analysis of a sample of the article from each consignment, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, showed that it contained approximately 47 per cent of sugar.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength and quality as determined by the tests laid down therein, and for the further reason that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statement in the labeling, "Soluble Saccharine," was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the said article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another article.

On October 2, 1920, 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 destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9692. Misbranding of pears. U. S. * * * v. E. R. Hayssen Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 12804. I. S. No. 15167–r.)

On October 26, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, 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 E. R. Hayssen Co., a corporation, Seneca Falls, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, on or about September 29, 1919, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of pears which were misbranded.