On November 6, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1467. Adulteration of ampuls sodium salicylate. U. S. v. 575 Ampuls of Sodium Salicylate. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 14207. Sample No. 90342–F.)

On November 7, 1944, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas filed a libel against 575 ampuls of sodium salicylate at Little Rock, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 21, 1944, from Brooklyn, N. Y., by the Adson-Intrasol Laboratories, Inc.

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 National Formulary, an official compendium, but its quality and purity fell below the official standard since the article was contaminated with undissolved material.

On December 6, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1468. Adulteration of boric acid. U. S. v. 13 Dozen Cartons of Boric Acid. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 14106. Sample Nos. 69509–F, 69518–F.)

On October 23, 1944, the United States attorney for the District of New Mexico filed a libel against 13 dozen cartons of boric acid at Santa Fe, N. Mex., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 11, 1943, and March 1, 1944, from Oklahoma City, Okla., by the Scotch-Tone Co.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that alum had been substituted in whole or in part for boric acid, which the article was represented to be.

On December 1, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1469. Adulteration of iron cacodylate. U. S. v. 950 Ampuls of Iron Cacodylate. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 14041. Sample No. 64075–F.)

On October 16, 1944, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia filed a libel against 950 ampuls, each containing 5 cc., of iron cacodylate at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 8, 1944, by the Adson-Intrasol Laboratories, Inc., from Brooklyn, N. Y. The article was labeled in part: "Iron cacodylate * * * intravenously."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity and quality fell below that which it purported and was represented to possess, since it was contaminated with undissolved material.

On December 6, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1470. Adulteration and misbranding of Digifortis. U. S. v. 1,156 Bottles of Digifortis. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 14085. Sample No. 78785–F.)

On November 2, 1944, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel against 1,156 bottles of Digifortis at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 21, 1944, from Detroit, Mich., by Parke, Davis & Co. The article was labeled in part: "Digifortis * * * 125% Strength of Tincture Digitalis of International Standard."

The United States Pharmacopoeia specifies that 1 cc. of tincture of digitalis shall be equivalent to 1.0 U. S. P. digitalis unit; and it provides that tincture of digitalis which varies not more than 20 percent from the Pharmacopoeial requirement shall be considered to conform to that requirement. Examination of a sample of the article by the method prescribed in the Pharmacopoeia for tincture of digitalis showed that its potency was not less than 2.1 U. S. P. digitalis units per cubic centimeter.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be tincture of digitalis, 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 in that compendium, and its difference in strength from the standard was not plainly stated on its label.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that it was a drug not designated solely by a name recognized in an official compendium, and its label failed to bear the common or usual name of the drug, i. e., tincture of digitalis. The article was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the statements in its labeling, (carton and bottle labels) "Original potency continued by the use of the International Standard and the lethal dose frog method of assay," and (circular