LABEL, IN PART: "Capsules Amylofene and Ephedrine Amylofene ¾ gr. * * * Ephedrine Sulphate ⅜ gr."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it was represented to possess, since it was represented to contain ¾ grain of *amylofene* and ⅜ grain of *ephedrine sulfate* per capsule, whereas it contained, in one lot, not less than 0.856 grain (6/7 grain) of *amylofene* and not less than 0.432 grain (3/7 grain) of *ephedrine sulfate* per capsule; and it contained, in the remaining lot, not less than 0.876 grain (⅞ grain) of *amylofene* and not less 0.435 grain (3/7 grain) of *ephedrine sulfate* per capsule.

DISPOSITION: June 18, 1945. A plea of not guilty having been entered, the case came on for trial before the court. At the conclusion of the testimony and arguments of counsel, the defendant was found guilty and a fine of $50 was imposed.

1571. Adulteration and misbranding of surgical pituitary. U. S. v. Bedwell Laboratories. Plea of not guilty. Tried to the court; verdict of guilty on count 1 and not guilty on count 2. Fine, $750. (F. D. C. No. 12595. Sample No. 57660–F.)

INFORMATION FILED: November 1, 1944, Southern District of California, against Bedwell Laboratories, a corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.; charging the defendant with giving a false guaranty. The guaranty was given by the defendant to the Soltan Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., on or about May 25, 1942. It provided that the article comprising each shipment or delivery made by the defendant to the latter firm would be neither adulterated nor misbranded within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

On or about October 22, 1943, the defendant sold and delivered to the Soltan Corporation a quantity of the above-named product, and on or about October 23, 1943, the Soltan Corporation shipped from the State of California into the State of Texas a quantity of the product which had been delivered to it and guarantied by the defendant.

LABEL, IN PART: (Invoice) "Surgical Pituitary 20 Units."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration (count 1), Section 501 (d) (2), a pituitary preparation having a potency of 10 U. S. P. posterior pituitary units per cubic centimeter, commonly known as "obstetrical pituitary," had been substituted for *surgical pituitary* having a potency of 20 U. S. P. posterior pituitary units per cubic centimeter, which the article purported and was represented to be.

Misbranding (count 2), Section 502 (i) (3), the article consisted of obstetrical pituitary, and was offered for sale under the name of "Surgical Pituitary 20 Units."

DISPOSITION: April 3, 1945. A plea of not guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the case came on for trial before the court. At the conclusion of the trial, the court returned a verdict of guilty on count 1 of the information and not guilty on count 2. On April 25, 1945, the defendant was fined $750 on count 1.

1572. Adulteration and misbranding of pituitary extract, obstetrical. U. S. v. Chicago Pharmacal Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $200 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 10570. Sample No. 37767–F.)

INFORMATION FILED: May 4, 1945, Northern District of Illinois, against the Chicago Pharmacal Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about February 5, 1943, from the State of Illinois into the State of Indiana.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (b), the article purported to be posterior pituitary injection, a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, an official compendium, but its strength differed from and its quality fell below the official standard since it did not possess an activity equivalent to 1 U. S. P. posterior pituitary unit, as required by the Pharmacopoeia, but possessed an activity equivalent to not more than 0.67 U. S. P. posterior pituitary unit.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Each 1 cc. contains: Solution of Posterior Pituitary, U. S. P., 1 cc," was false and misleading.

DISPOSITION: June 12, 1945. A plea of guilty having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of $100 on each of the 2 counts of the information, plus costs.