since each fluid ounce did not contain 400 U. S. P. units of vitamin B_1 but did contain a smaller amount.

On February 28, 1941, a plea of nolo contendere was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of $500.

463. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 795 Bottles and 972 Bottles of Chloroform. Default decrees of condemnation. Portion of product ordered destroyed; remainder ordered delivered to a hospital to be used for technical purposes. (F. D. C. Nos. 5174, 5180. Sample Nos. 47480-E, 50848-E.)

This product differed from the pharmacopoeial standards because of the presence of carbonizable substances in both lots and of chlorinated decomposition products in one.

On July 19 and 22, 1941, the United States attorneys for the District of Maryland and the Northern District of Illinois filed libels against 972 bottles of chloroform at Perry Point, Md., and 795 bottles of chloroform at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 27, 1941, by the City Chemical Corporation from New York, N. Y., and Jersey City, N. J.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Chloroform USP XI (Not for Anesthesia)."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be or was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and its strength differed from and its quality and purity fell below the standard set forth in that compendium since it contained carbonizable substances and in one lot chlorinated decomposition products. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Chloroform USP XI," borne on the label, was false and misleading.

On September 20 and October 15, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the goods seized at Chicago were ordered destroyed and those seized at Perry Point were ordered delivered to a hospital. The latter lot was relabeled by obliterating the term "U. S. P." and stamping on the label the words, "For technical uses only."

464. Adulteration of powdered extract of digitalis. U. S. v. 1 Can of Powdered Extract of Digitalis. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3742. Sample No. 25065-E.)

This product possessed a potency of not more than 1.3 U. S. P. digitalis units per 0.1 gram; whereas the National Formulary provides that it should possess a potency of not less than 2.75 U. S. P. digitalis units per 0.1 gram. Moreover, it was invoiced as "P. E. Digitalis 1-4," which meant that each gram should possess an activity of not less than 4 U. S. P. digitalis units.

On January 31, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 1 can of powdered extract of digitalis at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 2, 1940, by J. L. Hopkins & Co. from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated. It was labeled in part: "Powdered Extract Not Biologically Tested Defatted Digitalis * * * Not N. F."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it purported to be or was represented as a drug the name of which is recognized in the National Formulary, an official compendium, but its strength differed from the standard set forth in such compendium and its difference in strength from such standard was not stated on its label. It was alleged to be adulterated further in that a substance, namely, a preparation of digitalis possessing a potency of not more than 1.3 U. S. P. digitalis units per 0.1 gram had been substituted therefor.

On March 8, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

465. Adulteration and misbranding of powdered extract digitalis leaves. U. S. v. 1 Can of Powdered Extract Digitalis Leaves. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2156. Sample Nos. 3014-E, 3060-E.)

This product possessed a potency of 1.6 U. S. P. digitalis units per 0.1 gram, whereas the National Formulary requires that extract of digitalis possess a potency of not less than 2.75 U. S. P. digitalis units per 0.1 gram.

On June 4, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against one can of powdered extract digitalis leaves at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 27, 1939, by S. B. Penick & Co. from Jersey City, N. J.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.