61. Adulteration and misbranding of gauze bandage. U. S. v. 49 Dozen Packages of Gauze Bandage. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 706. Sample No. 68240–D.)

On October 13, 1939, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York filed a libel against 49 dozen packages of gauze bandage at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 18, 1939, by the Handy Pad Supply Co. from Worcester, Mass.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Non-ravel Surgical Gauze Bandage."

It was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity or quality fell below that which it purported or was represented to possess in that it was represented to be sterile; whereas it was not sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that representations appearing in the labeling that it was surgical gauze bandage which had been sterilized after packaging, had been prepared especially for the medical profession and carefully manufactured under most sanitary conditions for surgical use and was guaranteed to be satisfactory, were false and misleading.

On December 1, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

62. Adulteration and misbranding of Absorbal refills. U. S. v. 9 Packages of One Reel Refill Absorbal. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 272. Sample No. 63611–D.)

On July 7, 1939, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri filed a libel against 9 packages of One Reel Refill Absorbal at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 1, 1939, by Edward Girvin, D. D. S., from Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded.

It was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity or quality fell below that which it purported or was represented to possess.

Misbranding was alleged in that the representation in the labeling that it had been resterilized after packaging was false and misleading, as applied to an article that was not sterile, but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

On September 12, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

63. Adulteration of gauze bandage. U. S. v. 1,005 Dozen Packages, et al., of Gauze Bandage. Decree of condemnation. Product released for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 629. Sample Nos. 47391–D to 47394–D, incl., 76816–D to 76819–D, incl.)

On September 21, 1939, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland filed a libel against 3,775 dozen packages of gauze bandage at Perry Point, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 27, 1939, from Dayville, Conn., by the Acme Cotton Products Co.; and charging that it was adulterated. These bandages were supplied to a Government agency in accordance with Federal Standards Stock Catalogue Specifications which require that "After individual packaging, bandages shall be subjected to a sterilizing process whereby the effectively sealed packages are subjected to the action of steam heat sufficiently to raise the interior of the package to a temperature of 240 degrees F., which temperature shall then be steadily maintained as a minimum for a period of 30 minutes."

Adulteration was alleged in that the purity or quality of the article fell below that which it purported to possess.

On December 5, 1939, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released to the claimant on condition that it be relabeled "Not Sterile" or "To Be Sterilized Before Used."

64. Misbranding of First Aid Poc-Kits. U. S. v. 19 Dozen First Aid Poc-Kits. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 280. Sample No. 9830–D.)

On July 11, 1939, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 19 dozen packages of First Aid Poc-Kits at Harrisburg, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 15, 1939, by the Hampton Manufacturing Co., Inc., from Carlstadt, N. J.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Misbranding was alleged in that representations on the kit that it was indispensable as a first aid for all minor injuries, and was a safeguard against