

United States Department of Agriculture,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT NO. 214, FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

ADULTERATIONS OF MILK.

In accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, and of regulation 6 of the rules and regulations for the enforcement of the act, notice is given of judgments rendered in the Police Court of the District of Columbia, on the dates hereinafter mentioned, in the following cases involving violations of section 2 of the aforesaid act:

In *United States v. Robert E. Kanode*, of Gaithersburg, Md., the defendant, on November 23, 1909, was arraigned upon, and pleaded guilty to, an information charging him with the sale of milk in the District of Columbia which was adulterated in that butter fat, a valuable constituent thereof, had been abstracted therefrom; and the court imposed upon him a fine of \$10.

In *United States v. David Stup*, of Adamstown, Md., the defendant, on December 1, 1909, was arraigned upon, and pleaded guilty to, an information charging him with the sale of milk in the District of Columbia which was adulterated in that water had been mixed with it so as to lower and reduce its quality; and the court imposed upon him a fine of \$15.

In *United States v. Lyman T. Robinson*, of Meetze, Va., the defendant, on January 20, 1910, pleaded guilty to an information charging him with the sale of milk in the District of Columbia which was adulterated in that water had been mixed with it so as to lower and reduce its quality, and was fined \$15.

In *United States v. Albert Mack*, of Lewinsville, Va., the defendant, on January 20, 1910, was arraigned upon two informations charging him with sales of milk in the District of Columbia which was adulterated in that water had been mixed with it so as to lower and reduce its quality, and was fined \$15 in each case.

In *United States v. George R. Reeves*, of Glencarlynn, Va., the defendant, on January 20, 1910, pleaded guilty to an information charging him with the sale of milk in the District of Columbia which was adulterated in that water had been mixed with it so as to lower and injuriously affect its quality, and was fined \$15.

The facts on which the prosecutions were based were as follows:

An inspector of the health department of the District of Columbia, acting under authorization of the Secretary of Agriculture to Dr. William C. Woodward, health officer of said District, procured samples from milk sold and delivered at Union Station, Washington, D. C., by defendants in the above-mentioned cases, which were analyzed in the health department of the District of Columbia and found to be adulterated as above charged. All of said defendants were duly notified and given opportunities to be heard in regard to said adulterations, and it appearing that the act had been violated, the health officer reported the facts to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, who filed informations against the above-named defendants, with the results hereinbefore stated.

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 21, 1910.*

