

**2872. Adulteration of frozen egg product. U. S. v. Morton R. Craven (Eastern Provision Co., Consolidated Egg Yolk Co.). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$200 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4192. I. S. No. 3150-d.)**

At the September, 1912, sessions of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania the grand inquest of the United States in and for said district, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, returned an indictment against Morton R. Craven, trading under the name of the Consolidated Egg Yolk Co., Philadelphia, Pa., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on October 31, 1911, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, of a quantity of frozen egg product which was adulterated. The product was not labeled.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results: After calculating the results to moisture, fat free basis, cc of N/100 iodine solution reduced per 15 grams of sample, 185.3; milligrams of ammonia per 100 grams of eggs (ZnO method), 120.5; milligrams of ammonia per 100 grams of eggs (Folin's titration method), 74.6. Bacteriological examination of a sample of the product by said Bureau of Chemistry showed the following results: 160,000,000 organisms per gram, plain agar, after 4 days at 25° C.; 160,000,000 organisms per gram, plain agar, after 4 days at 25° C.; 160,000,000 organisms per gram, plain agar, after 4 days at 37° C.; 190,000,000 organisms per gram, plain agar, after 4 days at 37° C.; 10,000,000 *B. coli* group per gram; 10,000,000 streptococci per gram. It was found that the product must have consisted in part of spot eggs, as three embryos and one piece of mold were found; odor sour. The ten larvæ found indicated a filthy condition and careless handling. Adulteration of the product was charged in the indictment for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal and vegetable substance.

On June 9, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the indictment and the court imposed a fine of \$200 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

**2873. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. One Case of Oil. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 4194. S. No. 1434.)**

On June 21, 1912, the United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of one case of oil remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages and in the possession of Joseph Luongo, Providence, R. I., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about March 29, 1912, from the State of New York into the State of Rhode Island, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Tripoli Brand Trade Mark Olio Puro Italiano Di Olivi."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was labeled as set forth above and purported by said label to be pure olive oil, but that a certain substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been substituted in part in said oil for pure olive oil. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the packages containing the oil bore a label, statement, design, and device reading as above set forth, which label, statement, design, and device was false and misleading, to wit, that said oil purported by said label, statement, design, and device to be pure olive oil, when, in truth and in fact, said oil was not pure olive oil, but was composed in substantial part of cottonseed oil and oils other than olive oil. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the packages containing the oil bore a label reading as aforesaid, to wit, that said oil purported by its label to be pure olive oil, but was in fact composed in large part of cottonseed oil and oils other than olive oil, and was in manner and form as aforesaid so labeled and branded as to mislead the purchaser.

During the month of September, 1913, the case having come on for final disposition and no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

**2874. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. One Case of Oil. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 4195. S. No. 1434.)**

On June 21, 1912, the United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of one case of oil remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages and in the possession of Raffaele Petternte, Providence, R. I., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about March 11, 1912, from the State of New York into the State of Rhode Island, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Tripoli Brand Trade Mark Olio Puro Italiano Di Olivi."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was labeled as set forth above and purported by said label to be pure olive oil, but that a certain substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been substituted in part in said oil for pure olive oil. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the packages containing the oil bore a label, statement, design, and device reading as above set forth, which label, statement, design, and device was false and misleading, to wit, that said oil purported by said label, statement, design, and device to be pure olive oil, when, in truth and in fact, said oil was not pure olive oil, but was composed in substantial part of cottonseed oil and oils other than olive oil. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the packages containing the oil bore a label reading as aforesaid, to wit, that said oil purported by its label to be pure olive oil, but was in fact composed in large part of cottonseed oil and oils other than olive oil, and was in manner and form as aforesaid so labeled and branded as to mislead the purchaser.

During the month of September, 1913, the case having come on for final disposition and no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

**2875. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 2 Cases of Oil. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 4196. S. No. 1434.)**

On June 21, 1912, the United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of two cases of oil remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages and in the possession of Luigi Amitrano, Providence, R. I., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about March 11, 1912, from the State of New York into the State of Rhode Island, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Tripoli Brand Trade Mark Olio Puro Italiano Di Olivi."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was labeled as set forth above and purported by said label to be pure olive oil, but that a certain substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been substituted in part in said oil for pure olive oil. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the packages containing the oil bore a label, statement, design, and device reading as above set forth, which