

and had been substituted wholly or in part for rice bran, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, rice bran.

On March 12, 1919, the Seattle Flour Mills, Seattle, Wash., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$3,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be relabeled as rice bran and hulls, 50 per cent hulls.

E. D. BALL,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7131. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 24 Gallon Cans, 48 Half-gallon Cans, and 96 Quarter-gallon Cans of Olive Oil (so called). Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 9768. I. S. No. 12720-r. S. No. E-1256.)

On February 24, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, 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 24 gallon cans, 48 $\frac{1}{2}$ -gallon cans, and 96 $\frac{1}{4}$ -gallon cans of olive oil, so called, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Hartford, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 11, 1918, by Basileous Importing Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Pure Extra Fine Olive Oil (wreath of olive twigs bearing olives) Madrid Brand Imported from Spain."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that cottonseed oil had been mixed and packed in the gallon and $\frac{1}{4}$ -gallon cans so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be; and for the further reason that cottonseed oil and corn oil had been mixed and packed with the article contained in the $\frac{1}{2}$ -gallon cans so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements and designs borne on the cans were false and misleading, that is to say, the following words and designs, "Pure Extra Fine Olive Oil (wreath of olive twigs bearing olives) * * * Extra Sublime Olive Oil for Medicinal and Table Uses. * * *," which said words and designs were intended to be of such a character as to induce the purchaser to believe that the article was olive oil, when, in truth and in fact, it was not, and for the further reason that it purported to be a foreign product, when, in truth and in fact, it was a product of domestic manufacture packed in the United States; and for the further reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count; and for the further reason that the article was misbranded in being labeled "One Full Gallon," "Half Full Gallon," and "One Full Quarter Gallon," respectively,

whereas examination showed each of said cans to be considerably short in volume.

On April 25, 1919, 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.

E. D. BALL,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7132. Adulteration of cereal flour. U. S. * * * v. 19 Bags of Cereal Flour. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale.
(F. & D. No. 9770. I. S. No. 2526-r. S. No. W-282.)

On or about February 25, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, 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 19 bags of cereal flour, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by Charles Herendeen Mill Co., Danville, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 2, 1918, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable and animal substance.

On April 16, 1919, 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 at either private or public sale for animal food only.

E. D. BALL,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7133. Adulteration and misbranding of rice bran. U. S. * * * v. 1,190 Sacks of a Product Purporting to be Rice Bran. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9771. I. S. No. 2415-r. S. No. W-281.)

On February 24, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, 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 1,190 sacks of a product purporting to be rice bran, consigned on or about February 13, 1919, by the Nolan Mill & Feed Co., San Francisco, Calif., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product consisting largely of rice hulls had been mixed and packed therewith, and had been substituted wholly or in part for rice bran, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, rice bran.

On March 20, 1919, Charles Nelson Co., Seattle, Wash., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be relabeled as rice bran and hulls, 60 per cent hulls.

E. D. BALL,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.