

7755. Adulteration and misbranding of so-called olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Lyssandros D. Ravazula and Theodore D. Ravazula (Ravazula Bros.). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 12311. I. S. No. 13591-r.)

On April 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Lyssandros D. Ravazula and Theodore D. Ravazula, co-partners, trading under the firm name and style of Ravazula Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on May 8, 1919, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of quantities of so-called olive oil which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled, "Net Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gal.," or "Net Contents $\frac{1}{4}$ Gal.," as the case might be, and "Oil Superior Quality" (picture of olive branch) "St. Bertolino Brand Trade Mark Packed by Ravazula Brothers, N. Y. Winter pressed cottonseed salad oil slightly flavored with pure olive oil a compound."

Analysis of samples of the article made by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product consisted chiefly of cottonseed oil with some soya-bean oil, and that the cans were short volume.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that substances, to wit, cottonseed oil and soya-bean oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in large part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Oil Superior Quality Net Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ Gal." or "Net Contents $\frac{1}{4}$ Gal.," as the case might be, together with the designs and devices of an olive branch bearing olives, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type in an inconspicuous place, "Cottonseed salad oil slightly flavored with pure olive oil," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was olive oil, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon or $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was olive oil, in that each of the cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net or $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in large part of cottonseed oil and soya-bean oil, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net or $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, but did contain a less amount. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 5, 1920, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7756. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Lyssandros D. Ravazula and Theodore D. Ravazula (Ravazula Bros.). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 12312. I. S. Nos. 14889-r, 14979-r.)

On April 27, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Lyssandros D. Ravazula and Theodore D. Ravazula, co-partners, trading under the firm name and style of Ravazula Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on March 12, and March 29, 1919, from the State of New York into the States