

**S294. Adulteration of butter. U. S. \* \* \* v. William Winstead. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 546-c.)**

On January 14, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against William Winstead, Washington, D. C., alleging that on December 8, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of butter which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain other substance, to wit, oleomargarine, had been substituted in whole and in part for the article.

On January 14, 1920, the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

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

**S295. Adulteration of butter. U. S. \* \* \* v. Daniel A. Sullivan. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 547-c.)**

On January 14, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Daniel A. Sullivan, Washington, D. C., alleging that on December 8, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of butter which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain other article, to wit, process butter, had been substituted in whole and in part for the article.

On January 14, 1920, the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

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

**S296. Adulteration of butter. U. S. \* \* \* v. George Hagsis. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 548-c.)**

On January 16, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against George Hagsis, Washington, D. C., alleging that on December 8, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of butter which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that a certain other article, to wit, oleomargarine, had been substituted wholly or in part for the article.

On January 16, 1920, the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

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

**S297. Adulteration of lard. U. S. \* \* \* v. J. T. D. Pyles. Collateral of \$50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 549-c.)**

On January 16, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against J. T. D. Pyles, Washington, D. C., alleging that on December 11, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of lard which was adulterated.