exclusively of grape juice, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted exclusively of grape juice, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did not, but did consist in part of a mixture composed of added sugar and added water.

On December 7, 1920, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9513. Misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. * * * v. Osage Cotton Oil Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $200 and costs. (F. & D. No. 13915. I. S. Nos. 18807-r, 18805-r.)

On January 5, 1921, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Osage Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, having a place of business at Muskogee, Okla., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, or or about December 3, 1919, and January 7, 1920, respectively, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of quantities of cottonseed cake which was misbranded.

Examination of 40 sacks and 71 sacks from the two consignments, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, showed an average net weight of 95.3 pounds and 96.2 pounds, respectively.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "100 Pounds Gross 99 lbs. Net," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding the article, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the said sacks weighed 100 pounds gross and contained 99 pounds net of the said article, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the sacks weighed 100 pounds gross and contained 99 pounds net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said sacks did not weigh 100 pounds gross but did weigh a less amount, and each of the said sacks did not contain 99 pounds net of the said 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 July 2, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $200 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9514. Misbranding of Egg-Nu. U. S. * * * v. The Abner Royce Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 12323. I. S. No. 15087-r.)

On June 21, 1920, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Abner Royce Co., a corporation, Cleveland, Ohio, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about June 16 or July 5, 1919, from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of Egg-Nu which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of dried powdered egg and cornstarch. Baking tests made by the said bureau showed that the article did not take the place of eggs in cake baking. Cakes made with Egg-Nu were slightly