

and misled the purchaser when applied to a product containing the above-named ingredients and containing little or no orange juice. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On March 3, 1922, the National Fruit Flavor Co., New Orleans, La., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon 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 article be labeled "Squeeze (Orange Flavor) Imitation."

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

10328. Misbranding of crab meat. U. S. * * * v. Wallace M. Quinn (The Wallace M. Quinn Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 15436. I. S. Nos. 152-t, 6660-t.)

On February 7, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Wallace M. Quinn, trading as the Wallace M. Quinn Co., Crisfield, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 18, 1921, from the State of Maryland into the States of New York and Missouri, respectively, of quantities of crab meat which was misbranded.

Examination, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, of a sample from each of the consignments showed an average shortage in weight of 10.5 per cent and 10.6 per cent, respectively.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Contents 5 Lbs. Net," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding the article, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that each of the said cans contained 5 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 said cans contained 5 pounds net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said cans did not contain 5 pounds 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 February 7, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

10329. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. * * * v. 462 Boxes * * * of Oranges. Judgment of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 16190. I. S. Nos. 5561-t, 5562-t. S. No. B-3803.)

On March 13, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, 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 462 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pepper Fruit Co., from Highland, Calif., on or about February 21, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, respectively: "Century Brand, Riverside Fruit Co., Riverside, California"; and "Good Taste Brand Highland Oranges * * * Highland, California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On March 15, 1922, the Pepper Fruit Co., Highland, Calif., having entered an appearance as claimant for the property and having filed a bond in the sum of \$2,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings.

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