

to Protein 36.00 per cent),” which statement was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since the said article was deficient in protein [ammonia]. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On February 6, 1923, the Planters Oil Co., Albany, Ga., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of 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 \$800, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12681. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 200 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. No. 17008. I. S. No. 3196-v. S. No. E-4234.)**

On December 6, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of cottonseed meal at Jacksonville, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Empire Cotton Oil Co. from Cordele, Ga., on or about October 31, 1922, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) “Gilt Edge Brand Cotton Seed Meal Manufactured By Empire Cotton Oil Co. Home Office, Atlanta, Ga. Guaranteed Analysis: Protein \* \* \* 36.00%, (Equivalent to Ammonia 7.00%) \* \* \* Ingredients—Pressed Cotton Seed.”

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance low in protein had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was labeled “Guaranteed Analysis: Protein 36.00% (Equivalent to Ammonia 7.00%) \* \* \* Ingredients—Pressed Cotton Seed,” which statement was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since the product was deficient in protein and contained less than the equivalent of 7 per cent of ammonia. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On January 27, 1923, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product be correctly labeled.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12682. Adulteration of canned string beans. U. S. v. 16 Cases of Canned String Beans. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16698. S. No. E-4099.)**

On or about August 15, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 16 cases of canned string beans, at Bluefield, W. Va., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Rileyville Canning Co., Rileyville, Va., August 26, 1921, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of West Virginia, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: “Shenandoah River Green Beans \* \* \* Packed by Rileyville Canning Co. Rileyville, Va.”

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

On April 13, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*