

tured By The Buckeye Cotton Oil Co. General Offices, Cincinnati, Ohio * * *
Guarantee Protein 36.00% * * * Ammonia 7.00% Fibre 14.00%."

Analyses of a sample of the article from each of the three consignments, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, showed that the said samples contained 34.50 per cent, 34.25 per cent, and 33.56 per cent of protein, 6.71 per cent, 6.66 per cent, and 6.52 per cent of ammonia, and 15.85 per cent, 14.50 per cent, and 15.40 per cent of fiber, respectively.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a product inferior to good cottonseed meal had been substituted for good cottonseed meal, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Good Cottonseed Meal" and "Guarantee Protein 36.00% * * * Ammonia 7.00% Fibre 14.00%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article was good cottonseed meal, and contained not less than 36 per cent of protein, not less than 7 per cent of ammonia, and not more than 14 per cent of fiber, 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 good cottonseed meal, and contained not less than 36 per cent of protein, not less than 7 per cent of ammonia, and not more than 14 per cent of fiber, whereas it was not good cottonseed meal but was a product inferior to good cottonseed meal, and contained less protein, less ammonia, and more fiber than declared on the labels.

On April 26, 1924, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13009. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. William A. Dublin, George M. Brooks, and Gaines A. Legg (Boone, Holmes & Co.). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 18334. I. S. No. 6440-v.)

On July 5, 1924, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William A. Dublin, George M. Brooks, and Gaines A. Legg, copartners, trading as Boone, Holmes & Co., Clinton, Ky., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about August 6, 1923, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "B H & Co."

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of 1,440 eggs from the consignment showed that 171 eggs, or 11.8 per cent of those examined, were inedible, consisting of black rots, mixed rots, spot rots, and blood rings.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy and decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On November 19, 1924, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13010. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 198 Cases of Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be salvaged. (F. & D. No. 19553. I. S. No. 19137-v. S. No. C-4618.)

On January 17, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 198 cases of eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. T. Fisher, from Evansville, Ind., January 1, 1925, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

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

On January 21, 1925, G. W. Randall, Chicago, Ill., 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 \$1,000,

in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be canceled under the supervision of this department and the bad portion destroyed.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13011. Adulteration and misbranding of hominy feed. U. S. v. 500 Sacks of Hominy Feed. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. No. 18845. I. S. No. 22262-v. S. No. E-4886.)

On or about July 21, 1924, 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 a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of hominy feed, consigned June 11, 1924, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Corno Mills, from East St. Louis, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Corno Hominy Feed Guaranteed Analysis: Protein 10.00 Fat 7.00 * * * Made By The Corno Mills Co. Address: East St. Louis, Ill."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, a wheat and oat by-product, had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Protein 10.00 Fat 7.00, Hominy Feed," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that the said statements represented that the article contained 10 per cent of protein and 7 per cent of fat, whereas it contained less protein and less fat than declared on the label.

On August 15, 1924, the Corno Mills Co., East St. Louis, Mo., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation 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 \$1,675, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled to show its content of wheat and oat by-products.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13012. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of vinegar. U. S. v. 80 Barrels of Vinegar. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 15612. I. S. No. 6924-t. S. No. E-3647.)

On November 12, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, 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 80 barrels of vinegar, shipped from New York into Connecticut in interstate commerce, and remaining in the original unbroken packages at Bridgeport, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Douglas Packing Co., on or about October 26, 1921, into the State of Connecticut, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Barrel) "Douglas Packing Co. Excelsior Brand Apple Cider Vinegar Made From Selected Apples Reduced to 4 Per Centum Rochester N. Y."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated in that apple waste vinegar 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 article.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the labels on the barrels containing the article bore the following statement, "Apple Cider Vinegar Made From Selected Apples," which was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that the said statement represented that the product was apple cider vinegar, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. 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, to wit, apple cider vinegar.

On or about December 17, 1924, the Douglas Packing Co., Inc., Rochester N. Y., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of the court was entered, finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was further ordered by the court that the said prod-