

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that excessive water had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On July 14, 1925, the Dallas Creamery Co., Dallas, Wis., 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 reprocessed under the supervision of this department, so that it contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**13590. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 10 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.**  
(F. & D. No. 20200. I. S. No. 22430-v. S. No. C-4758.)

On June 25, 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 10 tubs of butter, remaining unsold in the original packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Wacousta Creamery Co., from Ottosen, Iowa, June 19, 1925, and transported from the State of Iowa 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 excessive water had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On July 10, 1925, F. Holle & Co., 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 reprocessed under the supervision of this department, so that it contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**13591. Adulteration and alleged misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 21 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.**  
(F. & D. No. 20256. I. S. No. 1202-x. S. No. C-4774.)

On July 6, 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 21 tubs of butter, remaining unsold in the original packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Valley Dairy Products Co., from Appleton, Wis., June 30, 1925, and transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that excessive water had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

Misbranding was alleged for the 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.