

the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 48 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Buffalo, N. Y., consigned by the Landa Cotton Oil Co., New Braunfels, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped August 26, 1924, from New Brunsville (New Braunfels), Tex., and transported from the State of Texas into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements "43% Protein Cottonseed Meal * * * Guaranteed analysis Crude protein 43%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the said article, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On October 17, 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 sold by the United States marshal.

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

13671. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 195 Tins of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16508. S. No. E-4011.)

On July 1, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, 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 195 tins of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Rochester, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from Philadelphia, Pa., between the dates of December 16, 1921, and January 21, 1922, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Tin) "¼ Lb. Net Chloroform * * * For Anaesthesia."

Analysis of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained hydrochloric acid.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by test laid down in said pharmacopœia.

On September 12, 1922, 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.

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

13672. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 53 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20274. I. S. No. 1210-x. S. No. C-4778.)

On July 10, 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 53 tubs of butter, remaining unsold in the original packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Herreman Creamery Co., from Salem, S. D., July 1, 1925, and transported from the State of South Dakota 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 with the said article, 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, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted from the article.

On July 17, 1925, Randack & 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 so as to contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

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