

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

On September 23, 1925, 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.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13782. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 11 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20236. I. S. No. 24184-v. S. No. E-5411.)

On or about July 3, 1925, 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 11 tubs of butter, consigned June 15, 1925, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Fox River Butter Co., from Philadelphia, Pa., and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Fox River Butter Co. * * * Phila. Pa.," and was invoiced "Butter."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance low in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, as prescribed by law.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, and in that the statement "Butter" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On or about August 4, 1925, the Fox River Butter Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., 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 \$660, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it not be sold or disposed of until reworked to contain 80 per cent of butterfat.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13783. Adulteration of canned corn. U. S. v. 675 Cases of Canned Corn. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released to be reprocessed. (F. & D. No. 19521. I. S. No. 20172-v. S. No. W-1633.)

On or about January 26, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, 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 675 cases of canned corn, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Sacramento, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by William Numsen & Sons, from Baltimore, Md., October 18, 1924, and transported from the State of Maryland into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Case) "Farm Queen Brand Sugar Corn Packed By Wm. Numsen & Sons Inc. Baltimore, Md."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that water or brine had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

On April 13, 1925, F. M. Ball & Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of forfeiture was entered, said decree providing that the product might be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13784. Adulteration and misbranding of jellies. U. S. v. James A. Hamilton. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 19274. I. S. Nos. 12627-v, 12628-v, 12629-v, 12630-v, 15185-v, 15186-v, 15187-v, 15188-v.)

On February 16, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed