

ported from the State of Nebraska into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

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

During the month of September, 1925, W. E. Sage, Chicago, Ill., claimant, having admitted the material 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 the eggs be candled under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed, and the good portion released.

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

13788. Misbranding of canned corn. U. S. v. 60 Cases of Canned Corn. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20096. I. S. No. 15655-v. S. No. E-5205.)

On June 22, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, 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 60 cases of canned corn, at Youngstown, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by A. L. Brahm Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., on or about April 13, 1925, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Nun-So-Good Brand Sugar Corn Contents 1 Lb. 4 Oz. Packed By New Vienna Canning Co. New Vienna, Ohio."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement "Contents 1 Lb. 4 Oz." borne on the labels, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further 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.

On September 15, 1925, C. Tornello & Co., Youngstown, Ohio, having appeared as claimant for the property and having executed a bond in the sum of \$200, to insure the relabeling of the product, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the said product be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings, and that it be brought into compliance with the law under the supervision of this department.

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

13789. Misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 71 Cases of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20262. I. S. No. 1901-x. S. No. C-4777.)

On July 2, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, 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 71 cases of butter, at Memphis, Tenn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pine Bluff Creamery Co., from Pine Bluff, Ark., June 11, 1925, and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Tennessee, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Jersey Creamery Butter One Pound Net * * * Pine Bluff Creamery Butter * * * Pine Bluff, Ark."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement "One Pound," borne on the labels, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further 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.

On July 21, 1925, the Pine Bluff Creamery Co., Pine Bluff, Ark., having appeared as claimant for the property, 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 \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, said bond providing that the product be reconditioned or relabeled under the supervision of this department.

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