Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Culpepper, Va., on or about July 6, 1927, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Covington-Nelson Creamery, Culpepper, Va."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On July 27, 1927, the Covington-Nelson Creamery Co., Culpepper, Va., 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 $1,000, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

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

15326. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 7 Tubs of Butter, et al. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22004. I. S. No. 20033-x. S. No. 39.)

On July 23, 1927, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 8 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the North State Creamery Co., Burlington, N. C., alleging that the article had been shipped from Burlington, N. C., on or about July 20, 1927, and transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "From North State Creamery Company, Burlington, N. C., Manufacturers of 'Dixie Brand' Butter."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of 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 the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, and for the further reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously declared on the outside of the package.

On August 5, 1927, Crawford & Lehman, Philadelphia, Pa., 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 $500, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

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

15327. Misbranding of Zovia, a concentrated mineral water. U. S. v. 12 Dozen Bottles of Zovia, a Concentrated Mineral Water. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 21649. I. S. No. 12521-x. S. No. W-2093.)

On February 24, 1927, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 12 dozen bottles of Zovia, a concentrated mineral water, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Zovia Wonder Water Co., from Alhambra, Calif., January 28, 1927, and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis by this department showed that the article was essentially an aqueous solution of magnesium sulphate.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded, in that the following statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent, since the said article contained no ingredient or combination