

Tenn., alleging that the article had been shipped from Rogersville, Tenn., on or about June 22, 1928, and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

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 substituted wholly or in part for the article and had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and in that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

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 June 28, 1928, C. M. Drake, 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 \$200, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law, and be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15937. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 7 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22869. I. S. No. 20166-x. S. No. 898.)

On June 20, 1928, 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 7 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Chesapeake Dairy Products Co., Mathews, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Mathews, Va., on or about June 18, 1928, 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 as amended.

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 substituted wholly or in part for the said article and had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength.

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 in that the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously stated on the outside of the package.

On June 28, 1928, C. M. Drake, 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 \$300, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law, and be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15938. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 15 Cans of Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 22482. I. S. No. 23418-x. S. No. 600.)

On February 25, 1928, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, 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 15 one-gallon cans (1 five-gallon can) of olive oil, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Port Arthur, Texas, consigned by A. Bologna & Co., alleging that the article had been shipped from New Orleans, La., on or about November 30, 1927, and transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that cottonseed oil had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and 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 offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil, and for the