

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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be relabeled to show its true constituency.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17135. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. Joseph W. Williams. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 19696. I. S. No. 12177-v.)

On November 17, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Joseph W. Williams, Republican City, Nebr., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about September 2, 1924, from the State of Kansas into the State of Colorado, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On March 20, 1930, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17136. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Texas Refining Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$250. (F. & D. No. 23754. I. S. Nos. 01119, 01120.)

On September 23, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Texas Refining Co., a corporation, Greenville, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about October 22, 1928, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of quantities of cottonseed meal which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "43% Protein Cotton Seed Meal Prime Quality Manufactured by Texas Refining Company Greenville, Texas. Guaranteed Analysis Crude protein not less than 43.00 Per Cent."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statements, to wit, "43% Protein Cotton Seed Meal," and "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein not less than 43.00 Per Cent," borne on the tag attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article was cottonseed meal containing not less than 43 per cent of crude protein; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was cottonseed meal containing not less than 43 per cent of crude protein, whereas it was a cottonseed meal product containing less than 43 per cent of crude protein.

On January 13, 1930, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$250.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17137. Misbranding of cottonseed cake and meal. U. S. v. Dallas Oil & Refining Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$600. (F. & D. No. 23752. I. S. Nos. 04784, 04794, 04796, 04797, 05008, 07503, 07505, 07507.)

On August 21, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Dallas Oil & Refining Co., a corporation, Dallas, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, from the State of Texas, in various consignments, on or about December 6, 1928, into the State of Kansas, on or about December 11, 1928, into the State of Wyoming, and on or about December 13, 1928, into the States of Illinois, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, and Minnesota, respectively, of quantities of cottonseed meal and cake which were misbranded. The article was labeled in part, variously: "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43%," "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%," and "Analysis Protein Basis 43 per cent."

It was alleged in the information that the articles were misbranded in that the statements, respectively, "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43%," "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%," and "Analysis Protein Basis 43 Per Cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing