

**21614. Misbranding of cottonseed screenings. U. S. v. Rosebud Oil & Cotton Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 29470. I.S. no. 47495.)**

This case was based on an interstate shipment of cottonseed screenings that were found to contain less than 43 percent of protein. the amount declared on the label.

On March 7, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Rosebud Oil & Cotton Co., a corporation, Rosebud, Tex., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 2, 1932, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of cottonseed screenings that were misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Prime Quality 43% Protein Cottonseed Cake and Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43% \* \* \* Manufactured By Rosebud Oil & Cotton Co., Rosebud, Texas."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statements, "43% protein \* \* \* guaranteed analysis protein, not less than 43%", borne on the tag, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it contained less than 43 percent of protein.

On November 20, 1933, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21615. Adulteration and misbranding of wheat bran. U. S. v. Voigt Milling Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 30246. Sample nos. 17783-A, 17786-A, 17787-A.)**

This case was based on interstate shipments of a product which was represented to be pure winter wheat bran but which was found to consist in part of screenings, or screenings and scourings.

On August 18, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Voigt Milling Co., a corporation, Grand Rapids, Mich., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 19, August 31, and September 12, 1932, from the State of Michigan into the State of Maryland, of quantities of wheat bran which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Voigt's Pure Winter Wheat Bran \* \* \* Manufactured By Voigt Milling Co. Grand Rapids, Mich."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a substance, added screenings and/or scourings, had been substituted in part for pure winter wheat bran, which the article purported solely to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Pure Winter Wheat Bran", borne on the bags containing the article, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the said statement represented that the article consisted solely of pure winter wheat bran, whereas it consisted in part of added screenings, or added screenings and scourings.

On November 1, 1933, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21616. Adulteration of cherries in brine. U. S. v. William G. Allen (Allen Fruit Co. or W. G. Allen Fruit Co. or Hunt Bros. Packing Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. no. 28140. I.S. nos. 22916 to 22919, incl.)**

This case was based on interstate shipments of cherries in brine that were found to be in part rotten and moldy.

On September 21, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against William G. Allen, trading as the Allen Fruit Co., the W. G. Allen Fruit Co., and the Hunt Bros. Packing Co., having his principal place of business at Salem, Oreg., also a place of business at Dundee, Oreg., alleging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, between the dates of July 13 and July 25, 1931, from the State of Oregon into the State of New Jersey, of quantities of cherries in brine that were adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of decomposed and putrid vegetable substances.

t  
C  
d  
p  
s  
f  
F  
S  
a  
2  
a  
cl  
m  
ar  
be  
21  
to  
Je

On November 21, 1933, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21617. Adulteration and misbranding of egg noodles. U. S. v. Figler-Saltzman & Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. no. 28131. I.S. no. 35871.)**

This case was based on an interstate shipment of a product represented to be egg noodles, which was found to contain insufficient egg solids to be classed as egg noodles and which was artificially colored to simulate the appearance of egg noodles.

On December 13, 1932, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Figler-Saltzman & Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about October 19, 1931, from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, of a quantity of egg noodles that were adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Taste Good Genuine Egg Noodles Mfg. by Figler, Saltzman & Glick, Inc., \* \* \* Chicago."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a product deficient in egg solids had been substituted for egg noodles, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was colored with undeclared artificial color in a manner whereby its inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Egg Noodles", borne on the carton, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it was not egg noodles, being deficient in egg solids. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was deficient in egg solids and contained an undeclared artificial coloring substance and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, egg noodles, and for the further reason that it was an imitation of another article.

On December 13, 1933, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21618. Adulteration of apple pomace. U. S. v. 36 Bags of Apple Pomace. Default decree of destruction. (F. & D. no. 31188. Sample no. 57476-A.)**

This case involved an interstate shipment of apple pomace that was found to contain excessive lead and arsenic spray residue.

On September 29, 1933, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 36 bags of apple pomace at Muskogee, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 31, 1933, by Gregory-Robinson-Speas, Inc., from Rogers, Ark. and charging that it was adulterated in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, since it contained arsenic and lead.

On November 4, 1933, an amended libel was filed representing that the United States marshal had seized 27 bags of the product described in the original libel, also 80 additional sacks similar in appearance and physical make-up to the said 27 bags and that analysis had disclosed that an excessive amount of lead and arsenic spray residue was contained in the product in the said 80 sacks, and charging that the entire 107 bags of the product were adulterated.

On November 23, 1933, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment was entered finding that the product was adulterated in that it contained an excessive amount of lead and arsenic spray residue and ordering that it be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21619. Misbranding of canned cherries. U. S. v. 97 Cases of Canned Cherries. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. no. 31293. Sample no. 51327-A.)**

Sample cans of cherries from the shipment involved in this case were found to contain less than the declared weight.

On October 30, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the