

in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of twenty-four 30-pound cases of butter at Savannah, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about March 1, 1934, by Armour Creameries, from Louisville, Ky., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Spring Brook Brand Creamery Butter * * * Distributed by Armour Creameries, General Offices, Chicago."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy or decomposed animal substance.

On April 27, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

22457. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 4 Boxes of Butter. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32629. Sample nos. 58210-A, 58211-A.)

This case involved a shipment of alleged butter that was found to consist of colored oleomargarine.

On March 31, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of four boxes of butter at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, by Swift & Co. (Mar. 23 and Mar. 29, 1934), from Hartford, Conn., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Country Roll Creamery Butter."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that oleomargarine had been substituted for butter, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, "Butter."

On April 30, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

22458. Adulteration of tullibeets. U. S. v. 4 Boxes of Tullibeets. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32634. Sample no. 67937-A.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of fish that were infested with worms.

On March 30, 1934, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of four boxes of tullibeets at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about March 28, 1934, by Frontie Parker, from Williams, Minn., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "From Frontie Parker."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy animal substance, and in that it consisted of portions of animals unfit for food.

On April 26, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

22459. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 12 Boxes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be re-worked. (F. & D. no. 32636. Sample no. 67944-A.)

This case involved a shipment of butter that contained less than 80 percent of milk fat.

On April 10, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 12 boxes of butter at Jersey City, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about March 28, 1934, by the Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association, from New Ulm, Minn., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.