

istration. The good portion was segregated from the bad, and the latter was delivered to a meat company for use as hog feed. On October 10, 1941, no claimant having appeared for the seizure at Phoenix, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2852. Adulteration of macaroni products. U. S. v. 4 Cases of Noodles, et al. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5455. Sample Nos. 53966-E to 53972-E, incl.)

On September 2, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Arizona filed a libel against 15 cases of egg noodles, 2 cases of macaroni, 10 cases of spaghetti, and 4 cases of vermicelli at Yuma, Ariz., alleging that the articles had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 24, April 24, and July 21, 1941, by Superior Macaroni Co. from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that they were adulterated in that they consisted in whole or in part of filthy substances. The articles were labeled in part: "Kwik Kook Egg Noodles [or "Macaroni Products]"; or "Superio Brand 100% Semolina Products."

On October 6, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

MISCELLANEOUS

2853. Adulteration of Cream of Maize. U. S. v. 102 Bags of Cream of Maize. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5910. Sample No. 59434-E.)

This product was insect-infested.

On September 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia filed a libel against 102 50-pound bags of Cream of Maize at Norfolk, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 4, 1940, by Decatur Milling Co., Inc., from Decatur, Ill.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance. The article was labeled in part: "Hexagon Brand Cream of Maize."

On October 8, 1941, the claimant having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2854. Misbranding of natural brown puffed rice. U. S. v. 60 Cases of Natural Brown Puffed Rice. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to charitable institution. (F. D. C. No. 5635. Sample No. 69959-E.)

This product contained approximately two-thirds the amount of vitamin B₁ declared on the label.

On September 8, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 60 cases of natural brown puffed rice at New Brunswick, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 28, 1941, by the Southern Rice Sales Corporation from Long Island City, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Package) "4 Ounces Net Weight River Brand Puffed Natural Brown Rice Contains Vitamin B₁ and B₂."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Each four ounce package of River Brand Natural Brown Puffed Rice contains 94.4 International units of Vitamin B₁," borne on the label, was false and misleading as applied to an article that contained not more than 60 International Units of vitamin B₁ in each 4-ounce package.

On November 19, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a charitable institution.

FEED

2855. Misbranding of cottonseed cake and meal. U. S. v. The Southern Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. D. C. No. 4151. Sample Nos. 18493-E, 18494-E.)

This product contained less protein than the amount declared on its label.

On July 3, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas filed an information against the Southern Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Newport, Ark., alleging shipment on or about October 4, 1940, from the State of Arkansas into the State of Kansas of quantities of cottonseed cake and meal that were misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tags) "Cottonseed Cake and Meal Superior Quality Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 41% * * * Distributed by Superior Cake & Meal Co."

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Protein, not less than 41%," borne on the tags, was false and misleading since it contained less than 41