

5158. Adulteration and misbranding of oil of lemon. U. S. * * * v. Magnus & Lauer, a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 7480. I. S. No. 18667-k.)

On August 22, 1916, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Magnus & Lauer, a corporation, San Francisco, Cal., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about September 11, 1914, from the State of California into the State of Washington, of a quantity of oil of lemon which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Magnus & Lauer * * * Oil Lemon * * * 139-141 Fremont St. San Francisco, Cal. Guaranteed by Magnus & Lauer Inc. under the Food and Drugs June 30, 1906. Serial Number 25454."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Specific gravity (25°/25° C.)	0.8460
Citral by Kleber (per cent)	3.7
Rotation in 100 mm tube at 25° C. (degrees)	80.6
Rotation of 10 per cent distillate in 100 mm tube at 25° C. (degrees)	75.1
Difference in rotation (degrees)	5.5
Refractive index, at 29° C.	1.4738
Iodoform test for alcohol: Positive.	
Ethyl alcohol (per cent by volume)	0.92
Boiling point (° C)	77-78

Analysis indicates a washed lemon oil mixed with an oil of high rotary power, probably an orange oil product.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that certain substances, to wit, washed lemon oil and other essential oil or oils, had been substituted in whole or in part for lemon oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statement regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, appearing on the label aforesaid, to wit, "Oil Lemon," was false and misleading in that it indicated to purchasers thereof that said article consisted of lemon oil; and for the further reason that it was labeled, "Oil Lemon," so as to deceive and mislead purchasers into the belief that said article consisted of lemon oil, when, in truth and in fact, the said article did not consist of lemon oil, but did consist of, to wit, a mixture of washed lemon oil and other essential oil or oils. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was, to wit, a mixture of washed lemon oil and other essential oil or oils, and was an imitation of, and offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, lemon oil.

On September 23, 1916, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*