Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the labels on the cans bore statements regarding the article which were false and misleading, and were intended to be of such a character as to induce the purchaser to believe that the product was olive oil, when, in truth and in fact, it was not; and for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On October 15, 1918, the said Crisafulli Brothers, claimants, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimants upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$850, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

6826. Adulteration of eggs. U. S. \* \* \* v. S Cases of Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9330. I. S. No. 5901-r. S. No. C-970.)

On August 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 8 cases of eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 21, 1918, by Abraham Amber, trading as A. Amber Produce Co., Kansas City, Kans., and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Missouri, charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of decomposed eggs.

On September 28, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. F. Marvin, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

6827. Adulteration and misbranding of double distilled water. U. S. \* \* \* v. 16 Bottles \* \* \* of Double Distilled Water. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. Empty containers ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 9331. I. S. No. 5902-r. S. No. C-977.)

On September 17, 1918, 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 16 bottles of double distilled water, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Leavenworth, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 21, 1918, by the Eads Water Co., Kansas City, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Kansas, charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Double Distilled Water \* \* \* Eads Water Co. Kansas City, U. S. A."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal or vegetable substance.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the brand or label on the product was misleading and deceptive, and calculated to induce the purchaser to believe that the product was pure distilled water, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not. On November 26, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal, and that the empty containers be sold.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

6828. Adulteration of herring. U. S. \* \* \* v. 94 Pails \* \* \* Hately Brand Norway Herring. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9332. I. S. No. 17603-r. S. No. E-1121.)

On September 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 94 pails, each containing 6 pounds of Hately Brand Norway Herring, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 1, 1918, by Hately Brothers, Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Georgia, and alleging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On October 22, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

6829. Adulteration and misbranding of oil of sassafras. U. S. \* \* \* v. 35 Pounds of Oil of Sassafras. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 9333. I. S. No. 13615-r. S. No. E-1120.)

On September 19, 1918, 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 of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 35 pounds of oil of sassafras, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 7, 1918, by M. G. Teaster, Johnson City, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted in whole or in part of waste camphor oil.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopæia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in said Pharmacopæia, and its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold; and for the further reason that a substance, to wit, waste camphor oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for oil of sassafras, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, oil of sassafras; and for the further reason that the statement on the