

in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained 1 gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid, so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Sicily, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained 1 gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Sicily, in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a product produced in the United States of America, and each of said cans did not contain 1 gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason, that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced in that it was a product manufactured or produced in whole or in part in the United States of America, and was branded as manufactured and produced in the kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that it was a mixture composed in large part of cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil; and for the further reason that the statements on the cans purported that the article was a foreign product, when not so. Misbranding of the article was alleged 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.

On May 21, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. BALL,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7146. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Guiseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli (Crisafulli Bros.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 9794. I. S. No. 14720-r.)

On July 21, 1919, 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 an information against Guiseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli, copartners, trading as Crisafulli Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on August 24, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "La Migliore Brand Extra Fine Olive Oil," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the Halphen test for cottonseed oil to be positive, and the test for corn oil with nitric acid gave a reddish brown coloration.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that substances, to wit, cottonseed oil and corn oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower, reduce, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in large part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Finest Quality Table Oil, Extra Fine Olive Oil, Net Contents One-quarter Gallon," together with the design and device of olive branches bearing olives, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with * * *," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was olive oil, and that each of

said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was olive oil, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not olive oil, but was a mixture composed in large part of cottonseed oil and corn oil, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount. Misbranding of the article was alleged 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.

On July 23, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. BALL,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7147. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Harry Arony and George Papitsas (Arony & Papitsas). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 9795. I. S. No. 7511-F.)

On July 18, 1919, 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 an information against Harry Arony and George Papitsas, copartners, trading as Arony & Papitsas, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on August 17, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Tipo Lucca Olio Sopraffino Stella d'Oro," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the Halphen test for cottonseed oil to be positive and the net volume of the cans to be 0.483 gallon.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed therewith so as to lower, reduce, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in large part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Tipo Lucca Olio Sopraffino, $\frac{1}{2}$ Gallon Net," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a product produced in the United States of America, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount, and for the further reason that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced in that it was a product manufactured and produced in whole or in part in the United States of America, and was branded as manufactured and produced in the kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that the statements borne on the cans purported that the article was a