

sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the article be reworked, so as to reduce the moisture thereof, under the supervision of this department.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7552. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. J. Langrall & Bro., Inc., a corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$10 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11432. I. S. Nos. 13347-r, 13697-r.)

On December 20, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against J. Langrall & Bro., Inc., a corporation, doing business at Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about February 5, 1919, and January 22, 1919, from the State of Maryland into the State of Pennsylvania, of quantities of oysters which were adulterated.

Analyses of samples of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

| | Shipment of— | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| | January 22, 1919. | February 5, 1919. |
| Drained meat (per cent)..... | 75.17 | 75.68 |
| Liquor (per cent)..... | 24.83 | 24.32 |
| Solids in meat (per cent)..... | 14.21 | 13.20 |
| Solids in liquor (per cent)..... | 4.35 | 3.90 |
| NaCl in meat (per cent)..... | Trace | 0.04 |
| NaCl in liquor (per cent)..... | 0.04 | 0.12 |
| Loss on boiling (per cent)..... | 57.6 | 56.2 |
| Solids on sample as received (per cent)..... | 11.76 | 10.94 |

The product contains added water.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been substituted in part for oysters, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On December 22, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7553. Adulteration and misbranding of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Charles Neubert (Charles Neubert & Co.). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11439. I. S. Nos. 3531-p, 3532-p, 3550-p, 13376-r, 13393-r, 13691-r.)

On January 10, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Charles Neubert, trading as Charles Neubert & Co., Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about January 28, 1919, February 3, 1919, January 21, 1919, and March 4, 1918, from the State of Maryland into the State of Pennsylvania, and on or about March 12, 1919, into the State of Michigan, of quantities of oysters, the first-mentioned shipment of which was adulterated and the remainder adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

| | Shipment of— | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | March 4, 1918. | March 4, 1918. | January 21, 1919. | January 28, 1919. | February 3, 1919. | March 12, 1919. |
| | <i>Gallon.</i> | <i>Gallon.</i> | <i>Pint.</i> | | <i>Quart.</i> | <i>Quart.</i> |
| Net volume..... | 0.977 | 0.978 | 0.951 | | 0.962 | 0.962 |
| Drained meat (per cent)..... | 83.4 | 82.1 | 76.4 | 78.1 | 75.27 | 80.3 |
| Liquor (per cent)..... | 16.6 | 17.9 | 23.6 | 21.9 | 24.73 | 19.7 |
| Solids in meat (per cent)..... | 11.97 | 11.76 | 11.2 | 11.37 | 11.66 | 10.91 |
| Solids in liquor (per cent)..... | 3.83 | 2.64 | 3.0 | 3.45 | 5.30 | 3.24 |
| NaCl in meat (per cent)..... | 0.01 | 0.01 | Trace. | 0.01 | Trace. | Trace. |
| NaCl in liquor (per cent)..... | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.10 |
| Loss on boiling (per cent)..... | 60.0 | 63.5 | 61.5 | 58.0 | 59.1 | 59.6 |

Product contains added water, and was found to be short volume in those cases where the volume is reported.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been substituted in part for oysters, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that water had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

Misbranding of the article in each of the shipments, except the one on January 28, 1919, was alleged for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents of the package was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside thereof in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On January 10, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7554. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Antonio Corrao. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 11440. I. S. No. 13747-r.)

On December 16, 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 Antonio Corrao, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on December 7, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Olio Puro d'Oliva Garantito Produzione Propria," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted practically of cottonseed oil and was short volume.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was labeled in conspicuous type "Olio Puro d'Oliva Lucca Tipo Italy Garantito Produzione Propria" and bore the design and device of an Italian olive-picking scene, so as to deceive and mislead purchasers into the belief that it was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not; for the further reason that the statements, designs, and devices, appearing on the label, represented to purchasers that it was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not; and for the further reason that by means of said statements, designs, and devices it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was