

spirits of turpentine when shaken vigorously with an equal volume of hydrochloric acid in a test tube and allowed to stand for a few minutes should not produce a brownish or greenish color, whereas said article when shaken vigorously with an equal volume of hydrochloric acid in a test tube and allowed to stand for a few minutes produced a brownish color; and the standard of the strength, quality, and purity of the said article was not declared on the containers thereof.

On April 11, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

**9236. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. \* \* \* v. 948 Cases \* \* \* of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14198. I. S. No. 1712-t. S. No. C-2695.)**

On January 18, 1921, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas, 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 948 cases, more or less, consisting of 800 cases, more or less, containing eight-ounce bottles and 148 cases, more or less, containing sixteen-ounce bottles, of tomato catsup, at Houston, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Serv-Us Pure Food Co., Mound City, Ill. on or about October 15, 1920, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Serv-Us Brand Tomato Catsup \* \* \* Serv-Us Grocery Products Corporation, Distributors, New York, Chicago, U. S. A. We guarantee the catsup to be absolutely pure and free from artificial coloring."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated in violation of section 7, paragraph 6, under "Food," of the Food and Drugs Act, in that said article was filthy, decomposed, and putrid.

On March 1, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**9237. Adulteration of Creole Dinner. U. S. \* \* \* v. 20 Cases \* \* \* of Creole Dinner. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14239. I. S. No. 12755-t. S. No. C-2736.)**

On January 24, 1921, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas, 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 20 cases, more or less, of Creole Dinner, at Houston, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the McIlhenny Co., New Iberia, La., on or about November 8, 1920, and transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Creole Dinner Net Contents 10 Ounces. \* \* \* Packed By McIlhenny Co., Avery Island, La."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated in violation of section 7, paragraph 6, under "Food," of the Food and Drugs Act, in that it was filthy, decomposed, and putrid.

On March 1, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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