

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

Misbranding was alleged with respect to a portion of the article for the reason that the statement on the label, "Best By Test," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On February 21, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed or sold by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9415. Adulteration and misbranding of mustard. U. S. * * * v. 16 Cases * * * of Bayle Quality Prepared Mustard * * *. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 13973. I. S. No. 1350-t. S. No. C-2588.)

On November 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Illinois, 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 cases, more or less, of Bayle Quality prepared mustard, consigned by the Bayle Food Products Co., St. Louis, Mo., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Centralia, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped from St. Louis, Mo., on or about September 2, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Bayle Quality Prepared Mustard Bayle Food Products Co. St. Louis 16 Oz. Net Weight Avois. Mustard Seed, Vinegar, Salt and Condiments Colored and Flavored with Turmeric."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that mustard bran had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the article, and for the further reason that it was mixed and colored in a manner whereby damage or inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Prepared Mustard * * * 16 Oz. Net Weight Avois. Mustard Seed, Vinegar, Salt and Condiments Colored and Flavored with Turmeric," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On February 21, 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.

C. W. PUGSLEY,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9416. Adulteration and misbranding of apple flavor and crab apple flavor phosphated beverages. U. S. * * * v. ½ Barrel of Apple Flavor and Two ½-Barrels of Crab Apple Flavor Phosphated Beverages. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 599-c. I. S. Nos. 14934-t, 14935-t.)

On March 30, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Nebraska filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of ½ barrel of apple flavor and two ½-barrels of crab apple flavor phosphated beverages, at Hastings, Nebr., alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about September 15, 1920, by the Red Cross Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Nebraska, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food

and Drugs Act, as amended. The articles were labeled in part: "Apple" [or "Crab Apple"] "non-alcoholic artificial flavor and color, Apple Flavor" [or "Crab Apple Flavor"] "Sweetened with saccharine. Guarantee. Contents of this package guaranteed to comply with all laws. * * * Guaranteed by Red Cross Mfg. Co. St. Louis, Mo.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in the libel for the reason that saccharin had been mixed and packed with them so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect their quality or strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for the articles, and for the further reason that said articles were colored in a manner whereby damage or inferiority was concealed, and further in that they contained an added deleterious ingredient which might render them injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the articles were labeled or branded so as to deceive or mislead the purchaser, and for the further reason that they were food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages.

On June 4, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9417. Adulteration and misbranding of spiced mustard dressing. U. S. * * * v. 14 Cases of Alleged Spiced Mustard Dressing. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14444. I. S. No. 10185-t. S. No. W-873.)

On February 15, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, 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 14 cases of alleged spiced mustard dressing, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Kondit Co., Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 13, 1920, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Net Wt. 9 Ozs. Repeater R Brand Spiced Mustard Dressing Colored With Turmeric The Kondit Co. Chicago, Ill."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that mustard hulls had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in part for spiced mustard dressing.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement borne on the label regarding the contents of the containers, to wit, "Spiced Mustard Dressing," was false and misleading and was calculated to deceive and mislead the purchaser.

On May 31, 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.

C. W. PUGSLEY,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9418. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. * * * v. 1,000 Cases * * * of Tomato Catsup. Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. Containers released to claimant. (F. & D. No. 14637. I. S. No. 1078-t. S. No. C-2831.)

On March 16, 1921, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Dis-