

District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 7 sacks of alleged maple sugar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Coast Conserve Co., Seattle, Wash., on or about December 15, 1919, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of California, and 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 wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable substance.

On September 3, 1920, 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.*

9654. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 400 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Decree ordering release of product under bond. (F. & D. No. 12700. I. S. No. 17589-r. S. No. E-2162.)

On June 2, 1920, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Florida, 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 400 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining in the original packages at Perry, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Central Oil Co., Macon, Ga., April 24, 1920, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, (on sacks) "Nitrogen 5.76% * * * Ammonia, not less than 7.00% * * *."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in protein had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the substances described in the labels on the said sacks, nitrogen 5.76 per cent and ammonia not less than 7 per cent.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the above-quoted statements appearing on the sacks containing the article were false and misleading in that the said article did not contain the substances therein set forth.

On September 30, 1920, the Central Oil Co., Macon, Ga., having entered an appearance as claimant for the property, it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9655. Adulteration and misbranding of Craig Healing Springs mineral water. U. S. * * * v. Craig Healing Springs Hotels, Inc., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 12800. I. S. Nos. 15762-r, 17331-r.)

On January 18, 1921, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Craig Healing Springs Hotels, Inc., a corporation, Springs, Va., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 28 and September 17, 1919, from the State of Virginia into the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia, respectively, of quantities of Craig Healing Springs mineral water, the former consignment of which was misbranded and the latter adulterated and misbranded.

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

Compounds.	Milligrams per liter.
Magnesium chlorid (MgCl_2)-----	2.7
Magnesium sulphate (MgSO_4)-----	8.1
Magnesium bicarbonate ($\text{Mg}(\text{HCO}_3)_2$)-----	5.9
Calcium bicarbonate ($\text{Ca}(\text{HCO}_3)_2$)-----	319.6
Silica (SiO_2)-----	13.3
Manganese bicarbonate ($\text{Mn}(\text{HCO}_3)_2$)-----	.3
Ferric oxid (Fe_2O_3)-----	4.4
Alumina (Al_2O_3)-----	2.9
Total-----	357.2

Sanitary analysis of the consignment into the District of Columbia showed that it contained *B. coli* in small quantities.

Adulteration of the product involved in the consignment of September 17, 1919, into the District of Columbia, was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal or vegetable substance.

Misbranding of the product involved in both consignments of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing on the labels of the bottles or the shipping cases containing the article, as the case might be, falsely and fraudulently represented that the product involved in the consignment of May 28, 1919, into Maryland, was effective as a relief, treatment, remedy, and cure for diseases of the skin, eczema, scrofulous sores, cutaneous and dermatic eruptions, indigestion in all its forms, dyspepsia, constipation, bilious diarrhea, catarrhal troubles, and other derangements of the stomach, leucorrhea, hemorrhoids, diabetes, Bright's disease, and rheumatism, and effective to heal and stimulate the kidneys to healthy and vigorous action; and that the product involved in the remaining consignment was effective as a relief for dermatic troubles, scrofula, indigestion, kidney trouble, Bright's disease, diabetes, and rheumatism, when, in truth and in fact, they were not. Misbranding of the product involved in the consignment of May 28, 1919, into Maryland, 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 February 14, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9656. Misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. * * * v. 400 Sacks * * * of Cottonseed Cake. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 13768. I. S. No. 463-t. S. No. C-2548.)

On October 7, 1920, 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 400 sacks, more or less, of cottonseed cake, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Gilmer Cottonseed Oil Co., Gilmer, Tex., on or about September 22, 1920, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statement on the labels of the sacks containing the said article, "100