

the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Tennessee into the State of New York, of quantities of strawberries in unlabeled crates, which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the 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 28, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$20 and costs.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10258. Adulteration and misbranding of gelatin. U. S. \* \* \* v. 7 Bags \* \* \* and 4 Barrels of \* \* \* Gelatin \* \* \* Decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.** (F. & D. Nos. 15737, 15743. I. S. Nos. 8832-t, 8834-t. S. Nos. E-3694, E-3710.)

On December 19, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 7 bags, containing approximately 1,600 pounds, and 4 barrels of gelatin, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., consigned on or about February 4 and 8, 1921, respectively, alleging that the article had been shipped by Peter Cooper's Glue Factory, Gowanda, N. Y., and the Keene Glue Co., Keene, N. H., respectively, and transported from the States of New York and New Hampshire, respectively, into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. A portion of the article was labeled in part, "From Keene Glue Co., Keene, N. H. \* \* \*."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that a substance, to wit, glue, had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the said article and for the further reason that it contained added poisonous or deleterious ingredients, to wit, copper and zinc, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On February 2, 1922, William H. Ferris and Ernest C. Ferris, copartners, trading as Ferris Bros., Baltimore, Md., claimants, having admitted the material allegations of the libels and having averred that the product had been purchased by them upon representations by the manufacturers thereof that it was fit for human consumption, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimants upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of good and sufficient bonds, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be not disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10259. Adulteration and misbranding of extracts of orange, lemon, strawberry, and raspberry. U. S. \* \* \* v. Extract of Orange, et al. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 15927. I. S. Nos. 8101-t, 8102-t, 8103-t, 8104-t. S. No. E-3729.)

On January 23, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 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 36 bottles of extract of orange, 57 bottles of extract of lemon, 36 bottles of extract of strawberry, and 36 bottles of extract of raspberry, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Leading Perfumers & Chemists, Inc., New York, N. Y., alleging that the articles had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about October 26, 1921, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the orange extract and lemon extract was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product deficient in orange oil or lemon oil, as the case might be, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect their quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for extract of orange and extract of lemon, which the said