

at Jersey City, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped by J. Aldeng Co. [J. A. Long Co.], Winchester, Ind., on or about December 18, 1920, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of New Jersey, 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 in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On December 20, 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.*

10663. Adulteration and misbranding of K. K. K. condition powder. U. S. * * * v. K. K. K. Medicine Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14344. I. S. No. 8738-r.)

On January 17, 1921, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, 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 K. K. K. Medicine Co., a corporation, Keokuk, Iowa, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 11, 1919, from the State of Iowa into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of K. K. K. condition powder which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "* * * Dr. Machin's K. K. K. Condition Powder Regulator * * * Prepared only by K. K. K. Medicine Co. Keokuk, Iowa. * * *."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted chiefly of sodium sulphate, sodium chlorid, iron sulphate, sulphur, charcoal, cottonseed hulls, and American wormseed.

Adulteration of the article was alleged for the reason that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was a mixture which consisted largely of cottonseed meal and cottonseed hulls, and was sold as a product composed of jalap, anise, gluten oil meal, rosin, soda, ash, fenugreek seed, iron sulphate, sulphur, gentian, cascara sagrada, salt, wormseed, wood charcoal, and Glauber's salt.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, appearing on the packages containing the said article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a preventive, treatment, remedy, and cure for hog cholera, tuberculosis in cattle, and cholera in chickens, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Gluten Oil Meal 54%," borne on the said packages, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the said article contained not less than 54 per cent of gluten oil meal, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained little, if any, gluten oil meal.

On April 5, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

10664. Misbranding of peaches. U. S. * * * v. The Danbury Fruit Co., a corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$10 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14360. I. S. No. 2462-t.)

At the October, 1921, term of the United States District Court within and for the Northern District of Ohio, the United States attorney for said district, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court aforesaid an information against the Danbury Fruit Co., a corporation, Danbury, Ohio, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about October 5, 1920, from the State of Ohio into the State of Indiana, of a quantity of peaches in baskets 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 in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On November 5, 1921, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

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