12026. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 250 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18190. I. S. No. 15840-v. S. No. E-4662.)

On December 21, 1923, 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 250 sacks of cottonseed meal, at Oxford, Pa., consigned by the Eastern Cotton Oil Co., from Edenton, N. C., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 8, 1923, and transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Perfection Cotton Seed Meal 100 Lbs. Net Manufactured By Eastern Cotton Oil Company Elizabeth City, N. C. Guarantee Protein not less than 41.00% Equivalent to Ammonia 8.00%."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the labeling bore the statements, "Perfection Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guarantee Protein not less than 41.00% Equivalent to Ammonia 8.00%," regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, which were false and misleading in that the said article did not in fact contain 41 per cent of protein, the equivalent of 8 per cent of ammonia. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On January 11, 1924, the Eastern Cotton Oil Co., Elizabeth City, N. C., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled under the supervision of this department.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture

12027. Adulteration and misbranding of flour. U.S. v. 360 Bags of Flour. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18167. I S. No. 8583-v. S No. W-1455.)

On December 15, 1923, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 360 bags of flour, at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Prairie Flour Mills, from Portland, Oreg., May 23, 1923, and transported from the State of Oregon into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended The article was labeled in part: "Everybody's Flour Strength, Dependability, Uniformity, Quality High Patent Prairie Flour Mills, Distributors Lewiston, Idaho Bleached 98 Lbs."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that water had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "98 Lbs.," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On January 7 1924, the Haslett Warehouse Co., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$720, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be brought into compliance with the said act under the supervision of this department.

C. F. MARVIN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

12028. Adulteration and misbranding of water. U. S. v. Crazy Well Water Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty to counts 1 and 16. Counts 2 to 15, inclusive, and count 17 dismissed. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No 12294. I. S. Nos. 5600-r, 5907-r, 5908-r, 7454-r, 7527-r, 7528-r, 7529-r, 7530-r, 7531-r, 7532-r, 7544-r, 7551-r, 7655-r.)

On August 12, 1921, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District