

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy animal substance, for the further reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, and for the further reason that it consisted in part of a putrid animal substance.

On August 31, 1923, the John L. Brink Co., Chicago, Ill., claimant, having admitted the material allegations of the libel and 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 \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be candled under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed, and the good portion released to the claimant.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12223. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 115 Cases of Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be candled. (F. & D. No. 17755. I. S. No. 4246-v. S. No. C-4086.)

On August 2, 1923, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 115 cases of eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the S. W. Mahan Produce Co., from Sigourney, Iowa, July 20, 1923, and transported from the State of Iowa into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy animal substance, for the further reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, and for the further reason that it consisted in part of a putrid animal substance.

On August 14, 1923, the John L. Brink Co., claimant, having admitted the material allegations of the libel and 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 \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be candled under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed, and the good portion released to the claimant.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12224. Adulteration of catsup. U. S. v. 418 Cases and 400 Cases of Catsup. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F & D. No. 18379. I. S. Nos. 17615-v, 17616-v. S. No. C-4283.)

On February 13, 1924, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 818 cases of catsup remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Brooks Tomato Products Co., from Shirley, Ind., in part October 24 and in part November 5, 1923, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Contents 8 Pounds Kenmore Brand Tomato Catsup."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy vegetable substance, for the further reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, and for the further reason that it consisted in part of a putrid vegetable substance.

On March 26, 1924, the Brooks Tomato Products Co., Shirley, Ind., claimant, having admitted the material allegations of the libel and 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 \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be sorted under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed and the good portion released.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*