

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it contained an added poisonous or other added deleterious ingredient, salicylic acid, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

On June 10, 1924, 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.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13179. Misbranding of peanut meal. U. S. v. 65 Sacks of Peanut Meal. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 19537. I. S. No. 21292-v. S. No. E-5118.)

On January 28, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, 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 65 sacks of peanut meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Bel Air, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Suffolk Oil Mill, from Suffolk, Va., about October 2, 1924, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "100 Pounds Peanut Meal Manufactured By Suffolk Oil Mill Suffolk, Va. Guaranteed Analysis Protein 41 per cent * * * Made From Shelled Peanuts."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement "Guaranteed Analysis Protein 41 per cent" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On February 9, 1925, the Suffolk Oil Mill, Suffolk, Va., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation 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 \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it not be sold or disposed of until correctly labeled and inspected by a representative of this department.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13180. Misbranding of crab meat. U. S. v. Rufus A. White and Oscar W. Nelson (White & Nelson). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10 and costs. (F. & D. No. 19582. I. S. Nos. 12726-v, 12727-v, 13282-v, 13283-v, 16091-v.)

On February 28, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Rufus A. White and Oscar W. Nelson, copartners, trading as White & Nelson, Hoopersville, Md., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, in various consignments, namely, on or about August 6, 1924, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, on or about August 12 and 14, 1924, respectively, from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, and on or about August 17, 1924, from the State of Maryland into the State of Pennsylvania, of quantities of crab meat which was misbranded. The article was contained in tins labeled variously: "Contents 1 Lb. Net," "Contents 5 Lbs. Net," or "Net Contents 1 1/4 Lbs."

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of 20, 50, and 50 tins, respectively, from the three consignments of the alleged 1-pound tins showed that the average net weight was 14.98, 15.48, and 15.34 ounces, respectively. Examination by said bureau of 75 of the alleged 1 1/4-pound tins and 10 of the alleged 5-pound tins showed that the average net weight was 1 pound 3.5 ounces, and 4 pounds 13 ounces, respectively.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Contents 1 Lb. Net," "Contents 5 Lbs. Net," and "Net Contents 1 1/4 Lbs.," borne on the respective-sized tins containing the article, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the tins contained 1 pound, 5 pounds, or 1 1/4 pounds of the article, as the case might be, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the said tins contained 1 pound, 5 pounds, or 1 1/4 pounds of the said article, as the case might be, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said tins did not contain the said respective amounts but did contain less amounts. Misbranding was alleged for the 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