on the case labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser when applied to an artificially-colored tomato product.

On February 11, 1925, the Greco Canning Co., San Jose, Calif., claimant, having admitted the material allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of the court was entered, finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was further ordered by the court that the said product be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled under the supervision of this department by pasting a sticker bearing the statement "Artificially Colored" on both panels of the can label.

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

13287. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 20 Dozen Tins of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16485. S. No. C-3665.)

On June 28, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, 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 20 dozen tins of chloroform, remaining in the unbroken packages at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., March 2, 1922, in interstate commerce, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform * * * For Anaesthesia."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article showed that it was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained hydrochloric acid, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under the name of chloroform, a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the said pharmacopœia.

On July 30, 1922, 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.*

13288. Misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. v. 400 Bags of Cottonseed Cake. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. No. 19515. I. S. No. 22700-v. S. No. C-4619.)

On January 21, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, 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 400 bags of cottonseed cake, at Athol, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Whitesboro Oil Mill, from Whitesboro, Tex., on or about January 5, 1925, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Choctaw Chief Brand * * * Guaranteed Analysis Protein not less than 43 per cent. Manufactured by Choctaw Cotton Oil Company, General Sales Office, Ada, Oklahoma."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement appearing in the labeling "Protein Not less than 43 per cent" was false and misleading and was calculated to induce the purchaser to believe that the article contained not less than 43 per cent of protein, when, in truth and in fact, it contained a much less amount than 43 per cent of protein.

On February 28, 1925, the Whitesboro Oil Mill, Whitesboro, Tex., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 $500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled to show its true contents.

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