

payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, conditioned in part that it not be sold or otherwise disposed of until relabeled to show its true contents, and inspected and approved by this department.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14522. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. Central Produce Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 19652. I. S. No. 7484-v.)

On August 11, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, 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 Central Produce Co., a corporation, Temple, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about February 3, 1924, from the State of Texas into the State of Louisiana, of a quantity of butter which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was invoiced as creamery butter.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a product deficient in milk fat, in that it contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, had been substituted for butter, a product which must contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article to wit, creamery butter, in that it contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, the minimum milk fat required by law. 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 June 22, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14523. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. Sanitary Fish Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 18755. I. S. Nos. 4630-v, 4631-v.)

On September 27, 1924, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, 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 Sanitary Fish Co., a corporation, Anacortes, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about August 28, 1923, from the State of Washington into the State of Tennessee, of quantities of canned salmon which was adulterated.

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

On June 18, 1926, 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.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14524. Adulteration and alleged misbranding of prepared mustard. U. S. v. 25 Cases of Prepared Mustard. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20056. I. S. No. 14437-v. S. No. W-1654.)

On May 1, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 cases of prepared mustard, at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by A. Luedemann, Inc., from New York, N. Y., October 21, 1924, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Dusseldorf Brand Prepared Mustard * * * A. Luedemann, Inc. New York."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, an imitation mustard, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower or injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation "Prepared Mustard" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser,