

**14680. Adulteration of apple chops. U. S. v. 861 Sacks of Apple Chops. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21269. I. S. No. 2097-x. S. No. C-5221.)**

On August 26, 1926, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, 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 861 sacks of apple chops, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Louisville, Ky., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Washington Dehydrated Fruit Co., Wenatchee, Wash., on or about February 9, 1926, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of Kentucky, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

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

On October 4, 1926, the Von Allmen Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky., having appeared as claimant for the property and the court having found that the product might be reclaimed and made to comply with the law by removing the excessive arsenic, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the said product be released to the claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

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

**14681. Adulteration of apple chops. U. S. v. 756 Sacks of Apple Chops. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21273. I. S. No. 13908-x. S. No. C-5230.)**

On September 1, 1926, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, 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 756 sacks of apple chops, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Louisville, Ky., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Evaporated Fruits, Inc., Selah, Wash., on or about July 30, 1926, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of Kentucky, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

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

On October 4, 1926, the Goodwin Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky., having appeared as claimant for the property and the court having found that the product might be reclaimed and made to comply with the law by removing the excessive arsenic, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the said product be released to the claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

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

**14682. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 18 Boxes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21177. I. S. No. 1884-x. S. No. C-5191.)**

On June 26, 1926, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, 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 18 boxes of butter, at Cincinnati, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Johnson Butter Co., Terre Haute, Ind., June 22, 1926, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Box) "From Johnson Butter Company, Terre Haute Indiana."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product which contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article did not contain 80 per cent of milk fat as prescribed by law.

On July 9, 1926, the Johnson Butter Co., Terre Haute, Ind., claimant, having admitted the 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