

March 12, 1927, and in part on or about March 17, 1927, and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Shipping case) "Flori-Kist Brand Tangerines Packed By Brooksville Citrus Growers Assn., Brooksville, * * * Florida."

Examination of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was composed of frost-damaged fruit.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated, in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, and in that a substance, frozen tangerines, had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

On April 11, 1927, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

14976. Adulteration of frozen eggs. U. S. v. 1,469 Cans of Frozen Eggs. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21741. I. S. No. 14764-x. S. No. E-6059.)

On March 17, 1927, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 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 1,469 cans of frozen eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Wichita Ice and Storage Co., Wichita, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped from Wichita, Kans., on or about February 23, 1927, and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On April 11, 1927, Armour & Co. having appeared as claimant for the property, 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 \$10,000, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

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

14977. Adulteration and misbranding of jellies. U. S. v. 50 Cases of Raspberry Jelly, et al. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Products released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21046. I. S. Nos. 12211-x to 12215-x, incl. S. No. C-5075.)

On or about April 30, 1926, 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 seizure and condemnation of 328 cases of variously flavored jellies, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the articles had been shipped by McNeal & Co. (McNeil & Co.), from Carpentersville, Ill., October 25, 1925, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The articles were labeled in part: (Jar) "Net Wt. 14 oz." (or "6 oz.") "Apple Pectin Raspberry" (or "Strawberry" or "Currant") "Jelly."

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and affect their quality and strength; for the further reason that substances, pectin jellies colored with fruit juices and acidified with tartaric acid, had been substituted wholly or in part for the said articles; and for the further reason that they had been colored in a manner whereby damage and inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Raspberry" (or other fruit) "Apple Pectin Jelly," borne on the labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that they were imitations of and were offered for sale under the distinctive names of other articles. Misbranding was alleged with respect to 80 cases containing alleged 6-ounce jars of raspberry jelly for the further reason that the statement "Net Wt. 6 Oz.," borne on the labels of the said jars, was false