It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that a substance, to wit, excessive water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom, and for the further reason that it contained less than 80 per cent of

On April 8, 1927, the Peter Fox Sons Co., Chicago, Ill., 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 payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be reprocessed under the supervision of this department to remove the excess water and to raise the percentage of butterfat to 80 per cent. .

W. M. JARDINE, Secretary of Agriculture.

15084. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 57 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21869. I. S. No. 16352-x. S. No. 18000.) E-6090.)

On April 12, 1927, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, 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 57 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., consigned by the Grafton Creamery Co., from Grafton, Iowa, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from the State of Iowa into the State of New York, on April 4, 1927, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength and had been sub-

stituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article and that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously

marked on the outside of the package.

On April 19, 1927, the Grafton Creamery Co., Grafton, Iowa, 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 payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,700, conditioned in part that it be reworked and reprocessed so as to contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat and the packages plainly and conspicuously marked to show the true quantity of the contents.

W. M. JARDINE, Secretary of Agriculture.

15085. Adulteration of grapefruit and oranges. U. S. v. 210 Boxes of Grapefruit, et al. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 21721, 21722, 21757, 21758. I. S. Nos. 15285-x, 15286-x, 15287-x, 15289-x. S. Nos. C-5334, C-5335, C-5349, C-5350.)

On or about February 24, 25, and 28, 1927, respectively, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying seizure and condemnation of 355 boxes of grapefruit and 86 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New Orleans, La., alleging that the articles had been shipped by S. E. Mays, of Plant City, Fla., from Tampa, Fla., in various consignments, in part February 15, 1927, and in part February 22, 1927, and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The articles were labeled in part: "S. E. Mays, Grower and Shipper Plant City, Florida."

Examination of the articles by this department showed that they consisted in

whole or in part of frost-damaged fruit.

Adulteration was alleged in the libels with respect to the oranges, and 115 boxes of the grapefruit, for the reason that they consisted in part of decomposed