

Cholera Remedy for the following ailments: Calf Cholera, White Scours, Diarrhoea, Bloody Fluxes, Dysentery, Scours, and Indigestion in all live stock \* \* \* Calf Cholera Remedy \* \* \* To Prevent and Overcome Scours in all Live Stock \* \* \* until Bowels move naturally \* \* \* until the bowels move naturally."

It was alleged in the libels that the articles were misbranded in that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said articles were false and fraudulent, since they contained no ingredients or combinations of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On February 11, 1929, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**16224. Misbranding of cooking compound. U. S. v. 75 Cases of Cooking Compound. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23301. I. S. No. 07408. S. No. 1433.)**

On January 4, 1929, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, 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 75 cases of cooking compound, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Danish Packing Co. (Ltd.), of Providence, R. I., alleging that the article had been shipped from Chicago, Ill., on or about December 22, 1928, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Colorado, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Cartons) "1 pound Net Weight. Penobscot Nut Product for Best Cooking and Baking. Danish Packing Co., Ltd., Providence, R. I."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement "1 Pound Net Weight," borne on the label, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and in 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, since the quantity stated was not correct.

On January 19, 1929, the Blainey-Murphy Co., Denver, Colo., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, conditioned in part that it be shipped to the Danish Packing Co. (Ltd.) at Chicago, the original manufacturer and shipper thereof, and that the said Danish Packing Co. (Ltd.) repack the article to bring the packages up to the weight of 1 pound. On February 15, 1929, the decree was amended to permit shipment of the product to Providence, R. I., to be there reconditioned by the said shipper.

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

**16225. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 70 Bags of Cottonseed Meal. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. & D. No. 23082. I. S. No. 0433. S. No. 1166.)**

On or about November 19, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of New Mexico, 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 70 bags of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original packages at Deming, N. Mex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Community Milling Co., El Paso, Tex., May 8, 1928, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of New Mexico, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "43 per cent protein Cottonseed Meal Prime Quality One Hundred Pounds Net. Manufactured by Spears & Company, El Paso, Texas, Crude Protein no less than 43 per cent."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the bags containing the article were misbranded and the contents thereof adulterated, in that the said statements upon the bags and labels regarding the chemical contents of the article