

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 required by the act of Congress of March 4, 1923.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements "Fancy Creamery Butter" and "One Pound Net Weight," borne on the packages containing the article, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented the article to be butter, to wit, an article containing not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as required by law, and that each of the packages contained 1 pound thereof; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was butter, to wit, an article containing not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as required by law, and that each of said packages contained 1 pound thereof; whereas it was a product deficient in milk fat in that it contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, and said packages did not each contain 1 pound of the article, but did contain a less amount. 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 in that the statement made was not correct.

On March 12, 1930, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17133. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 108 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 24680. I. S. Nos. 027513, 027520. S. No. 2888.)

On February 20, 1930, 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 108 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Callaway Cooperative Creamery Co., Callaway, Nebr., for the Broken Bow Creamery Co., Broken Bow, Nebr., in two consignments on or about June 11, 1929, and June 19, 1929, respectively, and transported from the State of Nebraska into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted 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.

On March 20, 1930, the Broken Bow Co-operative Creamery Co., Broken Bow, Nebr., 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 \$3,300, conditioned in part that it be reworked and reprocessed so that it contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17134. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 400 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 24540. I. S. No. 030754. S. No. 2851.)

On February 17, 1930, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Iowa, 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 400 sacks of cottonseed meal at Delhi, Iowa, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Graco Milling Co., Cairo, Ill., on or about February 6, 1930, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Iowa, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Graco 43 Per Cent Brand. Guaranteed Analysis Protein not less than 43 Per Cent. Manufactured by Graco Milling Company, Sherman, Texas."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statements, "43 per cent" and "Protein not less than 43 per cent," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On March 18, 1930, the Graco Milling Co., Sherman, Tex., 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 \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be relabeled to show its true constituency.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17135. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. Joseph W. Williams. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 19696. I. S. No. 12177-v.)

On November 17, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Joseph W. Williams, Republican City, Nebr., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about September 2, 1924, from the State of Kansas into the State of Colorado, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated.

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

On March 20, 1930, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17136. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Texas Refining Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$250. (F. & D. No. 23754. I. S. Nos. 01119, 01120.)

On September 23, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 Texas Refining Co., a corporation, Greenville, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about October 22, 1928, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of quantities of cottonseed meal which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "43% Protein Cotton Seed Meal Prime Quality Manufactured by Texas Refining Company Greenville, Texas. Guaranteed Analysis Crude protein not less than 43.00 Per Cent."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statements, to wit, "43% Protein Cotton Seed Meal," and "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein not less than 43.00 Per Cent," borne on the tag attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article was cottonseed meal containing not less than 43 per cent of crude protein; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was cottonseed meal containing not less than 43 per cent of crude protein, whereas it was a cottonseed meal product containing less than 43 per cent of crude protein.

On January 13, 1930, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$250.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17137. Misbranding of cottonseed cake and meal. U. S. v. Dallas Oil & Refining Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$600. (F. & D. No. 23752. I. S. Nos. 04784, 04794, 04796, 04797, 05008, 07503, 07505, 07507.)

On August 21, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 Dallas Oil & Refining Co., a corporation, Dallas, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, from the State of Texas, in various consignments, on or about December 6, 1928, into the State of Kansas, on or about December 11, 1928, into the State of Wyoming, and on or about December 13, 1928, into the States of Illinois, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, and Minnesota, respectively, of quantities of cottonseed meal and cake which were misbranded. The article was labeled in part, variously: "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43%," "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%," and "Analysis Protein Basis 43 per cent."

It was alleged in the information that the articles were misbranded in that the statements, respectively, "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43%," "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%," and "Analysis Protein Basis 43 Per Cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing