

17184. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. v. 220 Boxes of Grapefruit. Product released under bond to be salvaged. (F. & D. No. 24684. I. S. No. 025749. S. No. 2996.)

On or about February 27, 1930, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, 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 220 boxes of grapefruit at Oklahoma City, Okla., consigned by H. C. Stiles, Brownsville, Tex., on or about February 19, 1930, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Brownsville, Tex., into the State of Oklahoma, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in violation of the act, in that it showed the presence of decomposition.

On February 28, 1930, Mrs. Virginia D. Bryan, Oklahoma City, Okla., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, a decree was entered ordering that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it be salvaged under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17185. Misbranding of stock feed. U. S. v. 300 Sacks et al., of Stock Feed. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 23854, 23864. I. S. Nos. 013928, 013929. S. No. 1571.)

On or about January 29, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma, acting upon reports by an official of the State of Oklahoma, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying seizure and condemnation of 525 sacks of stock feed, in part at Tulsa, Okla., and in part at West Tulsa, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Hogan Mill Feed Co., Kansas City, Mo., in two consignments, on or about November 8, 1928, and December 17, 1928, respectively, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Oklahoma, and charging violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "100# Net Ideal 16% Gray and Ground Wheat Screenings Not to Exceed 8% Manufactured By Missouri Feed Mills, Kansas City, Mo., Protein, not less than 16.00 * * * Ingredients—Reground Wheat Shorts, Bran, Low Grade Flour, Ground Grain Screenings, and Grain Scourings not to exceed 8%."

It was alleged in the libels that the article was in violation of the food and drugs act, in that it contained no material amount, if any, of wheat shorts, which was declared on the label to be a main ingredient; calcium carbonate was present as an ingredient of the article though not declared on the label to be contained therein; protein was deficient, since the article contained only approximately 13 per cent of protein, whereas the label represented it to contain 16 per cent of protein; and ground limestone was present in the said article.

On February 13, 1929, the Hogan Mill Feed Co., Kansas City, Mo., appeared as claimant for the property and admitted that the article was misbranded. The said claimant having paid costs and executed bonds totaling \$500, to the effect that the article would not be sold or disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act, it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered in part to the West Tulsa Feed Store, West Tulsa, Okla., and in part to the Binding Stevens Seed Co., Tulsa, Okla. On May 4, 1929, the product having been properly relabeled under the supervision of this department, decrees were entered ordering the exoneration of said bonds.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17186. Adulteration and misbranding of canned sauerkraut. U. S. v. 95 Cases of Canned Sauerkraut. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 23796. I. S. No. 08964. S. No. 2018.)

On June 7, 1929, 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 95 cases of canned sauerkraut, remaining in the original packages at Cincinnati, Ohio, consigned by the Morgan Packing Co., Austin, Ind., in part on February 21, 1929, and in part on March 8, 1929, alleging that the article had been shipped from Austin, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding

in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Hougland's Sauerkraut * * * Packed by Hougland Bros. Canning Co., Underwood, Ind."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that sauerkraut low in acidity had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article, so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation "Sauerkraut" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On July 2, 1929, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered nunc pro tunc as of June 30, 1929, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17187. Adulteration of canned cherries. U. S. v. 668 Cases of Canned Cherries. Tried to the court and jury. Verdict for claimant. Verdict set aside and new trial granted. Case ordered dismissed. Consent order of destruction entered. (F. & D. No. 19971. I. S. No. 15620-v. S. No. E-5190.)

On April 6, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western 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 668 cases of canned cherries at Westfield, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Westfield Fruit Products Co., from Pittsburgh, Pa., on or about March 13, 1925, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Pride of Westfield Brand Red Pitted Sour Cherries, Packed by the Westfield Fruit Products Co., Inc., Westfield, N. Y."

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

On July 29, 1925, the Westfield Fruit Products Co., having appeared as claimant for the property, the case came on for trial before the court and a jury. After the submission of evidence and arguments by counsel, the jury returned a verdict for the claimant. Thereupon the Government filed a motion for a new trial. On September 28, 1925, the motion for a new trial was argued, and the verdict of the jury was set aside and a new trial granted. On November 13, 1928, an order was entered dismissing the case. On November 22, 1929, the claimant having expressed a desire that the cherries be destroyed on motion of the United States, judgment was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17188. Misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Butter. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24677. I. S. No. 028909. S. No. 2962.)

On March 3, 1930, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, 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 10 cases of butter at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped by the June Dairy Products Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y., in part on or about February 18, 1930, and in part on or about February 24, 1930, and transported from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "June Dairy Sweet Fancy Print Butter One Pound Net Weight."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement on the label, "One Pound Net Weight," 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 statement "One Pound Net Weight" was incorrect.

On April 9, 1930, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*