Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was represented to be butter, which representation was false and misleading, since the said article contained less than 80 per cent of milk fat.

On February 28, 1930, Isaac V. Horn, Buffalo, N. Y., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 \$800. conditioned in part that it be reworked under the supervision of this department so that it conform with the law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

17413. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 6 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 24819. I. S. No. 036378. S. No. 3141.)

On or about May 12, 1930, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 6 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Alma Creamery Co., from Alma, Mo., April 24, 1930, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration 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 therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was deficient in butterfat in that it contained less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

On May 27, 1930, Hunter, Walton & 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, conditioned in part that it be reworked under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

17414. Adulteration and misbranding of jellies. U. S. v. 180 Jars of Crabapple Jelly, et al. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23786. I. S. Nos. 09368, 09369, 09370, 09371, 09372. S. No. 1971.)

On May 27, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, 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 cendemnation of 1,200 jars of assorted jellies at Little Rock, Ark., alleging that the articles had been shipped by the C. Von Allmen Preserving Co., from Louisville, Ky., on or about March 27, 1929, and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Arkansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The articles were labeled in part: "Von Allmen's Pure, Extra Quality Crab-Apple ["Grape," "Raspberry," "Blackberry," or "Currant"] Jelly * * * Manufactured by The C. Von Allmen Preserving Co., Incorporated, Louisville, Ky."

It was alleged in the libel that the said jellies were adulterated in that added pectin, sugar, and acid had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the articles.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the labels, "Pure Extra Quality Blackberry Jelly," "Pure Extra Quality Grape Jelly," "Pure Extra Quality Currant Jelly," "Pure Extra Quality Crab Apple Jelly," and "Pure Extra Quality Raspberry Jelly," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On January 25, 1930, the C. Von Allmen Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and execution of bond in the sum of \$200, conditioned in part that it be relabeled.