On February 26, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, holding a District Court, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 63 cans of frozen mixed eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article was being offered for sale in the District of Columbia by Morris Bressler (Morris Bressler & Co. (Inc.)), Washington, D. C., and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it con-

sisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On or about March 27, 1931, M. Bressler & Co., Washington, D. C., 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 \$400, conditioned that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

18279. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. v. R. E. Roberts Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5. (F. & D. No. 25685. I. S. No. 016953.)

Samples of oysters from the shipment herein described having been found to contain added water, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the

United States attorney for the District of Maryland.

On March 16, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the R. E. Roberts Co., a corporation, Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about December 11, 1929, from the State of Maryland into the State of Florida, of a quantity of oysters which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "Maryland Beauty Packed By R. E. Roberts Co. Baltimore, Md. Oysters."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated, in that water had been mixed and packed with the said article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted

in part for the said article.

On March 24, 1931, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$5.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

18280. Adulteration of frozen whole eggs. U. S. v. 293 Cans of Frozen Whole Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture.

Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 25975. I. S. No. 16134. S. No. 4236.)

Samples of frozen whole eggs from the shipment herein described having been found to be decomposed, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter

to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia.
On March 3, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, holding a District Court, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 293 cans of frozen whole eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Fairmont Creamery Co., from Rapid City, S. Dak., on or about July 26, 1930, and had been transported from the State of South Dakota into the District of Columbia, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Fancy Fairmont's Frozen Fresh Eggs * * * Packed by The Fairmont Creamery Co., * * * Omaha, Nebr."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted

in part of a decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On March 17, 1931, the Fairmont Creamery Co., Omaha, 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 \$3,000. conditioned in part that it would not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law.