

tion of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that new labels be affixed to the cans bearing the statement, "Vegetable Gum and 1/10 of 1% Benzoate of Soda Added."

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**19746. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of rice. U. S. v. 200 Sacks of Rice. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 27760. I. S. No. 32482. S. No. 5844.)**

Samples of rice from the shipment herein described having been found to be below the grade indicated on the labels, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Puerto Rico.

On February 29, 1932, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel, and on or about March 7, 1932, an amended libel, praying seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of rice at San Juan, P. R. It was alleged in the libel as amended that the article had been shipped on or about January 30, 1932, by C. E. Grosjean Rice Milling Co., from San Francisco, Calif., to San Juan, P. R., and that it was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Sacks) "Celta Fancy San Juan \* \* \* Fancy Japan Mission Brand Rice \* \* \* C. E. Grosjean Rice Milling Co., San Francisco, Cal., U. S. A."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that rice of a different and lower grade than Fancy had been substituted in whole or in part for rice of Fancy grade, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Fancy" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since rice of a different and lower grade was substituted.

On April 19, 1932, C. E. Grosjean Rice Milling Co., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture. It was further ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$900, conditioned in part that it be properly branded and should not be disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**19747. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of rice. U. S. v. 500 Sacks of Rice. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 27761. I. S. No. 32479. S. No. 5845.)**

Samples of rice from the shipment herein described having been found to be below the grade indicated on the labels, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Puerto Rico.

On February 29, 1932, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel, and on or about March 7, 1932, an amended libel, praying seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of rice at San Juan, P. R. It was alleged in the libel as amended that the article had been shipped on or about January 29, 1932, by the Capital Rice Mills, San Francisco, Calif., to San Juan, P. R., and that it was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Sacks) "San Juan Fancy California Rice \* \* \* Capital Rice Mills, San Francisco, California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that rice of a different and lower grade than Fancy had been substituted in whole or in part for rice of Fancy grade, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Fancy" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since rice of a different and lower grade was substituted.

On April 19, 1932, the Capital Rice Mills, having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture. It was further ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, conditioned in part that it be properly branded and should not be disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*