been substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article contained less than 80 percent of butterfat. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it had been sold, shipped, and labeled as butter, which was false and misleading, since it contained less than 80 percent of milk fat.

On July 2, 1932, the Dallas Creamery Co., Dallas, Wis., 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 for reworking under the supervision of this Department, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act and all other laws.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20003. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U.S. v. 45 Cases, et al., of Butter. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. uct released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 28625, 28626. Samp Sample Nos.

These cases involved the shipment of quantities of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard

prescribed by Congress.

On July 8, 1932, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 67 cases of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Sacramento, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Mason, Nev., in part on or about June 22, 1932, and in part on or about June 24, 1932, consigned by the Yerington Creamery, Mason, Nev., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Butter * Yerington Creamery Mason, Nevada."

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that a product containing less than 80 percent of butterfat had been substituted for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Butter," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser

when applied to a product containing less than 80 percent of butterfat. On July 19, 1932, the Yerington Creamery Co., Mason, Nev., having appeared as claimant for the property, and having consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were 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 bonds totaling \$600, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, and that it be made to conform with the law under the supervision of this Department.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20004. Adulteration of blueberries. U.S. v. 6 Crates of Blueberries. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 28755.

Samples of blueberries taken from the shipment herein described were found to contain maggots.

On August 4, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of six crates of blueberries, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce August 3, 1932, by Maplelawn Orchards, from Rockland, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "From Maplelawn Orchards * * * Lincolnville, Maine."

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

sisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On August 18, 1932, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20005. Adulteration of blueberries. U.S. v. 5 Crates of Blueberries. fault decree of forfeiture and destruction. Sample No. 9057-A.) (F. & D. No. 28750.

Samples of blueberries taken from the shipment herein described were found to contain maggots.

On August 11, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of five crates of blueberries, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned on or about August 10, 1932, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by Earl B. Gott, from Bucksport, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "From Earl B. Gott [or "Golt"] Bucksport Me."

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

sisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On August 18, 1932, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20006. Adulteration of blueberries. U.S. v. 4 Crates of Blueberries. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 28752. Sample No. 9063-A.)

Samples of blueberries taken from the shipment herein described were found to contain maggots.

On August 11, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of four crates of blueberries, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned on or about August 10, 1932, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by L. E. Gould, of Lincolnville, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "From L. E. Gould Lincolnville Maine."

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

On August 18, 1932, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. G. Tugwell, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20007. Adulteration of blueberries. U.S. v. 4 Crates of Blueberries. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 28694. Sample No. 9458-A.)

Samples of blueberries taken from the shipment herein described were found to contain maggots.

On August 5, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of four crates of blueberries, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce August 4, 1932, by E. L. Grindle, of Bluehill, Maine, to Boston, Mass., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "From Ernest Grindle Bluehill Me."

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

On August 18, 1932, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.