On September 18, 1933, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

21470. Misbranding of cottonseed screenings. U. S. v. The Greenville Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. no. 30152. Sample no. 19804-A.)

Samples of cottonseed screenings taken from the shipment on which this case was based were found to contain less than 43 percent of protein, the amount

declared on the label.

On June 2, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Greenville Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Greenville, Tex., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 19, 1932, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of cottonseed screenings which were misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43% \* \* \* Choctaw Sales Company \* \* \* Kansas City, Missouri."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statement, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%", borne on the label, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it contained less than 43 percent of protein, namely, not more than 37.5 percent of protein.

On September 25, 1933, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

## 21471. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 23 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 31071. Sample no. 40318-A.)

This case involved a shipment of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard for butter

established by Congress.

On or about August 12, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 23 tubs of butter at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on August 1, 1933, by Litchfield Produce Co., from Litchfield, Minn., 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 product containing less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent of milk fat as

provided by the act of March 4, 1923.

On August 22, 1933, S. S. Borden Co., Chicago, III., 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 claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be reworked under the supervision of this Department.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

## 21472. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 13 Cubes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 30723. Sample no. 29741-A.)

This case involved a shipment of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard for butter

established by Congress.

On June 23, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 13 cubes of butter at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about June 12, 1933, by T. B. Klock & Co., from Billings, Mont., 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 product containing less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of

milk fat as provided by the act of March 4, 1923.