The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements "Protein 18.00" and "Fibre 16.58", borne on the tags attached to the bags containing the article, were false and misleading, and for the further reason that it was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it contained less than 18 percent of protein and contained more than 16.58 percent of fiber.

On November 17, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company and the court imposed a fine of \$75 and costs.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

23899. Adulteration of canned huckleberries. U. S. v. Ivans Pettit. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 32887. Sample nos. 51337-A, 51338-A, 58651-A, 58652-A, 58660-A.)

This case was based on various interstate shipments of canned huckle-

berries which were found to contain maggots.

On September 7, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Ivans Pettit, Burlington, N. J., alleging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, between the dates of August 10 and November 9, 1933, from the State of New Jersey into the States of New York and Pennsylvania, of quantities of canned huckleberries which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part, variously: "Burlington Brand * * * Huckleberries Packed by Ivans Pettit Burlington, N. J."; "Pansy Brand Huckleberries Packed by Ivans Pettit Burlington, N. J."; "Pansy Brand Huckleberries * * * Distributed by Lorch Bros. Philadelphia, Pa."; "Harbor Front Huckleberries * * * Packed For Comly Flanigen Co. Philadelphia Penna. Distributors."; "Red Seal Brand Huckleberries * * * Comly Flanigen Company Philadelphia, Pa."; "Lucky Boy Brand Fancy Huckleberries * * * Embassy Grocery Corp. Distributors New York, N. Y."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that the service of the state of the service of the state of the stat

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy vegetable and animal substance due to the large number of maggots

contained therein.

On November 14, 1934, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

23900. Misbranding of canned orange juice. U. S. v. Hanson & Choate Products Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. no. 32893. Sample nos. 28185-A, 28186-A, 30080-A, 30081-A, 30082-A.)

Sample cans of orange juice taken from the shipments involved in this case

were found to contain less than the volume declared on the label.

On October 31, 1934, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Hanson & Choate Products Co., a corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about September 20 and October 24, 1932, from the State of California into the States of Colorado and Michigan, of quantities of orange juice which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Hanson's * * * Orange Juice Net Contents 1 Pt. 4 Fl. oz. [or "Net contents 8 Fl. Oz." or "Net Contents ½ Gallon"] * * Hanson & Choate Products Company Los Angeles, California."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Net Contents 1 Pt. 4 Fl. oz", "Net Contents 8 Fl. Oz.", and "Net Contents ½ Gallon", borne on the labels, were false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the greater number of the cans examined contained less than the declared volume. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages, since the cans contained less than

declared.

On November 12, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

23901. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. Herman A. Curt (Almena Creamery).

Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. no. 32899. Sample no. 66080-A.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of butter that contained less

than 80 percent of milk fat.

On September 14, 1934, the United States attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Herman A. Curt, trading as Almena Creamery, Almena, Wis., alleging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, in the name of the Turtle Lake Cooperative Co., on or about January 30, 1934, from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of butter which was adulterated.

The article was alleged to be 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 prescribed by an

act of Congress of March 4, 1923.

On November 12, 1934, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

M. L. WILSON, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

23902. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 41 Cases, et al., of Butter. Default decree of condemnation. Product disposed of for animal food. (F. & D. no. 32937. Sample nos. 66475-A, 66551-A, 66552-A.)

This case involved a shipment of butter, samples of which were found to

contain mold, rodent hair, pieces of insects, and other filth.

On June 23, 1934, the United States attorney for the Western District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 67 cases of butter at Shreveport, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 30, 1934, by the Western Produce Co., from Abilene, Tex., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, variously: "Clear Brook Brand"; "Delicious Brand"; "Rath's Black Hawk Brand."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in

part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal substance.

On October 15, 1934, no claimant having appeared, and the allegations of the libel having been found to be true and correct and in accordance with the verdict of a jury, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed if not fit for human consumption, or delivered to charitable institutions if found fit for human consumption. The product was disposed of for animal food.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

23903. Adulteration and misbranding of salad oil. U. S. v. 62 Cans of Alleged Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to charitable institutions. (F. & D. no. 32970. Sample nos. 67448-A, 7953-A.)

This case involved a product which was found to consist of mixtures of cottonseed oil and olive oil, or peanut oil and olive oil, which was labeled to convey the impression that it was olive oil of foreign origin. The product was

also short volume.

On or about June 19, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 62 cans of a product, purporting to be olive oil, at New Haven, Conn., alleging that it had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about October 23, 1933, by Pietro Esposito & Bro., from New York, N. Y., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "La Gloriosa Packing Co. P. E. & B. Inc."

was labeled in part: "La Gloriosa Packing Co. P. E. & B. Inc."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that mixtures of cottonseed oil and olive oil, and peanut oil and olive oil, had been substituted for imported

olive oil, which the labeling as a whole implied the article to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "La Gloriosa Brand", "Prize Awarded at Exhibition of Rome 1924", "Italy", "Olio Finissimo", and the designs of a crown, olive branches, and medal carrying the Italian national colors, and the prominent words "Lucca Olive Oil", in the statement, "Pure and Delicious Oil Composed of Eighty Five Percent Choice