

Bama Co., from Birmingham, Ala., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was invoiced and labeled on the case: "Sweet-Um Assorted Jam." The jars were labeled in part: "Sweet-Um * * * Mixture of Pectin—Sugar Syrup 45% Pineapple, [etc.] Jam 55% The Bama Co., Birmingham, Ala."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that a mixture of sugar, acid, pectin, and water had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality; in that a mixture of fruit, sugar, acid, pectin, and water containing less fruit than jam had been substituted for jam; and in that a mixture of sugar, acid, pectin, and water had been mixed with the article in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the shipping case, "Sweet-Um Assorted Jam", was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser; and in that it was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, jam.

On May 23, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the article be disposed of as the law directs.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25994. Adulteration of chili pods. U. S. v. 24 Boxes of Chili Pods. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37215. Sample no. 59133-B.)

This case involved a shipment of chili pods that contained excessive arsenic.

On February 18, 1936, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 boxes of chili pods at Coffeyville, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 19, 1935, by W. H. Booth & Co., from Santa Ana, Calif., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Booth's Keno Brand Mexican Chili Pods W. H. Booth Co. Inc., Santa Ana, Calif."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, arsenic, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

On June 23, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25995. Adulteration of chili pepper. U. S. v. 3 Barrels of Chili Pepper. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37218. Sample no. 41646-B.)

This case involved a shipment of chili pepper that contained an excessive amount of arsenic.

On February 17, 1936, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of three barrels of chili pepper at San Antonio, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 26, 1935, by the Western Warehouse Co. for the account of C. L. Prats Chili Co., from Los Angeles, Calif., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Net Two Hundred Apache Brand Chili Pepper Scobey Storage Co., San Antonio, Texas."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, arsenic, which rendered the product injurious to health.

On June 2, 1936, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25996. Misbranding of shelled pecans. U. S. v. 18 Cases of Shelled Pecans. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37220. Sample no. 43861-B.)

This case involved shelled pecans contained in a package that had a cardboard false bottom. The net weight was inconspicuously declared on the side of the package and was partly obscured by a ribbon.

On February 19, 1936, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the