1681. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 39 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2697. Sample No. 36306-E.) Default decree of

This product was insect-infested.

On or about August 30, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed a libel against 39 boxes of candy at New London, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 24, 1940, by the Hollywood Candy Co. from Boston, Mass.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance. The article was labeled in part: "Roly Poly One Cent."

On February 24, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation

was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1682. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 9 and 12 Tins of Candy. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3590, 3591. Sample Nos. 28137-E, 28139-E.)

Samples of this product were found to contain rodent hairs and insect

On December 27, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia filed libels against 9 tins of candy at Parksley, Va.; and 12 tins of candy at Onley, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 29 and December 5, 1940, by the Wm. T. Kearney Co. from Baltimore, Md.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, and had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth. It was labeled in part: "High Lustre Confections."

On February 7, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemna-

tion were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1683. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 4, 10, and 10 Cartons of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3507. Sample Nos. 27508-E, 27509-E, 27510-E.)

This product contained rodent hairs and insect fragments.

On December 12, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Indiana filed a libel against 24 cartons of candy at Jeffersonville, Ind., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 10, 1940, by N. A. Kroeger & Co. from Baltimore, Md.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy substance, and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth. The article was labeled variously in part: "Subway Bars," "Orange & Lemon Slices," or "Kroeger's Jelly Cuts 240."
On February 12, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemna-

tion was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1684. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 67 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2795. Sample No. 36316–E.)

This product contained rodent excreta and rodent hairs.

On or about September 14, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed a libel against 67 boxes of candy at Norwich, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 23, 1940, by the Liberty Chocolate Co. from Boston, Mass.; and charging that it was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: (Stickers) "Liberty Chocolates Boston."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

On February 24, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1685. Adulteration and misbranding of candy. U. S. v. 25 Boxes and 72 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 2669, 2747. Sample Nos. 9651–E to 9656–E, incl.)

All lots of this product were found to contain rodent hairs; most lots contained insects or insect fragments; and one lot also contained human hairs.

One of the lots was short of the declared weight.

On August 24 and September 9, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi filed libels against 25 boxes of candy at Hattiesburg, Miss., and 72 boxes of candy at Biloxi, Miss., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about July 15 to on or about August 14, 1940, by the McGraw Candy Co. from Mobile, Ala.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled variously: "Penny Sticks," "1¢ each Peanut Blocks," "Azalea Brand * * * Peanut Bar," and "Peppermint"; (wrappers) "Azalea Brand Candy Mint Stock"; "Bundle Sticks"; or "Cocoanut Bars."

It was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy substance; and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions

whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

The cocoanut bars were alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Net wt. 4 ozs. or More" was false and misleading since it was incorrect; and in that it was in package form and did not bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents.

On November 6, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemna-

tion were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1686. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 79 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2738. Sample No. 24260-E.)

This product contained insect fragments and rodent hairs.

On September 3, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 79 boxes of candy at Camden, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 25, 1940, by the F. M. Paist Co. from Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was adulterated. It was labeled in part: (Boxes) "120 Count one cent Each Pin Wheels."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance; and in that it had been prepared under insantiary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

On January 31, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1687. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 19 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3595. Sample Nos. 35466-E, 35467-E.)

Samples of this product were found to contain rodent hairs and insect fragments. On December 26, 1940, the United States attorney for the Western District of Louisiana filed a libel against 19 boxes of candy at Alexandria, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 29, 1940, by Salvo & Berdon Candy Co. from Natchez, Miss.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy substance and had been prepared under insanitary conditions.

On January 27, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1688. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 18 Cases and 180 Boxes, and 39 Boxes of Candy. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3240, 3241. Sample Nos. 39298-E to 39300-E, incl., 39421-E to 39431-E, incl.)

Samples of this product were found to contain rodent hairs, insect fragments, cat hairs, and rodent excreta. Five of the items were overweight and one was

short weight.

On or about October 22, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri filed libels against 18 cases and 219 boxes of candy at Malden, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 23 and 26, 1940, by the Sennett Candy Co. from Memphis, Tenn.; and charging that all lots were adulterated and that a portion was also misbranded. The product was labeled in part: "5¢ Big Boy Sticks ["Peanut Butter" in some lots] Stick Candy Net Wt. 3 Oz."; "5¢ Nifty Packaged Stick Net Wt. 3 Oz."; "3 Oz. Easy Eater Peanut Bar 5¢"; "Dizzy Dozen Sticks"; "Big Bud 5¢ Net Wt. 3½ Oz."; "1¢ Big Bud Sticks"; "Chow Bar Net Wt. 1½ Oz."; "Net Wt. 2¾ Oz. Banner Bar 5¢"; "2 for 1¢ Stick Candy."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance; and in that it had been prepared under insanitary

conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

A portion was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements, (Big Boy Sticks Mint, Big Boy Sticks P-Nut, Dizzy Dozen Stick Candy, and Dizzy Dozen Stick Candy Mint) "Net Wt. 3 Oz.," and (Big Bud Sticks) "3½ Oz.," were false and misleading since they were incorrect. It was alleged to be