

was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On January 2, 1914, the defendant Brockway entered a plea of guilty to the information on behalf of the firm, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3261. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. George D. Lefas. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 210-c.)

On January 2, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against George D. Lefas, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 20, 1913, at the District aforesaid, of a quantity of so-called butter which was adulterated, in that another substance, namely, oleomargarine, had been substituted for butter in whole and in part. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On January 2, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3262. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. William Assimack and George Lambros. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 211-c.)

On December 30, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against William Assimack and George Lambros, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 13, 1913, at the District aforesaid, of a quantity of so-called butter which was adulterated and misbranded. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that another substance, namely, oleomargarine, had been substituted for the butter in whole or in part. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On December 30, 1913, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on the above by the defendants, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3263. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. E. C. Williams. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 212-c.)

On January 5, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against E. C. Williams, Port Deposit, Md., alleging the shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 11 and 17, 1913, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of quantities of milk which was adulterated. Adulteration of the product was