

"100 Lbs. Cold Pressed Cotton Seed Cake Manufactured by Riverside Cotton Oil Company Fort Worth, Tex. Guaranteed Analysis:

Protein-----	29%
Fat -----	6.3%
Crude Fiber-----	25%
Nitrogen Free Extract-----	28%

100 lbs. Net Feeding Stuff L. B. Youngblood Director Guaranteed under the Texas law and sold subject to inspection. Guaranteed composition must be printed plainly on reverse side of this tag. The Texas Inspection Tax has been paid. W. L. Boyett, State Feed Inspector, College Station, Texas. Information Bulletins Free."

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that the aforesaid label on said sacks or packages bore a statement regarding the article which was false and misleading in that it represented and stated on the labels upon said sacks or packages that each of them contained 100 pounds of the product, as stated on said labels, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said sacks or packages did not each contain 100 pounds of said product but contained less than 100 pounds of said product, and that each of said sacks or packages, so represented and stated to contain 100 pounds of the product as stated on said labels, contained but 96 pounds thereof. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that said sacks or packages were so labeled or branded as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, in that it was represented and stated on the labels upon said sacks and packages that each of them contained 100 pounds of the product, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of such sacks and packages did not contain 100 pounds as stated on said labels, but each contained less than that amount of such product, and that each of said sacks and packages so represented and stated as containing 100 pounds of said product on said labels contained but 96 pounds [average weight].

On February 28, 1914, the said Riverside Cotton Oil Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations in the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

**3387. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 20 Tubs, More or Less, of So-Called Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Released on bond. (F. & D. No. 5588. I. S. No. 7722-h. S. No. 2112.)**

On February 10, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 20 tubs, each containing about 65 pounds of a product purporting to be pure creamery butter, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Sharptown, N. J., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about January 19, 1914, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, from which State the said product, on or about February 2, 1914, was reshipped and transported into the State of New Jersey, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Rush—Perishable—For John Jamison, 3 S. Water St., Phila.—from William Richman—Manufacturer and Shipper—Pure Dairy Products—Fresh Cream, Milk, Unsweetened condensed milk and Sugared condensed milk, \*\*\*\*\* Unionville, N. Y."

It was alleged in the libel that the product purported to be pure creamery butter, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said product was not pure butter and was adulterated within the meaning of the act aforesaid, in that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed with the so-called butter so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect the quality and strength thereof, and for the further reason that the product had been mixed in a manner whereby damage and inferiority were concealed. It was further alleged in the libel that the containers of the butter did not bear any statement or declaration that the product contained an excessive amount of water, when in fact it was shipped as and purported to be pure creamery butter and was therefore misbranded within the meaning of the act aforesaid, in that product was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of an article, to wit, pure creamery butter, other than what it really was.

On March 17, 1914, William Richman, claimant, 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 should be delivered to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*

**3388. Adulteration and misbranding of jelly. U. S. v. 100 Cases of a Product Purporting to be Pure Grape Jelly. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 5590. I. S. No. 3368-h. S. No. 2115.)

On or about February 13, 1914, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 cases, more or less, each containing 2 dozen packages of a product purporting to be grape jelly, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about January 6, 1914, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The cases were labeled: "Two Dozen Tumblers Warfield Brand Pure Grape Jellies, Seeman Brothers, Distributors, New York." The packages in the cases were each labeled: "Warfield Pure Grape Jelly, Seeman Bros., Wholesale Distributors, N. Y. Contents 9 oz."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it had mixed with it an applied [apple] product, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength; and, further, said product contained a substance which had been substituted in part for the article represented as pure grape jelly. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that said product was labeled, "Pure Grape Jelly," in that said product consisted in large part of an apple product and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On March 4, 1914, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 24, 1914.*