

original unbroken packages at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 18, 1918, by the Thomas Roberts Co., Windy Hill, Md., and transported from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Packed by the Windy Hill Packing Company Easton, Md. Pure Tomato Sauce."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On November 21, 1918, 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.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6889. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 19 Cases, More or Less, Containing Cans of Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9385. I. S. No. 12353-r. S. No. C-988.)

On October 10, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, 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 19 cases, more or less, containing cans of oil, at Cleveland, O., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 10, 1918, by N. S. Monahos, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Olio Olivola" and "Winter-pressed cottonseed salad oil flavored slightly with pure olive oil, a compound."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that cottonseed oil had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted almost entirely for olive oil, which the article purported to be, thereby lowering its quality, strength, and value.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that said labeling and design, not corrected by above-quoted words in less prominent type, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that such statement and design indicated that said cans contained olive oil, when, in truth and in fact, cottonseed oil had been substituted almost entirely for olive oil. Misbranding of the article was further alleged in substance for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On November 4, 1918, Higgins, Babcock, Hurd Co., Cleveland, O., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6890. Adulteration and misbranding of feed. U. S. * * * v. Marsh Commission Co. (Marco Mills). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 8397. I. S. Nos. 12059-m, 12068-m, 12069-m.)

On April 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against