

base cider, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged with respect to the shipment of February 5, 1919, for the reason that an article consisting of an apple product, glucose, alcohol, and water had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in part for apple cider or apple base cider, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information with respect to the shipments of December 14, 1917, January 4, 23, and 26, 1918, and April 22, 1918, in that the statements "Apple Cider Base," "Apple Base Cider," and "Contains Apple Juice fermented with corn sugar and water," borne on the kegs containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that they represented that said article contained as its principal constituent some product of apples, whereas, in truth and in fact, it consisted principally of a mixture of glucose and water sweetened with saccharin. Misbranding of the article was alleged with respect to the shipments of March 15, 1919, April 28, 1919, and May 6, 1919, for the reason that the article was labeled in conspicuous type "Apple Cider" so as to deceive and mislead purchasers into the belief that it was apple cider, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a mixture of some apple product, glucose, water, saccharin, and benzoate of soda.

Misbranding was alleged with respect to the shipments of March 27, 1918, April 13, 1918, and December 9, 1918, for the reason that the article was an imitation of another article, to wit, cider, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the shipment of April 13, 1918, in that it was an imitation of port, that is to say, apple cider colored so as to imitate port, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the foregoing shipments in that the statement "Apple Cider" was false and misleading, and the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, in that it represented to purchasers that it was apple cider, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the shipment of February 5, 1919, for the reason that it was labeled "Apple Cider" when it was not, and for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents thereof was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 5, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$20 on each of the 25 counts, the total amount assessed being \$500.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*

**S002. Misbranding of cottonseed cake and cottonseed meal. U. S. \* \* \***  
**v. Apache Cotton Oil & Mfg. Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty.**  
**Fine, \$600.** (F. & D. No. 11613. I. S. Nos. 11958-r, 11959-r, 11960-r, 11961-r, 11983-r, 11989-r.)

On March 24, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Apache Cotton Oil & Mfg. Co., a corporation, Chickasha, Okla., alleging shipment by said defendant, on or about January 10, January 22, January 30, February 2, and February 7, 1919, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of quantities of an article which was misbranded.

Examination of each shipment showed that the sacks bore no statement of the quantity of the contents.

Misbranding of the article in each shipment was alleged in that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents thereof was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On April 29, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$300.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S003. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. \* \* \* v. Achilles Joannidi (Heretofore Copartner with Panos Perides). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$125. (F. & D. No. 11791. I. S. Nos. 13733-r, 17878-r.)**

On May 5, 1920, 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 an information against Achilles Joannidi, heretofore copartner with Panos Perides, trading under the name of Joannidi & Perides, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on November 14, 1918, and March 3, 1919, from the State of New York into the States of Connecticut and New Jersey, of quantities of an article which was adulterated and misbranded. The article in the shipment of November 14 was labeled in part, "La Marca Famosa Olio il Greco Brand Calamata Style packed by Joannidi & Perides New York." The article in the shipment of March 3 was unlabeled, but had been invoiced as "Spanish Oil."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted almost entirely of cottonseed oil, and in the shipment of November 14 the cans were short volume.

Adulteration of the article labeled in part "La Marca Famosa" was alleged in the information in that cottonseed oil had been mixed and packed with the article so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality. It was further adulterated in that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article labeled "La Marca Famosa" was alleged in that the statements on the labels on the cans containing the article, regarding the article, to wit, "Olio il Greco Brand Calamata Style," "La Marca Famosa," and "One Gallon Net," were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was olive oil produced in the kingdom of Greece, and that each can contained 1 gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, the article was not olive oil produced in the kingdom of Greece, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil produced in the United States of America, and each can did not contain 1 gallon net of the article, but did contain a less amount. The article was further misbranded in that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was produced in that it was branded as a product produced in the kingdom of Greece, whereas it was produced in the United States of America. The article was further misbranded in that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the article was olive oil produced in the kingdom of Greece, and that each can contained 1 gallon net of the article, whereas it was not olive oil produced in the kingdom of Greece, but was a mixture of cottonseed oil produced in the United States of America, and each can contained less than 1 gallon net of the article. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

Adulteration of the article in the other shipment was alleged in the libel in that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality. Further