

**11156. Adulteration and misbranding of salad dressing. U. S. v. 70 Cases of Regal Thousand Island Dressing. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16814. I. S. No. 7837-v. S. No. W-1211.)**

On September 29, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 70 cases of Regal Thousand Island dressing, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Spokane, Wash., consigned by Ben T. Hosking & Bro., Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped from Chicago, Ill., in two shipments, namely, March 1 and April 1, 1921, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Net Weight, 10 Ounces Regal \* \* \* Thousand Island Dressing \* \* \* Manufactured by Ben T. Hosking & Brother Chicago, Ill."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable or animal substance.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the label upon each bottle containing the article, "Net Weight, 10 Ounces," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser in that the label represented that the said bottles contained a greater quantity than was contained therein. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked upon the outside of each of said packages, since the weight marked upon the said labels was not correct.

On December 14, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**11157. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 12 Cases of Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16824. I. S. No. 3933-v. S. No. C-3784.)**

On or about August 24, 1922, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 12 cases of eggs, at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Copeland-Wells Co., Lenox, Iowa, August 15, 1922, and transported from the State of Iowa into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy animal substance, for the further reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, and for the further reason that it consisted in part of a putrid animal substance.

On September 20, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**11158. Adulteration and misbranding of flour. U. S. v. 400 Sacks of Flour. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 16869. I. S. No. 7961-v. S. No. W-1220.)**

On October 4, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 400 sacks of flour, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., consigned by Crowther Bros., Malad, Idaho, alleging that the article had been shipped from Malad, Idaho, on or about August 25, 1922, and transported from the State of Idaho into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Eureka Flour \* \* \* Net Weight 98 Pounds."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that bleached flour had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.