

adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Supreme Fancy Creamery Butter \* \* \* One Pound Net Weight."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product deficient in milk fat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in whole or in part for butter, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part abstracted.

On August 20, 1923, the North American Provision Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**11748. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 155 Cases of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.** (F. & D. No. 17650. I. S. No. 692-v. S. No. E-4451.)

On or about July 13, 1923, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Supreme Court of the District aforesaid, holding a District court, a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 155 cases of butter at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article was being offered for sale and sold in the District of Columbia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Armour's \* \* \* Cloverbloom Creamery Butter \* \* \* 1 Lb. Net Weight."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, excessive moisture, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in whole or in part for butter, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Butter," borne on each of the packages containing the said article, was false and misleading, in that it represented that each of the said packages contained butter, and for the further reason that the article was labeled "Butter" so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the said packages contained butter, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said packages did not contain butter but did contain a product containing excessive moisture and deficient in butterfat.

On August 20, 1923, Armour & Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*

**11749. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 117 Cases of Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be candled.** (F. & D. No. 17731. I. S. No. 4245-v. S. No. C-4076.)

On July 23, 1923, 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 117 cases of eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Viroqua Hide & Fur Co., Viroqua, Wis., July 16, 1923, and transported from the State of Wisconsin 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.