

and condemnation of 50 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Buffalo, N. Y., consigned by the South Texas Cotton Oil Co., Victoria, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped from Victoria, Tex., August 28, 1924, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs. Net."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements "100 Lbs. Net Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia 8.37% Protein 43.00%, Nitrogen 6.88% Fibre 10.00%" and "43%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason 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.

On October 23, 1924, 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 sold by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**13689. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 64 Bags and 50 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale.** (F. & D. Nos. 18918, 18948. I. S. Nos. 2467-v, 2493-v. S. Nos. E-4917, E-4934.)

On August 21 and September 10, 1924, respectively, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 114 bags of cottonseed meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Buffalo, N. Y., consigned by the Taft Oil & Gin Co., Taft, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped from Taft, Tex., in part July 28, 1924, and in part August 14, 1924, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs. Net" or "100 Pounds (Net)."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that the statements "100 Pounds (Net) 43 Per Cent Protein Cottonseed Meal Prime Quality Manufactured By Taft Oil and Gin Company, Taft, Texas Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein not less than 43.00 Per Cent Crude Fiber not more than 12.00 Per Cent," with respect to a portion of the product, and the statements "100 Lbs. Net Cotton Seed Meal Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia 8.37% Protein 43.00% Nitrogen 6.88% Fibre 10.00%," with respect to the remainder of the product, borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. 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 on the outside of the package.

On October 10 and 23, 1924, respectively, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be sold by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**13690. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 20 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 16882. I. S. No. 2076-v. S. No. E-4198.)

On October 23, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 20 cases of tomato catsup, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Niagara Falls, N. Y., consigned by the S. J. Van Lill Co., Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped from Baltimore, Md., on or about August 7, 1922, and transported from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, 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 wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On November 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.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*