

14633. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Atlanta Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 19796. I. S. No. 6628-x.)

On September 25, 1926, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, 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 Atlanta Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Atlanta, Ga., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about October 8, 1925, from the State of Georgia into the State of North Carolina, of a quantity of cottonseed meal which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Good Cottonseed Meal Manufactured By Atlanta Cotton Oil Co. Atlanta, Ga. Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia 7.00% Protein 36.00%."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article from the shipment showed 6.47 per cent ammonia, equivalent to 33.25 per cent protein.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a product containing less than 36 per cent of protein and less than 7 per cent of ammonia had been substituted for good cottonseed meal, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Good Cottonseed Meal Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia 7.00% Protein 36.00%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article was good cottonseed meal containing 7 per cent of ammonia and 36 per cent of protein, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was good cottonseed meal containing 7 per cent of ammonia and 36 per cent of protein, whereas it was not as represented but was a cottonseed feed containing less than 7 per cent of ammonia and containing less than 36 per cent of protein. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, cottonseed meal, in that it contained less than 36 per cent of protein.

On October 12, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14634. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 75 Cases, et al., of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 21125, 21126, 21140. I. S. Nos. 5496-x, 5497-x, 5498-x, 5535-x, 7701-x to 7706-x, incl. S. Nos. E-5703, E-5704, E-5705.)

On May 29 and June 3 and 9, 1926, respectively, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying seizure and condemnation of 209 tubs, 75 cases and 133 boxes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages in part at Springfield, and in part at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Mandan Creamery & Produce Co., Mandan, N. Dak., and transported from the State of North Dakota into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it was deficient in butterfat.

Misbranding was alleged with respect to 24 tubs of butter 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 July 21, 1926, the Mandan Creamery & Produce Co., Mandan, N. Dak., having appeared as claimant for the property, 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 \$100, conditioned in part that it be reworked so as to contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat, and relabeled to show the true quantity of the contents of the containers.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14635. Misbranding of mill run bran. U. S. v. El Paso Grain & Milling Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 17924. I. S. No. 7965-v.)

On February 1, 1924, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the