

wholly or in part for the said article and had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength; and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On July 13, 1929, Frank Hellerick and Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16620. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 20 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23888. I. S. No. 08098. S. No. 2048.)

On June 19, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 20 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Blue Ridge Creamery, Luray, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Luray, Va., on or about June 17, 1929, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength; and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On June 22, 1929, Crawford & Lehman (Inc.), Philadelphia, Pa., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16621. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 11 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23883. I. S. No. 08065. S. No. 2036.)

On June 13, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 11 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Waynesboro Creamery, Waynesboro, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Waynesboro, Va., on or about June 11, 1929, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article and had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On June 24, 1929, Edson Bros., Philadelphia, Pa., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum

of \$500, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16622. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 28 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23890. I. S. No. 04097. S. No. 2030.)

On June 12, 1929, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 28 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Dougherty Cooperative Creamery, Dougherty, Iowa, on or about June 6, 1929, and transported from the State of Iowa into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On June 18, 1929, the Dougherty Cooperative Creamery, Dougherty, Iowa, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having 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 costs and the execution of bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be reworked and reprocessed so that it contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16623. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 25 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23887. I. S. No. 08068. (S. No. 2037.)

On June 13, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Mountain View Creamery Co., Purcellville, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Purcellville, Va., on or about June 11, 1929, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article and had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength; and in that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On July 3, 1929, the H. R. Aiken Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$700, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16624. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. St. Louis Vinegar & Cider Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$525 and costs. (F. & D. No. 22594. I. S. Nos. 19922-x, 19935-x, 19936-x, 19937-x, 19941-x, 19943-x, 25248-x, 25249-x, 25308-x, 25309-x.)

On December 13, 1928, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, 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