

Grocery Co., Hattiesburg, Miss., in two consignments, on or about December 2 and 12, 1929, respectively, and transported from the State of Mississippi into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "From London Grocery Co. \* \* \* Hattiesburg, Mississippi."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product deficient in milk fat had been substituted for butter, which the said article purported to be, and in that a product containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of May (March) 4, 1923, which the article purported to be.

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

On January 13, 1930, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17107. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 1 Barrel of Butter. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 24561. I. S. No. 025366. S. No. 2652.)

On or about December 12, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, 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 1 barrel containing one hundred 1-pound packages of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. H. Brittain, Roanoke, Ala., on or about December 4, 1929, and transported from the State of Alabama into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "From W. H. Brittain \* \* \* Roanoke, Ala."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product deficient in milk fat had been substituted for butter, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that a product containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of May (March) 4, 1923, which the article purported to be.

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

On January 13, 1930, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17108. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 12 Tubs of Butter. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 24358. I. S. No. 022350. S. No. 2393.)

On October 11, 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 12 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Tennessee Valley Creamery Co., Knoxville, Tenn., alleging that the article had been shipped from Knoxville, Tenn., on or about October 8, 1929, and transported from the State of Tennessee 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 deficient in 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 the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal substance.

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

On December 26, 1929, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*