

entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimants to be reworked under the supervision of this department, upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds totaling \$4,000, conditioned that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act and other existing laws.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18648. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 21 Tubs, et al., of Butter. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 27163, 27169. I. S. Nos. 35342, 36466. S. Nos. 5049, 5050.)

Samples of butter from the shipments herein described having been found to contain less than 80 per cent of milk fat, the standard provided by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

On July 25 and July 29, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 29 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Eastman Creamery Co., from Prairie du Chien, Wis., in part on July 13, 1931, and in part on July 20, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was deficient in butterfat, in that it contained less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article had been sold, shipped, and labeled as butter, which was false and misleading in that the said article contained less than 80 per cent of milk fat.

On or about July 28 and July 29, 1931, the Peter Fox Sons Co., and Coyne & Nevins Co., both of Chicago, Ill., having appeared as claimants for respective portions of the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimants to be reworked under the supervision of this department, upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds totaling \$1,000, conditioned that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act and other existing laws.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18649. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 4 Tubs, et al., of Butter. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 27147, 27179. I. S. Nos. 35120, 36424. S. Nos. 4891, 4938.)

Samples of butter from the shipments herein described having been found to contain less than 80 per cent of milk fat, the standard provided by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

On or about June 17 and July 1, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 22 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Almond Cooperative Creamery Co., from Almond, Wis., in part on June 9, 1931, and in part on June 22, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was deficient in butterfat, in that it contained less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article had been sold, shipped, and labeled as butter, which was false and misleading in that the said article contained less than 80 per cent of milk fat.