

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy and decomposed vegetable substance.

On January 5, 1933, the Oregon Packing Co., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 claimant, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$300, conditioned that it should not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act and all other laws.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20803. Adulteration of canned pumpkin. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Canned Pumpkin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 29709. Sample no. 22444-A.)

This case involved a shipment of canned pumpkin that was found to be unsterile and decomposed.

On December 31, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 10 cases of canned pumpkin, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Frederick, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 14, 1932, by the William Laning & Son Co., from Bridgeton, N.J., to Frederick, Md., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Silver Lake Brand Fancy Pumpkin."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On January 16, 1933, 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. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20804. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 146 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 29707. Sample no. 21220-A.)

This case involved a shipment of tomato catsup that contained excessive mold.

On January 4, 1933, 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 the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 146 cases of tomato catsup at New York, N.Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 27, 1932, by A. C. Soper Co., from Farmingdale, N.J., to New York, N.Y., charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Gold Medal Brand Catsup."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On January 28, 1933, 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. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20805. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 5 Cubes of Butter. Product ordered released under bond to be reworked. (F. & D. no. 29921. Sample no. 20310-A.)

This action involved an interstate shipment of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard for butter prescribed by Congress.

On February 8, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 5 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about February 4, 1933, by the B. A. C. Dairy, from Cedar City, Utah, to Los Angeles, Calif., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.