

On November 4, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Lucian C. Worth, trading as L. C. Worth Commission Co., Kansas City, Mo., alleging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about June 28, 1932, from the State of Missouri into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of cottonseed screenings that were misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "K. C. Brand Cake and Meal \* \* \* Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43% \* \* \* Manufactured for Kansas City Cake and Meal Co. \* \* \* Kansas City, Mo."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statement, "Protein, not less than 43%", was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it contained less than 43 percent of protein.

On November 25, 1933, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$1.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21623. Adulteration of apples. U. S. v. 150 Bushels of Ben Davis Apples. Decree of confiscation. Apples delivered to a charitable institution. (F. & D. no. 31540. Sample no. 57873-A.)**

This case involved an interstate shipment of apples, that were found to bear arsenic in an amount that might have rendered them injurious to health.

On October 18, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 150 bushels of apples at Tulsa, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped, on or about October 15, 1933, by Allen Bement, Tulsa, Okla., from Springdale, Ark., and that the article had been guaranteed by W. B. Brogdon of Springdale, Ark., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it contained arsenic, which might have rendered it deleterious to health.

On October 27, 1933, W. B. Brogdon & Sons having appeared and admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of confiscation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the apples be rewashed so as to be in condition for use and delivered to a charitable institution.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**21624. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. Marshall County Cooperative Creamery. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25.01. (F. & D. no. 29459. I.S. no. 17089.)**

This case was based on 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 established by Congress.

On March 3, 1933, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Marshall County Cooperative Creamery, a corporation, Lewisburg, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about February 17, 1932, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of butter that was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Sunlight Creamery Butter \* \* \* The Cudahy Packing Co., Distributors General Office Chicago."

It was alleged in the first count of the information that the article was adulterated in that a product which contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged in the second count of the information for the reason that the statement, "Butter", borne on the label, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the said statement represented that the article was butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, whereas it contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat.