

On September 18, 1933, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 on the first count and 1 cent on the second count, in lieu of fine and costs.

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

21625. Misbranding of canned peas. U. S. v. 1,000 Cases of Canned Peas. Decree of condemnation. Product released under bond to be re-labeled. (F. & D. no. 30820. Sample no. 42373-A.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of a product which was represented to be canned sugar peas but which consisted of Alaska peas, a lower grade than sugar peas.

On August 4, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1,000 cases of canned peas at Richmond, Ind., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 26, 1933, by H. M. Crites & Co., from Ashville, Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Merrit Brand Sugar Peas * * * Packed for A. H. Perfect and Company, The Eavey Company."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement, "Sugar Peas", borne on the label, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser when applied to a product which was low-grade Alaska variety peas. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was sold under the name of another article.

On September 30, 1933, the Eavey Co., Richmond, Ind., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation 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 \$3,000, conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of this Department.

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

21626. Adulteration of cauliflower. U. S. v. 35 Crates of Cauliflower. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31247. Sample no. 58563-A.)

This case involved a shipment of cauliflower that was found to bear arsenic in an amount that might have rendered it injurious to health.

On October 6, 1933, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 35 crates of cauliflower at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 4, 1933, by the Erie County Growers & Shippers Association, from Orchard Park, N.Y., 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 an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, arsenic, which might have rendered it harmful to health.

On October 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.

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

21627. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 110 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be reworked. (F. & D. no. 31225. Sample no. 40370-A.)

This case 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 established by Congress.

On or about September 19, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 110 tubs of butter at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 9, 1933, by the Rosebud Creamery Co., from Sioux City, Iowa, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.