

atoes at Goldsboro, N. C., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 29, 1940, by C. C. Coles Canning Co., Hague, Va.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Cans) "Pine Cone Brand Tomatoes Contents 1 Lb. 3 Oz. Albert W. Sisk and Son Distributors."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that it purported to be a food for which a standard of quality had been prescribed by regulations as provided by law; but its quality fell below such standard, and its label failed to bear in such manner and form as the regulations specify, a statement that it fell below such standard.

On April 15, 1941, Albert W. Sisk & Sons having appeared as claimant, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

2013. Misbranding of canned tomatoes. U. S. v. 498 Cases and 100 Cases of Canned Tomatoes. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond to be relabeled. (F. D. C. Nos. 4249, 4250. Sample No. 22404-E.)

This product was substandard because of low drained weight.

On April 8, 1941, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York filed a libel against 498 cases, each containing 24 cans, of tomatoes at Brooklyn, N. Y., and 100 cases, each containing 24 cans, of the same product at Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 14, 1941, by Parrott & Co. from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Cans) "Lodi Brand Tomatoes * * * Net Contents 1 Lb. 12 Oz."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that it purported to be a food for which a standard of quality had been prescribed by regulations as provided by law; but its quality fell below such standard, and its label failed to bear in such manner and form as the regulations specify, a statement that it fell below such standard.

On May 6, 1941, Parrott & Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

2014. Misbranding of canned tomatoes. U. S. v. 100 Cases of Canned Tomatoes. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to a charitable organization. (F. D. C. No. 4289. Sample No. 56393-E.)

This product, which was labeled Grade A, was found to consist of Grade B tomatoes.

On April 10, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 100 cases, each containing 24 cans, of tomatoes at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 13, 1941, by Olney & Carpenter, Inc., from Wolcott, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Cans) "Grade A A&P Vine Ripened Tomatoes Net Wt. 1 Lb. 12 Oz."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Grade A" was false and misleading as applied to Grade B tomatoes.

On August 15, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a charitable organization.

2015. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 25 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5164. Sample No. 53224-E.)

Examination showed that this product contained worm and insect fragments.

On July 17, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Arizona filed a libel against 25 cases, each containing 24 bottles, of tomato catsup at Tucson, Ariz., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 20, 1941, by Kern Food Products, Inc., from Los Angeles, Calif.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance. The article was labeled in part: (Bottles) "California Club Brand Pure Tomato Catsup * * * Net Weight 14 Oz."

On September 10, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

Nos. 2016 to 2026 report the seizure and disposition of tomato catsup that contained excessive mold, indicating the presence of decomposed material.

2016. Adulteration of catsup. U. S. v. 94 Cases of Catsup. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 5030. Sample No. 44947-E.)

This product contained worm and insect fragments in addition to mold.

On June 27, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Idaho filed a libel against 94 cases, each containing 24 cans, of catsup at Pocatello, Idaho, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 27, 1941, by Royal Canning Corporation from Ogden, Utah; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy and decomposed substance. The article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Ropak Brand Catsup Contents 1 Lb. 15 Ozs."

On July 24, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

2017. Adulteration and misbranding of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 99 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4968. Sample No. 22559-E.)

This product contained worm and insect fragments in addition to mold. It also contained artificial color and sodium benzoate, which are not provided for in the standard of identity for tomato catsup, prescribed by regulations as provided by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

On June 23, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against 99 cases of tomato catsup at Grants Pass, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 27, 1941, by Val Vita Food Products, Inc., from Oakland, Calif.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Monte Rio Tomato Catsup."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a decomposed substance; in that inferiority had been concealed by the addition of artificial color; and in that artificial color had been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to make it appear better or of greater value than it was.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that it purported to be tomato catsup, a food for which a definition and standard of identity had been prescribed by regulations as provided by law, but it did not conform to such definition and standard since it contained artificial color and sodium benzoate.

On August 27, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2018. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 43 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4203. Sample No. 42237-E.)

On April 3, 1941, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York filed a libel against 43 cases, each containing 24 bottles, of tomato catsup at Buffalo, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 5, 1941, by Becker Prentiss, Inc., from Austin, Ind.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a decomposed substance. The article was labeled in part: (Bottles) "American Beauty Brand Tomato Catsup Packed by Morgan Packing Co., Austin, Ind."

On April 30, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2019. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 965 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 3883. Sample No. 29446-E.)

On February 27, 1941, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio filed a libel against 965 cases, each containing 24 bottles, of tomato catsup at Columbus, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 28, 1940, by Fettig Canning Corporation from Elwood, Ind.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a decomposed substance. The article was labeled in part: "Sunbeam Tomato Catsup Francis H. Leggett & Co."

On August 20, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

2020. Adulteration of tomato ketchup. U. S. v. 171 Cases of Tomato Ketchup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4032. Sample No. 43901-E.)

On or about March 22, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas filed a libel against 171 cases, each containing 24 bottles, of tomato