

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. The article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Golden Flow Brand Whole Peeled Pears in Heavy Syrup \* \* \* Packed By Pure Foods Corp., Los Angeles, Calif."

On January 30 and November 17, 1941, Pure Foods Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., having appeared as claimant, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered released under bond to be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

**2920. Misbranding of canned corn. U. S. v. 720 Cases of Canned Corn. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 6242. Sample No. 74571-E.)**

This product was not of Fancy quality because it was too mature.

On or about November 21, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 720 cases of canned corn at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article was shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 9, 1941, by the Chippewa Canning Co. from Chippewa Falls, Wis.; and charging that it was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Uco Fancy Golden Bantam Whole Kernel Corn \* \* \* Uco Food Corp. Newark, N. J. Distributors."

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the term "Fancy" was false and misleading as applied to an article that was not of Fancy quality because it was too mature.

On December 15, 1941, the Uco Food Corporation, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

**2921. Misbranding of canned corn. U. S. v. 201 Cases of Canned Corn. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond to be relabeled. (F. D. C. No. 5269. Sample No. 62157-E.)**

Examination showed that this product was not of Grade A or Fancy quality, as labeled.

On August 7, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois filed a libel (amended October 31, 1941, nunc pro tunc as of August 7, 1941) against 201 cases of canned corn at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 19 and 24, and May 7 and 14, 1941, by Columbia Canning Co. from Cambria, Wis.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the terms "Grade A," "Fancy," and "Its All Fancy Quality," were false and misleading as applied to corn of Grade B quality. It was labeled in part: "Grade A Kroger's Country Club Quality Brand Fancy Who'e Kernel Yellow Corn."

On September 17, 1941, Kroger Grocer & Baking Co., Chicago, Ill., 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.

**2922. Misbranding of canned corn. U. S. v. 999 Cases of Canned Corn. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 6247. Sample No. 74570-E.)**

This product was not of Fancy quality because of overmaturity and pasty, almost dry consistency, of the kernels.

On or about November 21, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 999 cases of canned corn at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 24, 1941, by the Empire State Canning Co. from Stacy Basin, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded in that the term "Fancy" was false and misleading as applied to corn that was not of Fancy quality. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Uco Our Best Grade Fancy Cream Style Golden Sweet Corn \* \* \* Uco Food Corp., Newark, N. J. Distributors."

On January 9, 1942, the Uco Food Corporation, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.