

animal food entering into the composition or manufacture of said cottonseed feed meal; and it was further alleged that said cottonseed feed meal was adulterated in that it contained a larger percentage of fiber than it was branded to contain and a smaller percentage of protein and fat than it was branded to contain.

On January 8, 1914, Charles E. Mitchell, claimant, having confessed the libel, it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceeding, bond having been executed and approved by said claimant in conformity with section 10 of the act.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3266. Adulteration of cream. U. S. v. David M. Pitts. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 216-c.)

On January 22, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against David M. Pitts, Manassas, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 12, 19, and 20, 1913, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, of quantities of cream which was adulterated. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent of the article of food, to wit, butter fat, was left out and abstracted in whole and in part.

On January 22, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3267. Adulteration of cream. U. S. v. John W. Humm. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 217-c.)

On February 13, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against John W. Humm, Frederick, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on July 21 and 23, 1913, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of quantities of cream which was adulterated. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent of the article of food, to wit, butter fat, was left out and abstracted in whole and in part.

On February 13, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3268. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. George Wen. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 218-c.)

On February 13, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against George Wen, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 31, 1914, at the District aforesaid, of a quantity of so-called butter which was adulterated and misbranded. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that another sub-

stance, namely, oleomargarine, had been substituted for butter in whole and in part. Misbranding of the product was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On February 13, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3269. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Benjamin F. Zimmerman. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$15. (F. & D. No. 219-c.)

On February 4, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Benjamin F. Zimmerman, Adamstown, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 10 and 13, 1914, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of quantities of milk which was adulterated. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed with it, which reduced and lowered its quality and strength.

On February 4, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$15.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3270. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed feed meal. U. S. v. 800 Sacks of Cottonseed Feed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 220-c. S. No. 2124.)

On February 17, 1914, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the State Commissioner of Agriculture and Industries of Alabama, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 800 sacks, each containing 100 pounds of cottonseed feed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages in the freight warehouse of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Co. at Montgomery, Ala., alleging that the product had been shipped on December 31, 1913, by the Memphis Manufacturing Co., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Alabama, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "100 Pounds. Imperial Brand Cotton Seed Feed Meal. For Stock Feed Only. Guaranteed Analysis: Protein 22%, Fat 05% [5% (?)], Fibre 22%. Manufactured by Memphis Manufacturing Co., Memphis, Tenn."

It was alleged in the libel that the product was adulterated and misbranded in that it was largely deficient in the principal and valuable ingredients of animal food, in this, to wit: That it contained a smaller percentage of protein than it was branded to contain; that it contained a smaller percentage of fat than it was branded to contain, which two constituents of animal food are material and valuable, and that said cottonseed feed meal contained a larger percentage of fiber than it was branded to contain, which said constituent of animal food is not a valuable constituent of animal food entering into the composition or manufacture of said cottonseed feed meal, and the same was adulterated in that it contained a larger percentage of fiber than it was branded to contain, and a smaller percentage of protein and fat than it was branded to