Act, as amended, from the State of Colorado into the State of Utah, of a quantity of egg noodles which were adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained little or no egg.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, an alimentary paste containing little or no egg, had been substituted for egg noodles, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the boxes containing the article bore a statement, to wit, "Egg Noodles," regarding the said article and the ingredients contained therein, which was false and misleading in that the said statement represented to the purchaser thereof that the article was egg noodles, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not egg noodles, but was a product containing little or no egg. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a product composed practically wholly of an alimentary paste, prepared in imitation of egg noodles, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, egg noodles. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On July 5, 1921, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $5 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10074. Misbranding of apples. U. S. * * * v. Thomas H. Peppers. Plea of guilty. Fine, $5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14738. I. S. No. 1722-t.)

On June 14, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Thomas H. Peppers, Montrose, Colo., alleging shipment by said defendant, on or about September 30, 1920, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Colorado into the State of Texas, of a quantity of apples contained in boxes, which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On September 9, 1921, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $5 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10075. Misbranding of apples. U. S. * * * v. Union Fruit Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14739. I. S. No. 1717-t.)

On June 9, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Union Fruit Co., a corporation, Paonia, Colo., alleging shipment by said company, on or about October 5, 1920, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Colorado into the State of Texas, of a quantity of apples contained in unlabeled baskets, which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On September 20, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $5 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10076. Misbranding of peaches. U. S. * * * v. Associated Fruit Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14740. I. S. No. 1633-t.)

On June 14, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Associated Fruit Co., a corporation, Delta, Colo., alleging shipment by said company, on or about September 25, 1920, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as