10079. Adulteration and misbranding of table oil. U. S. * * * v. 122 One-Gallon Cans of Table Oil * * *. Decree ordering release of product under bond. (F. & D. No. 15503. I. S. No. 8504-t. S. No. E-3618.)

On October 26, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report 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 122 one-gallon cans of table oil, consigned on or about September 3, 1921, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Banfi Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in whole or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the said article had been mixed in a manner whereby damage or inferiority had been concealed.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the package or label bore a statement, design, or device regarding the article and the ingredients or substances contained therein, to wit, "Finest Quality Table Oil Tipo Termini Imerese * * * 1 Gallon Net," together with a cut showing olive picking scene, which were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article and for the further 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, since the statement made thereon was not correct.

On November 22, 1921, the Banfi Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., having filed a claim and answer to the libel admitting the allegations thereof with respect to the misbranding of the article to be true, and praying permission to repack the said article in other containers, judgment of the court was entered ordering the release of the product to the said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of $250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be relabeled in compliance with the law.

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

10080. Misbranding of butter. U. S. * * * v. Jones Baker. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 612-c.)

On September 9, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Jones Baker, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 25, 1920, the said defendant did sell and offer for sale in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of butter which was misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was process butter and was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, butter.

On September 9, 1920, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

10081. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. George K. Chaconas. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 613-c.)

On September 15, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against George K. Chaconas, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 23, 1920, the said defendant did sell and offer for sale in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly or in part abstracted therefrom.

On September 15, 1920, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

10082. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Louis Mandes. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 614–c.)

On September 16, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Louis Mandes, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 24, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly or in part abstracted therefrom.

On September 16, 1920, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

10083. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Parros Papageorge. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 615–c.)

On September 17, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Parros Papageorge, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 24, 1920, the said defendant did sell and offer for sale in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly or in part abstracted therefrom.

On September 17, 1920, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

10084. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Anthony G. Mandes. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 616–c.)

On September 20, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Anthony G. Mandes, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 23, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been abstracted therefrom in whole or in part.

On September 21, 1920, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

10085. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Charles C. Rogers. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 617–c.)

On September 23, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Charles C. Rogers, Washington, D. C., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on August 23, 1920, from Herndon, in the State of Virginia, into the District of Columbia, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly or in part abstracted therefrom.