10368. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. * * * v. 462 Boxes of * * * Oranges. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 16176. I. S. No. 10952–t. S. No. W–1068.)

On April 1, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, 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 462 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the California Fruit Growers Exchange, from Mentone, Calif., March 23, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Washington Navels Direct Brand Crafton Orange Growers Association, Redlands, California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 7, 1922, the California Fruit Growers Exchange having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $2,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the said product be sorted and the bad portion destroyed.

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

10369. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. * * * v. 364 Boxes * * * of Oranges. Decree releasing good portion to claimant. (F. & D. No. 16177. I. S. No. 18437–t. S. No. C–3513.)

On or about April 1, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, 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 364 boxes of oranges, at Little Rock, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped by the California Fruit Growers Exchange, from Prenda, Calif., on or about March 22, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Arkansas, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Wash. Navels, Red Crescent Brand, Arlington Heights Fruit Company, Riverside, California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the said oranges showed a marked dryness, which indicated fruit badly frosted.

On April 3, 1922, the California Fruit Growers Exchange, claimant, having repacked and reconditioned the oranges under the supervision of this department and it having appeared that 202 boxes thereof conformed to the requirements of law, judgment of the court was entered ordering that the said 202 boxes of oranges be released to the said claimant, and that the balance thereof be destroyed by the United States marshal; and it was further ordered that the claimant pay all costs of the proceedings.

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

10370. Adulteration and misbranding of soluble saccharin. U. S. * * * v. 10 Pounds of Soluble Saccharin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9369. I. S. No. 6264–r. S. No. C–980.)

On October 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, 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 10 pounds of soluble saccharin, remaining in the original packages at Dallas, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., on or about August 16, 1918, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act The article was labeled in part: "Soluble Saccharine * * * 10 lbs. Net * * * W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., Manufacturing Chemists, St. Louis, Mo."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it was a drug and was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation, and for the further reason that the strength