of 33 dozen boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken boxes at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Randolph Marketing Co., from San Dimas, Calif., February 27, 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: "Blue Star Brand Oranges, Randolph Marketing Co., California Golden Quality, 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 4, 1922, the Randolph Marketing Co. having entered an appearance as claimant for the property and having filed a good and sufficient bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act, and the product having been sorted under the supervision of this department in accordance with a stipulation and decree theretofore filed, by consent of the claimant it was ordered by the court that the 109 boxes of the product which had been passed by this department as good and sound be released to the said claimant, that the balance thereof be condemned and destroyed, and that the bond be released and exonerated.

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

10503. Adulteration of middlings. U. S. * * * v. 400 Sacks of Middlings. Judgment by consent providing for release of product under bond. (F. & D. No. 15604. I. S. No. 9328-t. S. No. E-3645.)

On November 10, 1921, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, 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 400 sacks of middlings, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Franklinton, N. C., consigned by the Mayo Milling Co., Richmond, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped from Richmond, Va., on or about September 23, 1921, and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of North Carolina, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "* * * Mayo's Bull Middlings * * * Mayo Milling Co., Inc., Distributors, Richmond, Va."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On April 12, 1922, the Mayo Milling Co., Richmond, Va., claimant, having executed a bond in the sum of $1,000 and having paid the costs of the proceedings, in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment by consent was entered ordering the release of the product to the said claimant.

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

10504. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 20 Half-Gallon Cans of * * * Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product delivered to the Salvation Army. (F. & D. No. 14118. I. S. No. 6263-t. S. No. E-3014.)

On December 27, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, 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 20 half-gallon cans of a product purporting to be olive oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from Providence, R. I., on or about November 30, 1920, and transported from the State of Rhode Island into the State of New York, 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 an oil other than olive oil had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article, and for the further reason that the article had been mixed in a manner whereby its inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the labels on the cans containing the article, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained in the said cans, to wit, "Prodotti Italiani Olio di Oliva Pure Olive Oil Sopraffino Italia Brand Trade Mark Lucca Toscana Italia Net Contents ½ Gall.," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser by representing that the product was an Italian olive oil when it was not. Misbranding was alleged in substance for the further reason that the article was [food] in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly