10518. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. * * * v. Wilson & Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 16001. I. S. No. 3024–t.)

On March 15, 1922, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Wilson & Co., a corporation, trading at Altus, Okla., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about August 13, 1921, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Texas, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated.

Examination, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, of 5 cases, consisting of 1,800 eggs, from the consignment showed the presence of 248, or 13.7 per cent, inedible eggs, consisting of mixed or white rots, spot rots, blood rings, blood rots (very bad), and chick rots.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal substance.

On May 15, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50 and costs.

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

10519. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. * * * v. 64 Boxes of Butter * * *. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 16138. I. S. No. 8119–t. S. No. E–3855.)

On April 25, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 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 64 boxes, each containing 30 pounds, of an article purporting to be butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 11, 1922, by the Eggleston Creamery & Produce Co., Eggleston, Minn., and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that excessive moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had been in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the packages purported to contain butter, when in fact they did not.

On May 15, 1922, J. J. McDonald, Philadelphia, Pa., having entered his appearance as claimant of the goods, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bond in the sum of $1,200, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product be relabeled [reworked] under the supervision of this department.

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

10520. Adulteration and misbranding of milk chocolate. U. S. * * * v. Massachusetts Chocolate Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 8701. I. S. No. 4021–m.)

On April 3, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, 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 Massachusetts Chocolate Co., a corporation, Boston, Mass., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 9, 1917, from the State of Massachusetts into the State of New York, of a quantity of milk chocolate which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Wan-Eta Sweet Milk Chocolate Topekas, Massachusetts Chocolate Co., Boston, Mass."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was deficient in milk.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a product, to wit, a mixture composed largely of either sugar or sweet chocolate and deficient in milk, a necessary ingredient of sweet milk chocolate,