

3811. Adulteration and misbranding of orange extract, terpeneless. U. S. v. Mauss Extract Works. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 6198. I. S. No. 6799-h.)

On March 12, 1915, 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 an information against the Mauss Extract Works, a corporation, Mount Vernon, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 2, 1914, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of orange extract, terpeneless, which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Mauss Extract Works. Manufacturers of Fine and Distinctive Extracts for the Bottlers' and Confectioners' Trade a Specialty. 357-359 West 12th St. New York. Orange Extract. Turpeneless. Directions: Make the syrup by dissolving 10 pounds of granulated sugar in one gallon of water Filter through a felt bag. To each gallon of syrup add: Extract 1 oz., Citric Acid Solution 2 oz., Polygalin Foam, 24 drops. Color to suit. Use this syrup in proportion of one ounce to half pint bottle."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Specific gravity -----	0.940
Polarization at 20° C. (°V.) -----	+0.15
Citral (Hiltner) (per cent) -----	0.28
Total aldehydes (Chace) (per cent) -----	0.31
Alcohol (per cent by volume) -----	46.48
Methyl alcohol: None.	

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been mixed and packed with the said article, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength; further, in that a substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been substituted in part for terpeneless orange extract, which the said article purported to be. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statement regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, appearing on the label aforesaid, to wit, "Orange Extract, Turpeneless," was false and misleading, in that it indicated that the said article was a true terpeneless orange extract, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not a true terpeneless orange extract, but was a terpeneless orange extract with which a substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been mixed and packed, and for which [a] substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been substituted in part. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled "Orange Extract, Turpeneless," thereby indicating that it was a true terpeneless orange extract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a true terpeneless orange extract, but was a terpeneless orange extract with which a substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been mixed and packed, and for which a substance, to wit, commercial citral, had been substituted in part.

On March 17, 1915, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1915.