8265. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Daniel W. Robinson. Collateral of $15 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 500-c.)

On August 16, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Daniel W. Robinson, Washington, D. C., alleging the shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on July 19, 1919, from 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 it contained an added substance, to wit, water, which lowered its quality and strength.

On August 16, 1919, the defendant having failed to appear, the $15 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8266. Misbranding of bread. U. S. * * * v. Corby Baking Co. Plea of guilty to counts 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15. Remaining counts nolle prossed. Fine, $2,800. (F. & D. No. 516-c.)

On May 24, 1920, the Grand Jurors of the United States of America in and for the District of Columbia returned an indictment in 16 counts against the Corby Baking Co., a corporation, Washington, D. C., charging that on April 15, April 16, April 19, and April 20, 1920, said defendant corporation, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, unlawfully did manufacture within the District of Columbia and did sell and offer for sale within the District aforesaid, a certain article of food, to wit, bread, each and every loaf thereof being contained in a sealed wrapper bearing the statements, designs, and devices among other things of the tenor following, that is to say, "Corby's Large Loaf 100% Pure Net Weight 1½ lbs.," which was misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was charged in substance in the indictment for the reason that the following statement, to wit, "Net Weight, 1½ lbs.," borne on each of the wrappers containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the wrappers contained 1½ pounds of bread, and for the further reason that it was labeled and branded as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof into the belief that each and every wrapper thereof contained 1½ pounds of bread, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said wrappers did not contain 1½ pounds of bread, but did contain a less amount.

On June 4, 1920, a plea of guilty to counts 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 of the indictment was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of $2,800. The remaining counts of the indictment charging misbranding in violation of the Net Weight Amendment to the Food and Drugs Act were nolle prossed.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8267. Adulteration of eggs. U. S. * * * v. Morris & Co., a Corporation. Collateral of $200 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 519-c.)

On September 19, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Morris & Co., a corporation doing business in the District of Columbia, alleging that on August 21, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District

aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of eggs which were adulterated.

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

On September 19, 1919, the defendant corporation having failed to make an appearance, the $200 collateral that had been deposited by it to insure its appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8268. Adulteration of eggs. U. S. * * * v. Meyer Shuman. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 520-c.)

On September 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Meyer Shuman, Washington, D. C., alleging that on September 4, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of eggs which were adulterated.

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

On September 30, 1919, the defendant having failed to appear, the $25 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8269. Adulteration of minced ham. U. S. * * * v. Harry H. Harris. Collateral of $50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 521-c.)

On October 1, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Harry H. Harris, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 29, 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of minced ham which was adulterated.

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

On October 1, 1919, the defendant having failed to appear, the $50 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8270. Adulteration of ham. U. S. * * * v. Dommico Torre. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 522-c.)

On October 2, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Dommico Terre, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 16. 1919, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of ham which was adulterated.

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