8309. Adulteration of fish. U. S. * * * v. Thomas Tibbs. Collateral of $10 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 561–c.)

On May 22, 1920, 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 Thomas Tibbs, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 21, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of fish 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 substance.

On May 22, 1920, the defendant having failed to appear, the $10 collateral that had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

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

8310. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Vernon M. Lynch. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. No. 562–c.)

On May 24, 1920, 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 Vernon M. Lynch, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 18, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, a dead mouse, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality.

On May 24, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered by the defendant, and the court imposed a fine of $50.

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

8311. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Elijah T. Mills. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 563–c.)

On June 1, 1920, 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 Elijah T. Mills, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 9, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality.

On June 1, 1920, 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.*

8312. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Otis C. Pope. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 564–c.)

On June 2, 1920, 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 Otis C. Pope, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 22, 1920, the said defendant did offer for

sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly or in part abstracted therefrom.

On June 2, 1920, 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.*

8313. Adulteration of bacon and ham. U. S. * * * v. Frank Kidwell. Collateral of $50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 565–c.)

On June 15, 1920, 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 Frank Kidwell, Washington, D. C., alleging that on June 5, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, quantities of bacon and ham which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that they consisted in whole or in part of filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substances.

On June 15, 1920, 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.*

8314. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Edward Markham. Collateral of $50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 566–c.)

On June 22, 1920, 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 Edward Markham, Washington, D. C., alleging that on June 3, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained an added deleterious substance, to wit, colon bacilli, which rendered it injurious to health.

On June 22, 1920, 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.*

8315. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Louis A. Snouffer. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 567–c.)

On June 28, 1920, 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 Louis A. Snouffer, Washington, D. C., alleging that on June 16, 1920, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality.