

District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 12 cases of eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by J. W. Allen, Clayton, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped from Clayton, Kans., on or about September 5, 1922, and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

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

On November 20, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the bad portion be destroyed and the good portion sold by the United States marshal.

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

11205. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 15 Cases of Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 16833. I. S. No. 7543-v. S. No. W-1217.)

On September 9, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, 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 15 cases of eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by J. W. Allen, Oberlin, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped from Oberlin, Kans., on or about September 5, 1922, and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

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

On November 20, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the bad portion be destroyed and the good portion sold by the United States marshal.

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

11206. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 16834. I. S. No. 7599-v. S. No. W-1218.)

On September 9, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, 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 10 cases of eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by Carpenter & Shafer, Colby, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped from Colby, Kans., on or about September 5, 1922, and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

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

On November 20, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the bad portion be destroyed and the good portion sold by the United States marshal.

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

11207. Adulteration and misbranding of color, orange sirup, and fig jam. U. S. v. Caravan Products Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 16859. I. S. Nos. 5947-t, 6027-t, 6992-t.)

On December 13, 1922, 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 Caravan Products Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about May 13, 1921, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of color, on or about August 8, 1921, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of orange sirup, and on or about August 13, 1921, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of fig jam, all of which were adulterated and misbranded. The articles were labeled in part, respectively: "Caravan * * * Red Shade Manufactured By Caravan Products Co. New York, U. S. A.;" "Orange Ends Toil Brand

Artificial Color;" "Caravan * * * Fig Jam * * * Contains Gran. Sugar Corn Syrup 1-10 1% Benzoate of Soda."

Analysis of a sample of the color by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 62.8 per cent of sugar. Analysis of a sample of the orange sirup by said bureau showed that it consisted of an orange-yellow sirup of artificial odor and taste, containing not more than 2 per cent of orange juice, about .1 per cent of added tartaric acid, and 3 per cent of sucrose. Analysis of a sample of the fig jam by said bureau showed that it was a glucose fig and apple jam.

Adulteration of the color was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, sugar, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in large part for red shade, which the article purported to be.

Adulteration of the orange sirup was alleged for the reason that an imitation orange sirup, which contained added tartaric acid and little, if any, orange juice, had been substituted in whole and in part for orange, to wit, orange sirup, which the said article purported to be.

Adulteration of the fig jam was alleged for the reason that a glucose jam of fig and apple had been substituted in whole and in part for fig jam, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding of the color was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Red Shade," borne on the labels attached to the cans containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was red shade, to wit, an article designed and intended to be used in the coloring and composition of food, understood by the trade to be composed of coloring substances only, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was red shade, to wit, an article designed and intended to be used in the coloring and composition of food, understood by the trade to be composed of coloring substances only, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not red shade, but was a mixture composed in large part of sugar which contained a small amount of color. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a mixture composed in large part of sugar, prepared in imitation of red shade, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, red shade.

Misbranding of the orange sirup was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Orange," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was, to wit, orange sirup, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was, to wit, orange sirup, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, to wit, orange sirup, but was a mixture composed of an imitation orange sirup which contained added tartaric acid and little, if any, orange juice. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a mixture which contained added tartaric acid and little, if any, orange juice, prepared in imitation of orange, that is to say, orange sirup, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, orange, that is to say, orange sirup.

Misbranding of the fig jam was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Fig Jam" and "Contains Gran. Sugar," borne on the labels attached to the pails containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article consisted wholly of fig jam which contained granulated sugar, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of fig jam which contained granulated sugar, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did not consist wholly of fig jam which contained granulated sugar, but did consist of a glucose jam of fig and apple which contained no granulated sugar. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a glucose jam of fig and apple, prepared in imitation of fig jam, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, fig jam.

On December 18, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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