formity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be sorted under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed and the good portion released to the said claimant.

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

**11220. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. Hyman Siegel. Collateral of $25 forfeited.** (F. & D. No. 670–c.)

On August 17, 1921, 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 Hyman Siegel, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 1, 1921, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of candy which was adulterated.

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

On August 17, 1921, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which has been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

**11221. Adulteration of alcohol. U. S. v. Simon Gerber. Collateral of $25 forfeited.** (F. & D. No. 671–c.)

On August 25, 1921, 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 Simon Gerber, Washington, D. C., alleging that on July 14, 1921, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of alcohol which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that it differed from the standard of strength and quality as determined by the test laid down in the United States Pharmacopœia or the National Formulary, official at the time of such sale.

On August 25, 1921, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had beeen deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

**11222. Misbranding of milk. U. S. v. Raymond A. Wise. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $200.** (F. & D. No. 672–c.)

On September 10, 1921, 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 Raymond A. Wise, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 9, 1921, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Special Raw Milk."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, that is to say, raw milk. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that it was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof into the belief that the said article was raw milk, when, in truth and in fact, it was not raw milk, but was milk which had been treated with heat.

On September 10, 1921, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $200.

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

**11223. Misbranding of milk. U. S. v. Arthur Lee Thompson. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $200.** (F. & D. No. 673–c.)

On September 10, 1921, 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 Arthur Lee Thompson, Washington, D. C., alleging that on August 16, 1921, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell in the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Special Raw Milk."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, that is to say, raw milk. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason