11241. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Constantnos Lynard and Louis Dounis. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 693–c.)

On May 23, 1922, 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 Constantnos Lynard and Louis Dounis, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 8, 1922, the said defendants 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 adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part removed, thus reducing the quality of the said article.

On May 23, 1922, the defendants having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by them to insure their appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

11242. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. John D. Macos. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 694–c.)

On May 23, 1922, 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 John D. Macos, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 9, 1922, 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 adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part removed, thus reducing the quality of the said article.

On May 23, 1922, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

11243. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Robert R. Gidney. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 695–c.)

On May 23, 1922, 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 Robert R. Gidney, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 10, 1922, 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 adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part removed, thus reducing the quality of the said article.

On May 23, 1922, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

11244. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. James G. Graves. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 696–c.)

On May 23, 1922, 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 James G. Graves, Washington, D. C., alleging that on May 10, 1922, 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 adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain valuable constituent thereof, to wit, butterfat, had been in whole or in part removed, thus reducing the quality of the said article.

On May 23, 1922, the defendant having failed to enter an appearance, the $25 collateral which had been deposited by him to insure his appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

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

11245. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Gus Thomas. Collateral of $25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 697–c.)

On May 23, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the Police