Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of decomposed eggs.

On August 11, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13035. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 1 Case of Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 19027. I. S. No. 18411-v. S. No. C-4467.)

On or about July 31, 1924, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 1 case of eggs, at Mobile, Ala., alleging that the article had been shipped by Ellis & Chapman, from Waynesboro, Miss., July 29, 1924, and transported from the State of Mississippi into the State of Alabama, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "From Ellis & Chapman Waynesboro, Miss."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of decomposed eggs.

On August 11, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13036. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 68 Cases of Brooks Tomato Catsup. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18445. I. S. No. 9223-v. S. No. C-4311.)

On March 4, 1924, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 68 cases of tomato catsup, at Cleveland, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Brooks Tomato Products Co., from Shirley, Ind., on or about October 31, 1923, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Brooks Tomato Catsup * * * M'f'g. By Brooks Tomato Products Co., Collinsville, Ill."

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

On June 4, 1924, the Brooks Tomato Products Co., Collinsville, Ind., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $300, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

13037. Adulteration and misbranding of ground mixed feed barley. U. S. v. 140 Bags of Ground Mixed Feed Barley. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18288. I. S. No. 9193-v. S. No. C-4269.)

On February 2, 1924, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 140 bags of ground mixed feed barley, at Lexington, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Cokato Milling Co., Minneapolis, Minn., on or about November 9, 1923, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Ajax Ground Mixed Feed Barley * * * Protein 11% * * * Manufactured By Cokato Milling Co., Minneapolis, Minn."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was deficient in protein and contained oats and screenings, which had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the label bore the statement, "Ground Mixed Barley Protein 11%," which was false and misleading and