

per tablet; the diacetylmorphine hydrochloride and terpin hydrate tablets, labeled "Diacetylmorphine HCL. 1/50 gr." contained 1/67 grain of diacetylmorphine hydrochloride per tablet.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Tablets Atropine sulphate 1-150 gr.," "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 gr.," "Tablets Strychnine Sulphate 1-60 Grain," "Tablets Acetphenetid 2 Grains," "Tablets Diacetylmorphine Hydrochloride 1-24 Grain," "Tablets Atropine Sulphate 1-100 Grain," "Tablets Morphine Sulphate 1-8 Grain," "Tablets Nitroglycerin 1-100 Grain," "Tablets Strychnine Sulphate 1-100 Grain," "Tablets Caffeine Citrated 2 Grains," "Tablets Diacetylmorphine HCL 1/50 gr." and "Tablets Morphine Sulphate 1-4 Grain," as the case might be, borne on the labels of the respective products, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that each of said tablets contained the amount of the product declared on the label thereof, whereas the said tablets contained less than so declared. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the alleged 1/150 grain atropine sulphate tablets and a portion of the nitroglycerin tablets for the further reason that the statements "Guaranteed under the Food and Drugs Act July 30, 1906 Guaranty 7418," borne on the labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the products conformed to the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, whereas they did not.

On January 8, 1926, the defendants entered pleas of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$150.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14052. Adulteration of scallops. U. S. v. Nathaniel R. Steelman. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 19682. I. S. No. 13639-v.)

On November 2, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Nathaniel R. Steelman, trading as N. R. Steelman, at Oyster, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about March 13, 1925, from the State of Virginia into the State of New York, of a quantity of scallops which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that added water had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, scallop solids, had been in part abstracted.

On November 13, 1925, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14053. Adulteration of scallops. U. S. v. William T. Lawson. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$40. (F. & D. No. 19660. I. S. No. 17417-v.)

On September 24, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William T. Lawson, trading as W. T. Lawson, at Quinby, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about March 7, 1925, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, of a quantity of scallops which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for scallops. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, scallop solids, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On November 13, 1925, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$40.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14054. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. v. 215 Boxes of Oranges. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20071. I. S. No. 14613-v. S. No. W-1707.)

On April 30, 1925, 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 praying the seizure and con-

demnation of 215 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Glen Rosa Orchards, Riverside, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from Riverside, Calif., on or about April 17, 1925, and transported from the State of California into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Box) "Vaccaro Brand Grown & Packed By Joseph Vaccaro Riverside, California."

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

On May 7, 1925, the Earl Fruit Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14055. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20118. I. S. No. 23833-v. S. No. C-4739.)

On or about May 27, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, 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 10 cases of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Durant Creamery Co., Durant, Miss., on or about May 22, 1925, and transported from the State of Mississippi into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Jersey Queen Pure Creamery Butter * * * One Pound Net Weight * * * Durant Creamery Co. Durant, Miss."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of or offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, in that the packages were branded "Jersey Queen Pure Creamery Butter," and the product was not butter, in that it did not contain the amount of butterfat, namely, 80 per cent or more by weight, as required by the act of March 4, 1923, entitled, "An act to define butter and to provide a standard therefor."

On June 15, 1925, the Durant Creamery Co., Durant, Miss., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of the court was entered, finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation, and it was further ordered by the court that the said product be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$75, conditioned in part that it be not sold or otherwise disposed of in violation of law.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

14056. Misbranding of flour. U. S. v. 1,205 Sacks, et al. of Flour. Product ordered released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20143. I. S. Nos. 17456-v to 17463-v, incl. S. No. E-5352.)

On June 24, 1925, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 1,785 sacks of flour, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Columbia, S. C., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Austin-Heaton Co., from Durham, N. C., June 5, 1925, and transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of South Carolina, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled, variously: "Occo-nee-chee Self-Rising Flour 12 Lbs." (or "24 Lbs."); "Peerless Flour 12 Lbs." (or "24 Lbs."); "Superb 24 Lbs." (or "12 Lbs."); "Banner Self-Rising Flour 12 Lbs." (or "24 Lbs. When Packed.")

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that the statements, borne on the labels, namely, "12 Lbs." or "24 Lbs." or "When