the purchaser when applied to pectin jellies colored with fruit juice and containing added tartaric acid, and manufactured by a firm other than the H. D. Lee Mercantile Co. Misbranding of the preserves was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Apple," "Strawberry," "Raspberry," "Blackberry," "Cherry," "Peach," and "Pineapple," as the case might be, and "Pectin," borne on the labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On March 26, 1925, the Goodwin Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree for the condemnation and forfeiture of the property, judgment of the court was entered, finding the products misbranded, and it was ordered by the court that the said products be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that they not be sold until salvaged and relabeled under the supervision of this department.

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

14134. Misbranding of meat meal. U. S. v. 1,000 Bags of Meat Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20724. I. S. No. 1069-x. S. No. W-1836.)

On December 18, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, 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 1,000 bags of meat meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Berg Co., Inc., from Philadelphia, Pa., October 31, 1925, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs. Berg's 75% Protein Poultry Meat & Bone Scrap Guaranteed Analysis Min. Protein 75% * * * Manufactured By The Berg Company Incorporated. Philadelphia, Pa."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements borne on the label "Min. Protein 75%" and "100 Lbs." were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On December 29, 1925, the Hart-Hill Grain Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 $4,800, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be brought into compliance with the law under the supervision of this department.

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

14135. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 12 Cubes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20197. I. S. No. 20132-v. S. No. W-1735.)

On June 19, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, 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 12 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. E. Turner, from Seattle, Wash., June 13, 1925, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in milk fat had been substituted in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent, namely, milk fat, had been in part abstracted.

On June 30, 1925, Fred L. Hilmer Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property 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