On January 3, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12153. Adulteration of walnut meats. U. S. v. 3 Barrels and 23 Cartons of Walnut Meats. Default decree ordering destruction of product. (F. & D. Nos. 17312, 17315. I. S. Nos. 7692-v, 7693-v. S. Nos. W-1328, W-1333.)

On March 24, 1923, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, acting upon reports 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 3 barrels and 23 cartons of walnut meats, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Salt Lake City, Utah, alleging that the article had been shipped by Fred L. Mitchell & Son, in part from Los Angeles and in part from Santa Ana, Calif., on or about November 24 and 27, 1922, respectively, and transported from the State of California into the State of Utah, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Fred L. Mitchell & Son Walnut Meats Santa Ana California."

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

On January 4, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12154. Adulteration of walnut meats. U. S. v. 2 Cases of Walnut Meats. Default decree ordering destruction of product. (F. & D. No. 17348. I. S. No. 11278-v. S. No. W-1346.)

On March 24, 1923, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, 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 2 cases of walnut meats, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Ogden, Utah, alleging that the article had been shipped by M. Getz & Co., Inc., from San Francisco, Calif., on or about November 18, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Utah, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Monogram California Fancy Selected * * * Light Amber Walnut Pieces Packed By M. Getz & Co., Inc. San Francisco * * * 50 Lbs. Net."

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

On January 14, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12155. Adulteration and misbranding of flour. U. S. v. 350 Sacks of Flour. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 18279. I. S. No. 1398-v. S. No. E-4727.)

On January 31, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, 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 350 sacks of flour, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Williamson Milling Co. from Clay Center, Kans., on or about October 8, 1923, and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "The Williamson Milling Co. 140 Lbs. Winner Flour. Clay Center, Kans. U. S. A."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, excessive moisture, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality, and for the further reason that water had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "140 Lbs.," borne on the sacks containing the article, was false and misleading and deceived and