Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole and in part of a filthy and decomposed vegetable substance.

On May 6, 1924, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $75 and costs.

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

12353. Adulteration and misbranding of apple jelly. U. S. v. 23 Cases and 5 Cases of Apple Jelly. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 18382. I. S. Nos. 15362-v, 15363-v. S. No. E-4733.)

On February 15, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, 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 23 cases, each containing 3 dozen jars, and 5 cases, each containing six 5-pound crocks of apple jelly, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Providence, R. I., alleging that the article had been shipped by F. P. Adams Co. (Inc.), from Boston, Mass., in two consignments, namely, on or about November 16 and 22, 1923, respectively, and transported from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Rhode Island, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Pure Apple Jelly."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that substances, glucose, pectin, and citric acid, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality or strength and had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement appearing on the labels, "Pure Apple Jelly," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On May 23, 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.

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

12354. Adulteration and misbranding of strawberry jam and raspberry jam. U. S. v. 40 Jars of Strawberry and 20 Jars of Raspberry Jam. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 18393. I. S. Nos. 15365-v, 15366-v. S. No. E-4737.)

On February 19, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, 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 40 jars of strawberry jam and 20 jars of raspberry jam remaining in the original unbroken packages at Woonsocket, R. I., alleging that the article had been shipped by the F. P. Adams Co. (Inc.), from Boston, Mass., on or about November 10, 1923, and transported from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Rhode Island, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "One Pound Net Pure Strawberry" (or "Raspberry") "Jam Prepared From Selected Fruit and Refined Sugar Manufactured By F. P. Adams Co. Inc. Boston, U. S. A."

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

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the jars containing the article, "Pure Strawberry" or "Raspberry," as the case might be, and "Jam Prepared from Selected Fruit and Refined Sugar," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On May 23, 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.

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