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 be reprocessed, under the supervision of this department, so as to contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15853. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of vinegar. U. S. v. 66 Barrels of Vinegar. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22393. I. S. No. 23716-x. S. No. 471.)

On January 27, 1928, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 66 barrels of vinegar, remaining unsold in the original packages at Burlington, Iowa, alleging that the article had been shipped by the National Vinegar Co., from St. Louis Mo., on or about December 31, 1927, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Iowa, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Cider Vinegar, St. Louis, Mo."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was largely vinegar made from dried apple products.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Cider Vinegar," borne on the labels, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and in that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On April 17, 1928, the National Vinegar Co., St. Louis, Mo., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant, to be relabeled under the supervision of this department, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of $1,000, conditioned in part that it should not be disposed of contrary to law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15854. Misbranding of scratch feed. U. S. v. Federal Milling & Refrigerating Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $20 and costs. (F. & D. No. 19302. I. S. No. 15195-v.)

On December 26, 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 an information against the Federal Milling and Refrigerating Co., a corporation, Hagerstown, Md., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about April 7, 1924, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of a quantity of scratch feed which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Eureka Scratch Feed 100 Lbs. * * * Federal Milling and Ref'g. Co. Hagerstown, Md."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statement, to wit, "100 Lbs.," borne on the sacks containing the said article, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that the sacks each contained 100 pounds of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the said sacks each contained 100 pounds of the article, whereas they did not, but did contain a less amount. 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, since the stated quantity represented more than the actual contents of the package.

On June 4, 1927, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $20 and costs.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15855. Misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 45 Cases of Cloverbloom Creamery Butter. Product released under bond to be reworked. (F. & D. No. 21127. I. S. No. 7436-x. S. No. E-5718.)

On May 5, 1926, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and