15370. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 384 Cases of Eggs. Consent d cree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released und bond. (F. & D. No. 20363. I. S. No. 1403-x. S. No. C-4793.)

On July 29, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in tl District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure ai condemnation of 384 cases of eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packag at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by B. W. Hayde from Wray, Colo., July 24, 1925, and transported from the State of Colora into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the fo and drugs act.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adulterated, that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substan

On August 10, 1925, B. W. Hayden, Wray, Colo., claimant, having admitt the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decr judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by t court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon payment of t costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $1,0 conditioned in part that the eggs be candled under the supervision of tl department, the good portion released, and the remainder destroyed.

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

15371. Adulteration of tomato puree. U. S. v. 96 Cases of Tomato Pur Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F D. No. 21949. I. S. No. 4693-x. S. No. C-5476.)

On June 7, 1927, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Il nois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Distr Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and c demnation of 96 cases of tomato puree, remaining in the original unbrok packages at East St. Louis, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped the Frankton Ideal Canning Co., from Frankton, Ind., on or about April 1927, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Illinois, a charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that it c sisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid vegetable substan

On August 9, 1927, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgm of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the co that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

15372. Adulteration and misbranding of grape jelly. U. S. v. 40 Do Jars of Grape Jelly. Default decree of condemnation and f feiture. Product delivered to charitable institution. (F. & D. 21963. I. S. No. 16399-x. S. No. E-6141.)

On June 27, 1927, the United States attorney for the Southern District New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seiz and condemnation of 40 dozen jars of grape jelly, remaining in the origi unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had b shipped by Richard Brinkman from West New York, N. J., on or about A 21, 1927, and transported from the State of New Jersey into the State of N York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Mrs. Brinkma Pure Home Made Grape Jelly, * * 7 Oz. Net, Jersey City."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was adultera in that a substance, pectin jelly, had been substituted wholly or in part the said article, and in that a substance, pectin, had been mixed and pac therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality and stren

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Pure H Made Grape Jelly, 7 Oz. Net" was false and misleading and deceived misled the purchaser, for the further reason that the article was offered sale under the distinctive name of another article, and for the further rea that it was food in package form and the quality (quantity) was not pla and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On September 19, 1927, no claimant having appeared for the property, j ment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by court that the product be delivered to a charitable institution for consump and not for sale.

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