Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and had been substituted in part for oysters, which the said article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, oyster solids, had been in part abstracted.

On February 23, 1922, the defendants entered pleas of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed fines in the aggregate sum of $50.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10309. Adulteration of currants. U. S. * * * v. Silas A. Birdsong, Thomas H. Birdsong, and George S. Birdsong (Birdsong Bros.). Pleas of guilty. Fine, $100. (F. & D. No. 15563. I. S. No. 7845-t.)

On January 19, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Silas A. Birdsong, Thomas H. Birdsong, and George S. Birdsong, copartners, trading as the Birdsong Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, November 30, 1920, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of currants which were adulterated.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the presence of live beetles, fuzzy nests or egg cases, and much loose excreta.

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

On February 6, 1922, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $100.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10310. Adulteration and misbranding of Wood's special concentrated sweetener. U. S. * * * v. 3 Cans of * * * Wood's Special Concentrated Sweetener. Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12997. I. S. No. 3329-r. S. No. W-623.)

On or about July 3, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern 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 for the seizure and condemnation of 3 cans of Wood's special concentrated sweetener, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., June 14, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Wood's Special Concentrated Sweetener 500 * * *."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that an imitation product had been substituted for a food sweetener, which the product purported to be; and for the further reason that the said article contained an added deleterious ingredient, saccharin, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article; and for the further reason that the statement, "Special Concentrated Sweetener 500," appearing on the can containing the article, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser in that the said statement represented the article as being 500 times sweeter than sugar, when it was not.

On August 17, 1921, 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.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

10311. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. * * * v. Martin Luther Reed (M. L. Reed). Plea of guilty. Fine, $50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 14364. I. S. No. 374-t.)

On August 3, 1921, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against