

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that an artificially-colored distilled vinegar had been substituted for malt vinegar, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Malt Vinegar," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that the article was malt vinegar, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was malt vinegar, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not malt vinegar but was an artificially-colored distilled vinegar. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an artificially-colored distilled vinegar prepared in imitation of and offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, malt vinegar.

On June 3, 1924, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

12467. Misbranding of dairy feed. U. S. v. Arkadelphia Milling Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 17705. I. S. No. 9819-v.)

On December 10, 1923, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, 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 Arkadelphia Milling Co., a corporation, Arkadelphia, Ark., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about October 12, 1922, from the State of Arkansas into the State of Texas, of a quantity of dairy feed which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "100 Pounds (Net) Clover Leaf 24% Dairy Feed * * * Manufactured by Arkadelphia Milling Company Arkadelphia, Arkansas Guaranteed Analysis: Crude Protein not less than 24.00 Per Cent."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the said sample contained 20.75 per cent of crude protein.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis: Crude Protein not less than 24.00 Per Cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that the article contained not less than 24 per cent of crude protein, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 24 per cent of crude protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did contain less than 24 per cent of crude protein, to wit, 20.75 per cent of crude protein.

On March 28, 1924, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

12468. Misbranding of feed. U. S. v. Mississippi Elevator Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20 and costs. (F. & D. No. 17521. I. S. No. 10727-v.)

On July 18, 1923, the United States attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, 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 Mississippi Elevator Co., a corporation, Memphis, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about September 7, 1922, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Mississippi, of a quantity of feed which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Karomel Korn Horse & Mule Feed (Sweet) Made in Memphis, Tennessee By Mississippi Elevator Company * * * Guaranteed Analysis Protein minimum 10.00."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 8.60 per cent of protein.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Protein Minimum 10.00," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients