The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained added poisonous or deleterious ingredients, arsenic and lead, in amounts that might have rendered it injurious to health.

On May 7, 1933, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

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

**25590. Misbranding of Southland's Cottonseed Cake and Meal. U. S. v. Southland Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $20 and costs.** (F. & D. no. 35958. Sample nos. 27422–B, 27424–B.)

This case was based on interstate shipments of quantities of an article described as Southland's Cottonseed Cake and Meal, which contained less protein and more crude fiber than the respective percentages thereof represented on the label.

On September 16, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Southland Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Oklahoma City, Okla., charging shipment by said corporation, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 26, and February 4, 1935, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of quantities of an article described as Southland's Cottonseed Cake and Meal which was misbranded. The article was labeled: "100 Lbs. Net Southland's Cottonseed Cake and Meal Prime Quality Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43% Crude Fat, not less than 5% Crude Fiber, not more than 12% * * * Made from Decorticated Cotton Seed By Southland Cotton Oil Company Head Office Paris Texas."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statements, "Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein, not less than 43%", and "Crude Fiber, not more than 12%", borne on the label, were false and misleading, and in that by reason of said statements the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the statements represented that the article had a protein content amounting to not less than 43 percent and a crude fiber content amounting to not more than 12 percent; whereas in fact the article had a protein content amounting to less than 43 percent and a crude fiber content amounting to more than 12 percent.

On January 15, 1936, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of $20 and costs.

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

**25591. Adulteration of tangerines. U. S. v. The Eustis Packing Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $90.** (F. & D. no. 35960. Sample no. 29334–B.)

This case was heard upon an interstate shipment of tangerines, examination of which showed the presence of decayed and dried-out fruit.

On March 13, 1936, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Eustis Packing Co., a corporation, Eustis, Fla., charging shipment by said corporation in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 17, 1935, from the State of Florida into the State of Wisconsin, of a quantity of tangerines that were adulterated. The article was labeled: "American Beauty Brand [design of a red rose]."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, namely, excessive decayed, dried-out pulp of the tangerine, and in that a nonedible substance, namely, excessive decayed, dried-out pulp of the tangerine orange, had been substituted in part for the article, and in that a valuable constituent of the article, namely, tangerine juice, had been in part abstracted by the excessive drying of the pulp.

On April 15, 1936, a plea of nolo contendere was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation and the court imposed a fine of $90.

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

**25592. Adulteration of baking powder. U. S. v. Commercial Importing Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50 and costs. Fine suspended.** (F. & D. no. 35962. Sample no. 38113–B.)

This case was based on a shipment of baking powder that contained a smaller percentage of available carbon dioxide than the minimum required for baking powder.

On September 13, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Commercial Importing Co., Inc., Seattle,