Choc."; "Banner Nougat"; "Clusters Light Cream Clusters"; "Hall's Black Walnut Kisses"; "Cream Midgets"; "Cream Scotties"; or "French Creams."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy substance. It was alleged to be adulterated further in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

Between May 4 and November 23, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1192. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 23 Boxes of Candy. Default decree of condemnation. (F. D. C. No. 2766. Sample No. 24261–E.)

This product contained rodent hairs and insect fragments.

On September 6, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 23 boxes of candy at Camden, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 23, 1940, by the F. N. Paist Co. from Philadelphia, Pa.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth. The article was labeled in part "2 for 1¢ Pals."

On September 25, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1193. Adulteration of candy. U. S. v. 17 Boxes of Candy (and 1 other seizure of candy). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 2185, 2189. Sample Nos. 10115–E to 10118–E, incl.)

Samples of this product were found to contain human hairs, rodent hairs, nondescript dirt, and insect fragments.

On June 11, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed libels against 17 boxes of candy at Jersey City, N. J., and 44 cartons of candy at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about January 29 to on or about May 23, 1940, by the Two Star Confectionery Co. from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance; and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth. The article was labeled in part variously: "Two Star Candy Spearmint Leaves"; "Big Five Candy Gum Drops"; "72 Lucky Shoe"; or "Ass'd Haggi's Long Chewing Gum."

On September 26, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1194. Adulteration and misbranding of candy. U. S. v. 42 Boxes of Candy (and 4 other seizures of candy). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 2311, 2312, 2338, 2390, 2391. Sample Nos. 1891–E, 1892–E, 1893–E, 20409–E, 20410–E, 28060–E, 28061–E.)

Samples of this product were found to contain insect fragments and rodent hairs. Portions of the product failed to comply with certain labeling requirements of the law.

Between July 6 and July 22, 1940, the United States attorneys for the Eastern District of Virginia and the Middle District of Georgia filed libels against 866 boxes and 17 cartons of candy at Portsmouth, Va.; 269 boxes at Norfolk, Va.; and 100 cartons at Albany, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce within the period from on or about June 19 to on or about July 2, 1940, by Queen City Candy Co. from Charlotte, N. C.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. Portions of the article were labeled variously: "Queen's Candies Cherry Sandwich"; "Queen's Candies King Bar"; "Suckers"; "M. L."; or "B. L." The remainder was unlabeled.

The article in all lots was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, and in that it had been prepared under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

The three lots seized at Portsmouth, Va., were alleged to be misbranded in that the article was in package form and—with the exception of a few bars which were labeled—did not bear the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, and did not bear an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents. The product seized at Porstmouth was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was fabricated from two or more ingredients and did not bear the common or usual name of each such ingredient. Two of the lots seized at