Olive Oil Extra Fine Imported Lucca Italy [design of olive branches] Prodotti Italiani. We guarantee our olive oil to be absolutely pure under any chemical analysis—insuperable for table use and excellent for medicinal purposes, Imported from Italy [and similar statements in Italian]"; (2) in that it was offered for sale under the name of another food; and (3) in that it was in package form and did not bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor.

On June 29, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a charitable institution.

3620. Misbranding of salad dressing. U. S. v. 30 Cases of Salad Dressing. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered delivered to a local charitable organization. (F. D. C. No. 6740. Sample Nos. 84526-E, 84724-E.)

Examination showed that this product was French dressing consisting essentially of peanut oil, vinegar, and spices, with little or no olive oil.

On January 20, 1942, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 30 cases, each containing 12 6-ounce bottles, of salad dressing at Newark, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 21 and December 31, 1941, by C. F. Mattlage Sales Co. from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Bottles) "You-All Brand French Salad Dressing."

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the statement in the labeling, "Made with imported pure olive oil, the finest salad oil," was false and misleading as applied to an article containing little or no olive oil; and (2) in that the statement, "Guaranteed to comply with all pure food laws," was false and misleading in that it was incorrect.

On April 23, 1942, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered delivered to a local charitable organization, after said organization had destroyed the labels.

3621. Misbranding of oleomargarine. U. S. v. 50 Cases of Oleomargarine. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 6660. Sample No. 54452-E.)

Examination showed that this product was deficient in fat.

On January 5, 1942, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 50 cases, each containing 30 1-pound cartons, of oleomargarine at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 11, 1941, by Capital City Products Co. from Columbus, Ohio; and charging that it was misbranded in that it purported to be a food for which a definition and standard of identity had been prescribed by regulations as provided by law, but it failed to conform to such definition and standard since it contained less than 80 percent of fat. The article was labeled in part: "Kingnut Brand Vegetable Oleomargarine."

On January 23, 1942, Capital City Products Co. having appeared as claimant, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration. It was converted into oil.

SACCHARINE PRODUCTS

CANDY

3622. Action to enjoin and restrain distribution in interstate commerce of adulterated candies. U. S. v. G. T. Edwards (G. T. Edwards & Co.). Consent decree granting permanent injunction. (Inj. No. 7.)

On January 14, 1941, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia filed a complaint against G. T. Edwards, trading as G. T. Edwards & Co. at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that from on or about September 12, 1942, to the date of filing the complaint, the defendant had been manufacturing, packing, and shipping candy under insanitary conditions whereby it might have become contaminated with filth; that the food so prepared and packed consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, putrid, and decomposed substance that was unfit for food and was adulterated in violation of the law; and that the candy so prepared and packed was being offered for interstate shipment. The complaint alleged further that the defendant had failed to remedy the defects existing in his plant and was continually manufacturing and packing adulterated candy; that he would continue to ship such adulterated candy in interstate commerce unless enjoined from doing