

ment was not corrected or relieved by the statement "Contains Egg Yolks and Whites," which appeared in much smaller type two lines below the prominently displayed words "Sugared Egg Yolks"; and in that they were offered for sale under the name of another food, "Sugared Egg Yolks."

On November 3, 1943, Frigid Food Products, Inc., claimant for the 2 lots at Springfield, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered released under bond to be reconditioned, in the case of the lot that was in part decomposed, by separating the fit portion from the unfit portion, and, in the case of the egg yolks, by properly relabeling the cartons under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration. On April 11, 1944, no claimant having appeared for the 7 cartons seized at New York, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

5686. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 487 Crates of Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond for salvaging. (F. D. C. No. 10810. Sample No. 56646-F.)

On September 22, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey filed a libel against 487 second-hand crates, each containing 30 dozen eggs, at Jersey City, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 29, 1943, by the Irving Manaster Co. from McPherson, Kans.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed substance.

On October 23, 1943, the Larry Oshin Co., New York, N. Y., claimant, having admitted allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond, conditioned that the unfit portion be separated and destroyed or denatured under the supervision of the Federal Security Agency.

FEEDS AND GRAINS*

5687. Misbranding of calf meal. U. S. v. Frank E. Moore and L. Virginia Moore (Hilltop Farm Feed Co.). Pleas of guilty. Fine of \$20 which included both defendants. (F. D. C. No. 10588. Sample No. 8741-F.)

On December 13, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed an information against Frank E. Moore and L. Virginia Moore, individuals trading as copartners under the firm name Hilltop Farm Feed Co., at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging shipment on or about March 9, 1943, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Wisconsin of a quantity of calf meal that was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Hilltop Calf Meal For raising calves economically without milk. Prevents scours and keeps them growing rapidly * * * Guaranteed analysis Protein not less than 24%. Fat—not less than 4.5%. Fiber not over 5%."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Protein not less than 24%. Fat—not less than 4.5%," were false and misleading since it contained not more than 20.94 percent of protein, and not more than 3.64 percent of fat.

The product was also alleged to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs as reported in drugs and devices notices of judgment.

On December 13, 1943, the defendants having entered pleas of guilty, the court imposed a fine of \$20 which included both defendants.

5688. Misbranding of Mutual Compound. U. S. v. Joseph C. Winslow and Stephen R. Winslow (Mutual Products Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. D. C. No. 8752. Sample No. 76895-E.)

This product consisted essentially of a mixture of wheat, corn, and oat products, dry milk, small amounts of salt, sugar, reducing sugars, yeast, iodide, calcium, iron, phosphate compounds, anise, and resinous material. It contained 19.44 percent of crude protein, 4.08 percent of crude fat and 3.38 percent of crude fiber.

On February 6, 1943, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota filed an information against Joseph C. Winslow and Stephen R. Winslow, trading as the Mutual Products Co., Minneapolis, Minn., alleging shipment on or about March 3, 1942, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Wisconsin of a quantity of food, known as Mutual Compound, which was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements appearing in its labeling which represented and suggested that, when fed to calves as di-

*See also No. 5796.