

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statement, "Standard Cottonseed Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein 36%, Ammonia 7%," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On May 29, 1924, 35 sacks of the product having been seized and no claimant having appeared therefor, judgments of the court were entered, finding the product to be adulterated and misbranded and ordering that it be sold by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12637. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 250 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Product released under bond to be used for fertilizer. (F. & D. No. 17215. I. S. No. 3403-v. S. No. E-4300.)**

On January 31, 1923, the United States attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 250 sacks of cottonseed meal at Hendersonville, N. C., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Southern Cotton Oil Co., Waynesboro, Ga., December 27, 1922, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of North Carolina, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs. Good Cotton Seed Meal \* \* \* Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 36%."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product deficient in protein had been mixed and packed therewith and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the labels bore the statement, "Good Cotton Seed Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 36%," which was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On August 1, 1923, the Southern Cotton Oil Co., claimant, having paid the costs of the proceedings and executed a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment of the court was entered, ordering that the product be released to the said claimant to be used for fertilizer purposes.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12638. Adulteration and alleged misbranding of canned salmon. U. S. v. 239 Cases of Canned Salmon. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product disposed of for fish food. (F. & D. No. 14388. I. S. No. 10541-t. S. No. W-856.)**

On January 31, 1921, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 239 cases of canned salmon, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Central Alaska Fisheries, Inc., from Drier Bay, Alaska, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, reaching Seattle on or about August 30, 1920, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Pal Brand Superior Firm Flake Red Alaska Salmon \* \* \* packed \* \* \* By Central Alaska Fisheries, Inc., At Drier Bay, Prince William Sound, Alaska Home Office, Berkeley, California."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the label, "Superior Firm Flake Red Alaska Salmon \* \* \* Packed for the Best Trade," were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On June 16, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered, finding the product to be adulterated, and ordering its condemnation and forfeiture, and it was further ordered by the court that the said product be sold to the Washington State Fisheries Department to be used as fish food.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*