

into the State of Washington, of a quantity of canned salmon which was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Blanchard Brand Alaska Pink Salmon Packed By Beauclaire Packing Co. Port Beauclerc, Alaska."

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of 576 cans taken from the consignment showed that 63 cans, or 10.9 per cent, were decomposed.

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

On April 6, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant companies, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

13308. Misbranding of canned corn. U. S. v. 200 Cases of Corn. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 19916. I. S. No. 15619-v. S. No. E-3949.)

On March 20, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, 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 200 cases of corn, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Buffalo, N. Y., consigned by the New Vienna Canning Co., New Vienna, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the * * * Canning Co., from New Vienna, Ohio, November 28, 1924, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of New York, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Nun-so-good Brand Evergreen Sugar Corn Contents 1 Lb. 4 Oz. Packed By New Vienna Canning Co. New Vienna, Ohio."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement "Contents 1 Lb. 4 Oz.," appearing in the labeling, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On April 21, 1925, the New Vienna Canning Co., New Vienna, Ohio, having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, for repacking, relabeling, use, and disposition pursuant to the law and under the supervision of this department.

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

13309. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. George W. Robertson (W. H. Hicks & Co.). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 18360. I. S. No. 4589-v.)

On May 27, 1924, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against George W. Robertson, trading as W. H. Hicks & Co., Bristol, Tenn., alleging shipment by said defendant, under the name of S. M. Porter Produce Co., in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about August 14, 1923, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Virginia, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated.

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of 540 eggs from the consignment showed that 68 eggs, or 12.59 per cent of those examined, were inedible, consisting of black rots, mixed rots, spot rots, and blood rings.

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

On March 9, 1925, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

13310. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 26 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be reprocessed. (F. & D. No. 19872. I. S. No. 23142-v. S. No. C-4664.)

On February 20, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the