

18123. Adulteration of dressed poultry. U. S. v. 1 Barrel of Dressed Poultry. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26057. I. S. No. 20267. S. No. 4384.)

Samples of dressed poultry from the shipment herein described having been found to be decomposed and emaciated, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York.

On March 21, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of one barrel of dressed poultry, remaining in the original unbroken package at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by Sanford Ziegler from Fairfield, Iowa, on or about March 13, 1930 (November 13, 1930), and had been transported from the State of Iowa into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal substance; in that it consisted in part of portions of animals unfit for food; and in that it was the product of diseased animals.

On April 14, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18124. Adulteration of canned prunes. U. S. v. 13 Cases, et al., of Canned Prunes. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 25935, 26080. I. S. Nos. 15618, 28057, 28058. S. Nos. 4034, 4391.)

Samples of canned prunes from the shipments herein described having been found to be moldy and partially decomposed, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

On February 19 and March 23, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid libels praying seizure and condemnation of 37 cases, each containing 24 cans, and 49 cases, each containing 72 cans of prunes, remaining in the original unbroken packages in part at Reading, Pa., and in part at Shenandoah, Pa., consigned by Paulus Bros. Packing Co., in part from Salem, Oreg., and in part from Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped in two consignments on or about December 9, 1930 and January 24, 1931, respectively, and had been transported from the State of Oregon into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On March 10 and April 13, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18125. Adulteration of dressed poultry. U. S. v. 530 Pounds of Poultry. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26038. I. S. No. 20265. S. No. 4334.)

Examination of dressed poultry from the shipment herein described having shown that it consisted largely of cull poultry and that a large part was decomposed, emaciated, and diseased, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York.

On March 18, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 530 pounds of dressed poultry, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by St. Ansgar Product Co., from St. Ansgar, Iowa, in part on or about June 9 and in part on or about June 12, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Iowa into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, in that it consisted in part of a portion of an animal unfit for food, and in that it was the product of a diseased animal.