

filed in the District Court of the United States libels praying seizure and condemnation of 849 cases of canned salmon, in various lots at Columbus, Chillicothe, Portsmouth, and Washington Court House, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce into the State of Ohio, on or about September 29 and September 30, 1932, by the Oceanic Sales Co., from Seattle, Wash., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. A portion of the article was unlabeled. The remainder was labeled in part: "Edola Brand Pink Salmon Oceanic Sales Co. Seattle."

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that it consisted partly of a decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On February 8, 1933, the Superior Packing Co., Seattle, Wash., having entered an appearance and claim, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to the claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds totaling \$1,500, conditioned that it should not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs act and all other laws.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20703. Adulteration of figs. U. S. v. 46 Cases of Figs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 29548. Sample no. 12954-A.)

This case involved a quantity of figs that were found to be insect-infested.

On November 29, 1932, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 46 cases of figs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 22, 1932, by Farnsworth & Ruggles, from San Francisco, Calif., to Seattle, Wash., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Calimyrna Figs * * * Packed by Giebeler's Fig Gardens, Merced, Calif."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy vegetable substance.

On January 10, 1933, 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.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20704. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 92 Cubes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 29627. Sample no. 25099-A.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard for butter prescribed by Congress.

On November 22, 1932, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 92 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 4, 1932, by Nelson-Ricks Creamery Co., from Salt Lake City, Utah, to San Francisco, Calif., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Butter."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product containing less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Butter", borne on the label, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since the article contained less than 80 percent of milk fat.

On November 29, 1932, the Nelson Ricks Creamery Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, conditioned that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the Federal Food and Drugs Act and all other laws.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*