

3,146 cases of canned salmon at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 29 and August 14, 1936, by the Alaska Year Round Canneries Co., from Seldovia, Alaska, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On September 11 and December 4, 1936, the Alaska Year Round Canneries Co., having appeared as claimant and having consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it not be disposed of in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26643. Adulteration of apples. U. S. v. 381 Boxes, et al., of Fresh Apples. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond.** (F. & D. no. 38701. Sample nos. 24571-C, 24573-C.)

This case involved fresh apples that were contaminated with arsenic and lead.

On November 5, 1936, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 430 boxes of fresh apples at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 26, 1936, by Duckwall Bros., Inc., from Hood River, Oreg., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it contained added poisonous or deleterious substances, arsenic and lead.

On November 10, 1936, J. F. Hunt & Co. having appeared as claimant and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it should not be disposed of in violation of the law.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26644. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. v. 10 Barrels of Oysters. Consent decree ordering the article to be released under bond to be repacked.** (F. & D. no. 38719. Sample no. 28427-C.)

This case involved oysters that contained added water.

On November 27, 1936, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 10 barrels containing 1,452 pints of oysters at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 21, 1936, by O. E. Wentworth from Baltimore, Md., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that water had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower its quality or strength; and in that water had been substituted wholly or in part for the article.

On December 8, 1936, O. E. Wentworth & Co., Baltimore, Md., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment was entered ordering that the product be released under bond to be repacked in order to remove the excess water.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26645. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. v. 133, 710, and 250 Pint Cans of Oysters. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction.** (F. & D. nos. 38720, 38822. Sample nos. 28430-C, 28622-C.)

These cases involved oysters that contained added water.

On November 27 and December 15, 1936, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 1,093 pints of oysters at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in part on or about November 23, 1936, in the name of W. L. Tull, and in part on or about December 9, 1936, in the name of W. L. Tull & Bro., from Crisfield, Md., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that water had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce or lower its quality or strength and in that water had been substituted in whole or in part for the article.