

McGovern & McGovern, from Seattle, Wash., on or about October 10, 1923, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of Tennessee, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Higrade Brand \* \* \* Pink Alaska Salmon Packed In Alaska By Sea Coast Packing Co. Seattle, Wash."

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

On June 3, 1924, 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.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12412. Adulteration and misbranding of canned tuna fish. U. S. v. 99 Cases of Tuna Fish. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12552. I. S. No. 15220-r. S. No. E-2068.)**

On April 13, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 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 99 cases of tuna fish remaining in the original unbroken packages at Bethlehem, Pa., consigned by the Curtis Corporation, Long Beach, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from Long Beach, Calif., on or about January 20, 1920, and transported from the State of California into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Curtis Brand \* \* \* California Tuna White Meat \* \* \* Packed By The Curtis Corporation. Long Beach, Cal."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that blue fin, yellow fin, striped tuna, and bonita had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for California tuna white meat, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the packages inclosing the article bore labels containing the following statement, "Curtis Brand \* \* \* California Tuna White Meat," which was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the said packages contained California tuna white meat, when, in fact, they did not.

On April 25, 1924, 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.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12413. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 4,794 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 17182. I. S. No. 8317-v. S. No. W-1284.)**

On January 19, 1923, 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 4,794 cases of canned salmon remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the North Pacific Trading & Packing Co. from Klawack, Alaska, September 22, 1922, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Klawack Brand \* \* \* Salmon \* \* \* Packed at Klawack Alaska, U. S. A. By The North Pacific Trading and Packing Company. San Francisco Calif."

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

On March 4, 1924, the North Pacific Trading & Packing Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and 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 \$5,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product be sorted under the supervision of this department, that the bad portion be destroyed, and the good portion released to the claimant.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*