

13941. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. Alaska Herring & Sardine Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$150. (F. & D. No. 19603. I. S. Nos. 20219-v, 20221-v, 20287-v, 20288-v, 20289-v, 20294-v.)

On May 12, 1925, 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 an information against the Alaska Herring & Sardine Co., a corporation, organized under the laws of Washington and having a representative within said State, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in various consignments, namely, on or about August 12, 23, and 27, 1924, respectively, from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, of quantities of canned salmon which was adulterated.

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article from each shipment showed 21 per cent, 26 per cent, and 16 per cent, respectively, of decomposed salmon.

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 June 22, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and on October 19, 1925, the court imposed a fine of \$150.

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

13942. Adulteration and misbranding of rice bran. U. S. v. 300 Sacks of Rice Bran. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 17221. I. S. No. 8309-v. S. No. W-1306.)

On February 2, 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 300 sacks of rice bran, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by Cathie & Fitch, from San Francisco, Calif., August 20, 1922, and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Ground Limestone And Rice Bran For Poultry Feed Only. * * * Crude Protein, Not Less Than 10.00% Crude Fat, Not Less Than 13.00% Fibre, Not More Than 12.62% Ash, (Incl. lime, CaCo₃), Not More Than 30.50%."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance containing an excessive amount of mineral matter and deficient in fat and protein had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Protein, Not Less Than 10.00% Crude Fat, Not Less Than 13.00% Fibre, Not More Than 12.62% Ash, (Incl. Lime, CaCo₃), Not More Than 30.50%," borne on the labels, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On September 3, 1925, W. F. Jahn & Co., Seattle, Wash., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and paid the costs of the proceedings and having executed a bond in the sum of \$750, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the bond be continued to insure that the product be disposed of in accordance with law and the directions of this department.

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

13943. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of jam. U. S. v. 5 Cases Raspberry Jam, et al. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20432. I. S. Nos. 14581-v, 14582-v, 14583-v. S. No. W-1779.)

On October 6, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Idaho, 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 5 cases of raspberry jam, 25 cases of strawberry jam, and 7 cases of dewberry jam, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Pocatello, Idaho, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Hewlett Bros. Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, on or about April 9, 1925, and transported from the State of Utah into the State of Idaho, and charging misbranding with respect to all of the product and adulteration with respect to a portion thereof, in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Case) "Hewlett's Su-