

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, screenings, had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation "Ingredients Oats," appearing on the labels was false and misleading, and the words "Other Grains" did not correct the misleading impression conveyed. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, "Bleached Crescents Ingredients Oats, Barley, and Other Grains," whereas, in truth and in fact, the article contained screenings bleached with sulphur dioxide.

On June 6, 1924, S. Zorn & Co., Louisville, Ky., having appeared as claimant for the property, 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 \$300, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the article be relabeled "Bleached Crescent Grain Screenings."

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12379. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 182 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 13063. S. No. W-631.)

On July 1, 1920, 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 182 cases of canned salmon remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped from Brooklyn, N. Y., December 29, 1919, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Hall's * * * Par-Valu Brand * * * Red Alaska Salmon."

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

On April 7, 1924, the Alitak Packing Co., Seattle, Wash., 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 \$365, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be sorted under the supervision of this department, the good portion delivered to the claimant, and the bad portion destroyed.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12380. Misbranding of meat meal. U. S. v. Howard R. Norton (Norton & Co.). Collateral of \$50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 18472. I. S. Nos. 732-v, 10591-v.)

At the April, 1924, term of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, holding a police court, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court aforesaid an information against Howard R. Norton, trading as Norton & Co., Washington, D. C., alleging that on or about July 26, 1923, the said defendant did offer for sale and sell within the District of Columbia in violation of the food and drugs act a quantity of meat meal, and that on or about November 21, 1923, the said defendant did ship from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland in violation of said act a quantity of meat meal, all of which was misbranded. A portion of the article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs Good Luck Meat Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein 55%." The remainder of the said article was labeled in part: "100 Lbs High Grade Meat Meal Guaranteed Analysis Protein 55% * * * Manufactured by Norton & Co. Washington, D. C."

Analyses of a sample from each of the lots by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the said samples contained 52 per cent and 48.08 per cent, respectively, of crude protein.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information, for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein 55%," borne on the sacks containing the article, regarding the said article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that the said statement