On September 16, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the New England Fish Co., a Maine corporation, trading at Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about September 22, 1930, from Alaska into the State of Washington, of a quantity of canned salmon which was adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole and in part of a filthy and decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On October 26, 1931, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50 and costs.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18982. Adulteration of canned tomato puree. U. S. v. 1,123 Cases of Tomato Puree. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26840. I. S. No. 11893. S. No. 5031.)

Samples of canned tomato puree from the shipments herein described having been found to contain excessive mold, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of California.

On August 7, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1,123 cases of tomato puree, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Rocky Mountain Packing Corporation, from Ogden, Utah, in part on or about December 14, 1929, and in part on or about December 17, 1929, and had been transported from the State of Utah into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Case) "Tomato Puree Distributed by Rocky Mountain Packing Corp."

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

On November 4, 1931, the default of the claimant, the Coast Fishing Co., Wilmington, Calif., was entered. Judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered on the same date, and the court ordered that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18983. Misbranding of cottonseed cake and screenings. U. S. v. The Warren Cotton Oil & Manufacturing Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $10. (F. & D. No. 26632. I. S. No. 18315.)

Sample sacks of cottonseed cake and screenings from the shipment herein described having been found to contain less than 100 pounds net, the weight declared on the label, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Western District of Arkansas.

On September 19, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Warren Cotton Oil & Manufacturing Co., a corporation, Warren, Ark., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about December 2, 1930, from the State of Arkansas into the State of Kansas, of a quality of cottonseed cake and screenings that were misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Interstate Brand 43% Protein Cotton Seed Cake & Meal * * * 100 Pounds Net * * * Made for Interstate Feed Company Fort Worth, Texas."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statement, to wit, "100 Pounds Net," borne on the tag attached to the sack containing the said article, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that each of the sacks contained 100 pounds net of the article; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the said sacks contained 100 pounds net of the said article; whereas each of the sacks did not contain 100 pounds of the article, but did contain a less amount. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On October 19, 1931, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $10.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*