24789. Adulteration of canned spinach. U. S. v. 99 Cases, et al., of Canned Spinach. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35502. Sample nos. 31879–B to 31882–B, incl.)

This case involved canned spinach which was found to contain worms, maggots, insects, and trash.

On May 15, 1935, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 379 cases of spinach at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 16 and February 26, 1935, by the Litteral Canning Co., from Fayetteville, Ark., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled, variously: "Sanders Brand [or "Faycano" or "Licano Brand"] Spinach * * * Packed by Litteral Canning Co. Fayetteville, Ark."

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

On May 31, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

24790. Adulteration of cream. U. S. v. One 5-Gallon Can of Cream. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35517. Sample no. 13992–B.)

On May 8, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of one 5-gallon can of cream at Baltimore, Md., consigned by E. F. Baker, from Woodstock, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 6, 1935, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "E. F. Baker, Woodstock, Va."

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

On May 9, 1935, the consignee, the Chesapeake Creameries, Inc., having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

24791. Adulteration of cream. U. S. v. One 10-Gallon Can of Cream. Consent decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35518. Sample no. 13993–B.)

On May 9, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of one 10-gallon can of cream at Baltimore, Md., consigned by the Philomont Station of the Chesapeake Creameries, Inc., from Philomont, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 7, 1935, 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 filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal substance.

On May 9, 1935, the Chesapeake Creameries, Inc., having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

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

24792. Adulteration of apples. U. S. v. 20 Bushels of Apples. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35519. Sample no. 28585–B.)

Examination of the apples involved in this case showed the presence of arsenic and lead in amounts that might have rendered them injurious to health.

On April 16, 1935, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 20 bushels of apples at Youngstown, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 10, 1935, by Lerch Cold Storage, Inc., from Lockport, N. Y., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs