

21, 1926, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

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

On September 20, 1926, the Puget Sound Salmon Packing Co., Seattle, Wash., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libels and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were 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 good and sufficient bonds, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14659. Adulteration and misbranding of noodles. U. S. v. 56 Boxes of Noodles. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 20796. I. S. Nos. 11180-x, 11181-x, 11182-x. S. No. C-4939.)

On January 26, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 56 boxes of noodles, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Chicago Macaroni Co., from Chicago, Ill., December 24, 1925, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Selected Durum Wheat Net Weight 20 Pounds Big 3 \* \* \* Manufactured By Chicago Macaroni Co. Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.," and was invoiced as yellow noodles.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance containing little or no egg had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower or injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the product was colored in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the failure to declare the presence of artificial color was deceptive and misleading and would deceive and mislead the purchaser; for the further reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package, and for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On April 7, 1926, 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.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14660. Adulteration and misbranding of maple sirup. U. S. v. 19 Tins of Maple Sirup. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 20960. I. S. No. 11186-x. S. No. C-5055.)

On March 23, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 19 tins of maple sirup, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Detroit, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Atlas Fruit Flavoring Co., from Chicago, Ill., February 16, 1926, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Tin) "Maple Syrup Purity & Strength Guaranteed By Atlas Fruit Flavoring Co. Chicago, Ill."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, glucose, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, for the further reason that it was labeled "Maple Syrup," which deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that it was food in package form