

tion in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was contained in jars labeled in part: "Sunshine Brand \* \* \* First Quality Pimientos, Pomona Products Co. Griffin, Georgia."

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 11, 1931, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments were entered finding that the product should be condemned, and ordering that it be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**18292. Adulteration of dressed poultry. U. S. v. 13 Barrels of Poultry. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26003. I. S. No. 20261. S. No. 4266.)**

The product herein described having been found to consist in part of diseased dressed poultry, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey.

On March 9, 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 13 barrels of poultry, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Jersey City, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped by the North Pole Cold Storage Ice Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., in behalf of J. I. Christian, on or about December 20, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New Jersey, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance, in that it consisted in part of a portion of an animal unfit for food, and in that it was the product of a diseased animal.

On April 20, 1931, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**18293. Adulteration and misbranding of Golden egg mix. U. S. v. 3 Cases of Golden Bantam Egg Mix, et al. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 26016. I. S. Nos. 21991, 21992. S. No. 4298.)**

Samples of a product, billed as Golden Bantam egg mix, from the shipments herein described having been found to be artificially colored and to contain an added material consisting in part of reducing sugars, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Northern District of California.

On March 11, 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 15 cases of Golden Bantam egg mix, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by Kushner & Co., from New York, N. Y., in part on or about January 13, 1931, and in part on or about January 24, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

The article was labeled in part, variously: (Cases) "Baco [in diamond] San Francisco Option New York from China Importers Comm. Co. 7 Water St. New York;" "Tip Top Brand Bashaw Arey Co. Shellers Nuts and Egg Products \* \* \* Kushner & Co. \* \* \* New York Golden Egg Mix;" "Baco [in diamond] San Francisco Option New York from China Importers Comm. Co. 7 Water St. New York Golden Egg Mix;" "Cob [in triangle] No. 51, San Francisco From China Golden Egg Mix Kushner & Co. \* \* \* New York;" or "Poco Brand No. 44 San Francisco From China."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance artificially colored and consisting in part of reducing sugars had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article had been colored in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On April 3, 1931, the Pacific Orient Co., San Francisco, Calif., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having 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