On October 24, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

R. G. Tugwell, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20206. Adulteration of canned salmon. U.S. v. Robert John Peratovich (Bayview Packing Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 27546. I.S. nos. 22352, 22354, 22355.)

This action was based on shipments of canned salmon, samples of which

were found to be tainted or stale.

On July 11, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Alaska, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against Robert John Peratovich, trading as Bayview Packing Co., at Klawock, Territory of Alaska, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, in part on or about August 16, 1931, and in part on or about August 24, 1931, from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, of quantities of canned salmon that 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 4, 1932, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20207. Adulteration and misbranding of shipstuff with screenings. U.S. v. Shenandoah Milling Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. no. 25734. I.S. no. 3978.)

This action was based on the interstate shipment of a quantity of feed described as shipstuff with screenings, which contained less protein and fat than labeled. The net weight of the article was not properly declared on the label.

On June 1, 1931, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Shenandoah Milling Co., Inc., a corporation, Shenandoah, Va., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about September 26, 1930, from the State of Virginia into the State of North Carolina, of a quantity of the said shipstuff with screenings that was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "100 Lbs. Net Weight When Packed Shipstuff With Screenings Not Exceeding Mill Run Crude Protein 16.00 per ct. Crude Fat 4.00 per ct. * * * Manufactured by Shenandoah Milling Company, Inc., Shenandoah, Virginia."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a feeding substance, shipstuff and screenings containing less than 16 percent of crude protein and less than 4 percent of crude fat, had been substituted for

the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Crude Protein 16.00 per ct." and "Crude Fat 4.00 per ct.", borne on the tag, were false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser; since it contained less than 16 percent of crude protein and less than 4 percent of crude fat. 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, since the statement "100 Lbs. Net Weight When Packed", appearing on the tag, was not a statement of the quantity of the contents of each of the respective sacks, but was a statement having reference to a former time, namely, when the article was packed.

On October 31, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

R. G. TUGWELL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

20208. Misbranding of middlings and screenings. U.S. v. Gwinn Milling Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$170. (F. & D. no. 26653. I.S. nos. 18353, 18354, 18355, 18361.)

This action was based on the shipment of quantities of a product represented to be wheat middlings with screenings containing 16 percent of protein. Samples taken from each shipment were found to contain an undeclared corn product, and to have a protein content of less than 16 percent.