

Adulteration of the product was charged under the allegation that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy vegetable substance.

On February 29, 1936, no claimant having appeared, a default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered.

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

25741. Adulteration and misbranding of blackberry wine. U. S. v. 28 Bottles of Alleged Blackberry Wine. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture, providing for the delivery of the product to the Secretary of the Treasury for disposal in accordance with law. (F. & D. no. 36864. Sample nos. 51401-B, 51402-B.)

This product was an artificially colored mixture of alcohol and water containing tartaric acid.

On December 26, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Supreme Court of that District a libel praying seizure and condemnation of a quantity of wine in the District of Columbia, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about November 29 and December 6, 1935, by Madera Bonded Wine & Liquor Co., Baltimore, Md., therefrom to the District of Columbia and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article consisted of two lots of alleged wine, the bottles thereof being labeled in part: "Gold Stripe American Blackberry Wine"; "Maid of Honor American Blackberry Wine."

Adulteration of the product was charged (a) under the allegation that an artificially colored mixture of alcohol and water containing tartaric acid had been substituted for "American Blackberry Wine"; (b) under the allegation that the product was mixed in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding of the product was charged (a) under the allegations that the label on the bottles bore the statements, to wit, "Blackberry Wine * * * 12% to 14% Alcohol by Volume * * *" and "Bottled in Bonded U. S. Wine Store Room Md. 4"; that the said statements were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, when applied to an artificially colored mixture of alcohol (about 10 percent) and water, containing tartaric acid; and (b) under the allegation that the product was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On April 8, 1936, no claimant having appeared, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered providing for delivery of the product to the Secretary of the Treasury for disposal in accordance with law.

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

25742. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 770 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture, providing for delivery of the product to the claimant for reconditioning under bond. (F. & D. no. 36865. Sample no. 64939-B.)

Decomposed salmon was present in this product.

On December 23, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of a quantity of canned salmon at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by the Halibut Bay Packing Co., on or about August 24, 1935, from Halibut Bay, Alaska, to Seattle, Wash., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the product was charged under the allegation that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On January 21, 1936, the product having been claimed by the Halibut Bay Packing Co., a consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, providing for delivery of the product to the claimant for reconditioning upon giving of bond in the sum of \$1,000.

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

25743. Misbranding of Roquefort Spread. U. S. v. 80 Cartons of Roquefort Spread. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 36866. Sample nos. 50299-B, 50610-B.)

The label on the packages of this article bore an erroneous statement regarding the weight of the contents.

On December 23, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of a quantity of Roquefort