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

On March 18, 1936, O. L. Grimes having appeared as claimant for the article and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it not be disposed of in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

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

26018. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 302 Cartons of Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 37350. Sample nos. 64974–B, 65136–B.)

This case involved shipments of canned salmon that was in part decomposed.

On March 9, 1936, 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 302 cartons, each containing 48 unlabeled cans of salmon at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 28 and August 10, 1935, by the Premier Salmon Co., from Stevens Creek, Alaska, 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 decomposed animal substance.

On March 16, 1936, the Premier Salmon Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it should not be disposed of in violation of the law.

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

26019. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 1,956 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 37353. Sample nos. 64969–B, 65135–B.)

This case involved shipment of canned salmon that was in part decomposed.

On March 12, 1936, 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 1,956 cases of unlabeled cans of pink salmon at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 6, 1935, by the Herbert L. Dominici Cannery, from Uyak, Alaska, 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 decomposed animal substance.

On March 18, 1936, H. T. Dominici having appeared as claimant for the article and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it not be disposed of in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

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

26020. Adulteration and misbranding of peach preserves. U. S. v. 30 Cases of Peach Preserves. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37356. Sample no. 48083–B.)

This case involved shipment of peach preserves that were deficient in fruit and that contained an excess of sugar and added acid.

On March 12, 1936, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 30 cases of peach preserves at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 18, 1936, by Holsum Products from Cleveland, Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Silver Buckle Brand * * * Pure Peach Preserves, Distributed by E. R. Codfrey & Sons Co., Milwaukee, Wis."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that a mixture of sugar and acid had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower its quality; in that a mixture of fruit, sugar, and acid, containing less fruit and more sugar than a preserve should contain had been substituted for preserve; and in that a mixture of sugar and acid had been mixed with the article in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Pure Peach Preserves", was false and misleading and tended to deceive and