

Establishment Number	Establishment Name	Inspection Date	Description
M717+P19051+V717	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	2/22/2022	<p>At approximately 12:40pm, while walking back from performing antemortem inspection (HATS Category IV) in the barns, REDACTED observed egregious noncompliance with HATS Category II (Truck Unloading). The REDACTED passed along the fence immediately parallel to the truck unloading area, where they heard a man’s voice yelling explicit vulgar words from inside the truck. The REDACTED backtracked to the side of the truck where they observed the unloading of the lower level of the truck by an establishment employee that was using a battery-powered electric prod, and the truck driver that was using a rattle paddle. The two men were attempting to unload the last few groups of market hogs that were bunching up in the back corner of the lower level. Each time the two men tried to get them to go out towards the ramp and out the trailer door the hogs continued to bunch up in the corners. The REDACTED heard the men continue to yell explicit vulgar words at the pigs. The REDACTED also heard the establishment employee tell the truck driver to “relax” because “the vet is watching”. The REDACTED moved to the side of the truck where they could see more clearly through the side windows as the men tried to move the last two groups of bunched up pigs off the truck. The REDACTED observed the establishment employee indiscriminately prod with the battery-powered electric prod several pigs in the group, including multiple animals in the face. The prod was energized, as the REDACTED could hear it sizzle each time it contacted the animals. The truck driver paddled several of the animals in the face, head region, and on the back of the animals (bringing his arm to the level of his head and/or above his head, then bringing the paddle down directly onto the animals, making a slapping sound with each hit). Several of the animals vocalized in response to the paddling and electric prodding, and the group bunched up further in the corner of the trailer, some crawling up on the backs of others with their forelegs (piling on top of one another). The REDACTED looped back around the front of the truck to enter the barn area where they could access the inner part of the barn. The REDACTED found the REDACTED, REDACTED REDACTED and REDACTED REDACTED and asked them to stop all truck unloading. The REDACTED called the USDA office and had the REDACTED bring U.S. Reject tags to the barn area, which they applied to each of the truck unloading doors (U.S. Reject Tag number B42 276265, B42 276264, B42 276263, and B42 276262). After communicating with the REDACTED, the REDACTED was instructed to have the stunning area of the facility tagged with a U.S. Reject tag, which the REDACTED applied to the alleyways leading into the REDACTED areas (U.S. Reject Tag number B27 073432). The REDACTED notified REDACTED REDACTED, REDACTED, of the regulatory control action due to the egregious animal handling observations at truck unloading and that the District Office management team was contacted for further guidance. This is a violation of the FMIA (21 U.S.C.) 603, regulations 9 CFR Part 313.2(a) and 313.2(b) and the HMSA of 1978.</p>
M717+P19051+V717	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	2/10/2022	<p>At approximately 0930 hours, while verifying compliance with facilities while hogs were moved to the REDACTEDs, the REDACTED, observed noncompliances with HATS Category IV – Antemortem Inspection, Facilities: The establishment’s moving wall framework had approximately 2 feet in</p>

			<p>length of metal welds eroded on the bottom and sides with multiple sharp and jagged edges. The bottom portion has a small opening of less than 1 inch in diameter, too small for a toe to be entrapped. Both the south and north REDACTED drive alleys have two walk through gates, allowing people to walk from the outside walkway to the inside area between the two REDACTEDs. The gates have a stainless-steel metal shield attached to square metal framework. The north drive alley outside gate had an eroded area approximately 1 foot by 2.5 inches (the entire width of the inside edge of the square metal frame) on the left and right frame pieces. The north drive alley inside gate had approximately 1 foot by 2.5 inches eroded area on the left framework, 2 feet by 2.5 inches eroded area on the right framework, and 6-7 by 2.5 inches eroded area on the bottom framework. The outside gate on the south REDACTED alley had a 1 foot by 2.5 inches eroded area on the bottom framework. The inside gate of the south alleyway had a 1 foot by 2.5 inches eroded area on the left, right, and bottom framework. These eroded areas had continuous jagged and sharp to touch edges and were large enough that could entrap a claw or foot. There was no observable blood or hair; thus, no regulatory tag was placed. In addition, the U-board used in the U.S. Suspect pen for slow or downer hogs, had approximately 80-90% of the welds on the top edge of the stainless-steel shield were detached from the framework. On the long edge, at least 5 detached welds had a sharp edge sticking up. A 5 inch section on the long edge was bend outwards. The DTP notified REDACTED, and REDACTED, of the observed noncompliance with regulation 9 CFR 313.1(a) and the forthcoming noncompliance record. REDACTED mentioned the night maintenance team would be looking into it that night.</p>
M717+P19051+V717	Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	11/16/2021	<p>At approximately 02:45 PM, while performing HATS category IV, Antemortem Inspection, REDACTED condemned a pig in the U.S. Suspect pen. The establishment employee accompanying REDACTED immediately prepared two hand-held captive bolt devices (HHCB) to humanely euthanize the animal. REDACTED then observed the following noncompliance with HATS category VIII, Stunning Effectiveness. The employee attempted to stun the animal with one of the HHCB device, but the attempt was unsuccessful and the animal remained conscious, attempting to roll over from a recumbent position. REDACTED observed blood trickling down the forehead from where the stunning attempt had made contact. REDACTED then had to instruct the establishment employee to make a second stun attempt on the animal. The employee then used the second HHCB device in attempt to stun the animal and again the animal remained conscious, attempting to roll over. After the second attempt REDACTED observed the animal blinking and tracking movement with its eyes. REDACTED then had to instruct the employee to make a third attempt to stun the animal. The employee promptly reloaded the HHCB, and on the third attempt, successfully rendered the animal unconscious. REDACTED informed plant management, REDACTED of her observations regarding the establishments failure to render the animal unconscious after multiple stunning attempts and that a noncompliance record (NR) would be issued. REDACTED informed the REDACTED that she contacted the Des Moines district through supervisory channels for further guidance regarding possible enforcement action.</p>

