

patent"); 8,776,738; 8,820,276 ("the '276 patent"); and 7,059,282 ("the '282 patent"). The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists or is in the process of being established. The Commission's Notice of Investigation named the following respondents: Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V. ("Fiat") of Slough, United Kingdom; FCA US LLC of Auburn Hills, Michigan; FCA Mexico, S.A. de C.V. of Sante Fe, Mexico; FCA Melfi S.p.A. of Melfi, Italy; and FCA Serbia d.o.o. Kragujevac of Kragujevac, Serbia. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in the investigation. Respondent Fiat and the following patents and patent claims were later terminated from the investigation: (1) The '397 patent (ALJ's Order No. 6, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice Aug. 18, 2015); (2) the '492 patent (ALJ's Order No. 8, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice Oct. 26, 2015); (3) Claims 3, 5, 13–16, 18–19, 22, 35–36, 38–44, 46–48, 50, and 54–56 of the '738 patent; claims 1–5, 7, 10, 19–23, and 26–28 of the '276 patent; and Fiat (*see* ALJ's Order No. 13, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice Dec. 21, 2015); and (4) the '282 patent (*see* ALJ's Order No. 15, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice Jan. 29, 2016).

On January 6, 2016, complainant moved for termination of the investigation based on withdrawal of the complaint. No party opposed the motion.

On January 7, 2016, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 16) granting complainant's motion and finding that the motion for termination satisfies Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1) and that no "extraordinary circumstances" exist that would preclude granting the motion. No party petitioned for review of the ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID and the Commission has terminated the investigation.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Dated: January 29, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–02018 Filed 2–3–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–556 and 731–TA–1311 (Preliminary)]

Truck and Bus Tires From China; Institution of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations and Scheduling of Preliminary Phase Investigations

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of investigations and commencement of preliminary phase antidumping and countervailing duty investigation Nos. 701–TA–556 and 731–TA–1311 (Preliminary) pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports of truck and bus tires from China, provided for in statistical reporting numbers 4011.20.1015 and 4011.20.5020 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value and alleged to be subsidized by the Government of China. Unless the Department of Commerce extends the time for initiation, the Commission must reach a preliminary determination in antidumping and countervailing duty investigations in 45 days, or in this case by March 14, 2016. The Commission's views must be transmitted to Commerce within five business days thereafter, or by March 21, 2016.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 29, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nathanael N. Comly, 202–205–3174, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. These investigations are being instituted, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)), in response to a petition filed on January 29, 2016, by United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, Pittsburgh, PA.

For further information concerning the conduct of these investigations and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 207).

Participation in the investigation and public service list. Persons (other than petitioners) wishing to participate in the investigations as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in sections 201.11 and 207.10 of the Commission's rules, not later than seven days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Industrial users and (if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level) representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping duty and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to these investigations upon the expiration of the period for filing entries of appearance.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and BPI service list. Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI gathered in these investigations available to authorized applicants representing interested parties (as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)) who are parties to the investigations under the APO issued in the investigations, provided that the application is made not later than seven days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Conference. The Commission's Director of Investigations has scheduled a conference in connection with these investigations for 9:30 a.m. on February 19, 2016, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC. Requests to appear at the conference should be emailed to William.bishop@usitc.gov and Sharon.bellamy@usitc.gov (do not file on EDIS) on or before February 17, 2016.

Parties in support of the imposition of countervailing and antidumping duties in these investigations and parties in opposition to the imposition of such duties will each be collectively allocated one hour within which to make an oral presentation at the conference. A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the conference.

Written submissions. As provided in sections 201.8 and 207.15 of the Commission's rules, any person may submit to the Commission on or before February 24, 2016, a written brief containing information and arguments pertinent to the subject matter of the investigations. Parties may file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the conference. If briefs or written testimony contain BPI, they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. Please consult the Commission's rules, as amended, 76 FR 61937 (Oct. 6, 2011) and the Commission's Handbook on Filing Procedures, 76 FR 62092 (Oct. 6, 2011), available on the Commission's Web site at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 29, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016-02066 Filed 2-3-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Louis Watson, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 9, 2015, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Louis Watson, M.D. (Respondent). The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of

Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration FW2729804, and the denial of any pending application to renew or modify the registration, on ground that he "do[es] not have authority to practice medicine or handle controlled substances in California, the state in which he is registered with the DEA." Show Cause Order, at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).¹

The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent is registered with the DEA as a practitioner, pursuant to which he is authorized to dispense controlled substances in Schedules II through V, at the registered address of 99 N. San Antonio Ave., #140, Upland, California. *Id.* The Order also alleged that Respondent's registration does not expire until May 31, 2017. *Id.*

The Show Cause Order further alleged that effective September 12, 2014, the Medical Board of California (MBC) revoked Respondent's California Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate, based on the recommendation of a state Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), who had conducted a hearing. *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus alleged that Respondent is currently "without authority to handle controlled substances in California, the state in which [he is] registered with the" Agency, and that "DEA must revoke [his] registration." *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f), 824(a)(3)).

The Show Cause Order also notified Respondent of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement in lieu of a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence of failing to elect either option. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The Show Cause Order further explained that "[m]atters are deemed filed upon receipt by the Hearing Clerk." *Id.*

On July 15, 2015, DEA Diversion Investigators (DIs) went to a location in Claremont, California which they believed to be Respondent's residence. GX 3. The DI verified that the location was Respondent's address with a neighbor and a pool maintenance employee. *Id.* The DI then left the Show Cause Order "on his front door." *Id.*; see also GX 6, at 11-12 (Declaration of DI).

Thereafter, Respondent submitted a request for hearing to the DEA Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ). While Respondent's request was dated August 9, 2015, it was not received by the OALJ until August 24, 2015. GX4.

In his Hearing Request, Respondent listed the name and address of the

attorney who was representing him in a state court challenge to the MBC's order, thus suggesting that the attorney was representing him in this matter. *Id.* Thereafter, the Chief Administrative Law Judge (CALJ) issued an order directing the Government to file evidence to support its allegation that Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances as well as any motion for summary disposition based on this ground no later than September 8, 2015; the order also directed that if the Government filed such a motion, Respondent was to file his response no later than September 22, 2015. GX 5, at 1-2. In his order, the CALJ also noted that although Respondent's Hearing Request listed the attorney retained to represent his appeal of the decision of the California Medical Board, there was no indication that this attorney was also representing him in the instant proceeding, and thus Respondent's hearing request was construed to be "a *pro se* request." *Id.* A copy of the CALJ's order was mailed postage pre-paid to Respondent at 2058 N. Mills Avenue #142, Claremont, California, the address listed on the envelope containing Respondent's Hearing Request. GX 9, at 2; see also GX 5, at 2.

Thereafter, the Government filed a motion requesting that the CALJ deny Respondent's request for a hearing on the ground that it was not timely filed pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(a), which requires the filing of a written request for hearing "within 30 days after the date of receipt of the order to show cause." GX 6, at 1 (Motion to Preclude Response to the Order to Show Cause). Therein, the Government argued that Respondent's hearing request was filed 40 days after the date of service of the Order to Show Cause, and that Respondent had not shown good cause for the untimely filing. The Government thus argued that Respondent had waived his right to a hearing and that the CALJ should issue an order denying his hearing request and forwarding the file to the Administrator for a final decision. *Id.* at 3.

On the same date, the Government also filed a Motion for Summary Disposition. Therein, the Government requested that the CALJ "issue a Recommended Decision to summarily revoke" Respondent's DEA registration on the ground that he lacks state authority to dispense controlled substances in California, the State in which he holds his registration. GX 7, at 1-2. As support for its motion, the Government submitted copies of the MBC's Decision and the state ALJ's

¹The Show Cause Order also proposed the denial of any other pending application. Show Cause Order, at 1.