County, Arizona. BLM currently administers a portion of this management area as the Yuma Desert and Sand Dunes Habitat Management Area and the Gran Desierto Dunes ACEC. BLM proposes to expand the Yuma Desert and Sand Dunes Habitat Management Area to include the remaining flat-tailed horned lizard habitat within the Barry M. Goldwater Range, Yuma County, Arizona.

Existing management prescriptions for the Yuma Desert and Sand Dunes Habitat Management Area and Gran Desierto Dunes ACEC would be modified to further limit surface disturbances within the expanded management area. These modifications would exclude Federally-owned lands within the management area from disposal, place additional limits on land-use authorizations and camping within the area, prohibit commercial collection or sales of native plant products, prescribe fire suppression methods, and limit other discretionary actions that may result in loss or degradation of flat-tailed horned lizard habitat.

There is no designated utility corridor between Interstate 8 and the Southerly International Boundary in Yuma County. The Amendment would designate one right-of-way corridor and limit new utilities and roads to this corridor.

In addition, the amendment would establish a policy for mitigating and compensating for impacts to flat-tailed horned lizards from projects within flat-tailed horned lizard habitat. Mitigation and compensation would be applied both within and outside of the Yuma Desert and Sand Dunes Habitat Management Area.

Possible adverse socioeconomic impacts to Yuma County government and private entities may result from increased costs associated with development activities on Federal lands. Lands within the management area would not be available for lease or disposal. Possible benefits would be alleviation of threats to the flat-tailed horned lizard in this area and conservation of the species and its habitat.

Complete records of all phases of the planning process will be available for public review at the Yuma District Office, 2555 East Gila Ridge Road, Yuma, Arizona.

This notice is published under the authority found in 43 CFR 1610.2(c).

Dated: July 23, 1996

David Daniels,

Surface Protection Specialist/Acting District Manager.

[FR Doc. 96–19146 Filed 7–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–32–M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–389]

Certain Diagnostic Kits for the Detection and Quantification of Viruses; Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on June 25, 1996, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337, on behalf of Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, New Jersey 07110. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain diagnostic kits for the detection and quantification of viruses, that infringe claims 1, 2, 5–9, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18 of United States Letters Patent 5,476,774.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after a hearing, issue a permanent exclusion order and permanent cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–1802. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Smith R. Brittingham IV, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–2576.

AUTHORITY: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR § 210.10.

SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on July 22, 1996, *Ordered That*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain diagnostic kits for the detection and quantification of viruses, by reason of infringement of claims 1, 2, 5–9, 11, 12, 15, 17, or 18 of United States Letters Patent 5,476,774; and whether there exists an industry in the United States as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is—Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, New Jersey 07110.

(b) The respondents are the following companies alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Organon Teknika B.V., 5281 RM Boxtel, The Netherlands

Organon Teknika Corporation, 100 Akzo Avenue, Durham, North Carolina 27712

(c) Smith R. Brittingham IV, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Room 401–M, Washington, DC 20436, shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Sidney Harris is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

(4) Pursuant to section 210.50(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR § 210.50(b)(1), the Commission delegates to the presiding administrative law judge for this investigation the authority to compel discovery, take evidence, and hear argument with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and directs the presiding administrative law judge to include findings of fact and conclusions of law on public interest issues in any recommended determination filed with the Commission under section 210.42(a)(1)(ii), 19 CFR § 210.42(a)(1)(ii).

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in

accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR § 210.13. Pursuant to sections 201.16(d) and 210.13(a) of the Commission's Rules, 19 CFR §§ 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint will not be granted unless good cause therefore is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against such respondent.

Issued: July 23, 1996.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–19109 Filed 7–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–U

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 94–83]

David M. Headley, M.D., Grant of Restricted Registration

On September 7, 1994, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to David M. Headley, M.D., (Respondent) of Port Gibson, Mississippi, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), as being inconsistent with the public interest.

On September 30, 1994, the Respondent filed a timely request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Jackson, Mississippi, on August 22 and 23, 1995, before Administrative Law Judge Paul A. Tenney. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence, and after the hearing, counsel for both sides submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On November 28, 1995, Judge Tenney issued his Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Ruling, recommending that the Respondent's application for registration be granted provided he meet the following conditions:

(1) Submit to random, unannounced urine screenings once every two weeks for a period of not more than one year. Respondent shall transmit to the Special Agent in Charge of the New Orleans Field Division of the DEA or his designee the results of such urine screenings on a monthly basis.

(2) Respondent shall continue to attend weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meetings, or other support group meetings of his choice, for a period of not less than one year.

Neither party filed exceptions to his decision, and on January 16, 1996, Judge Tenney transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator.

The Deputy administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 C.F.R. 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator adopts, in full, the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and his adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Deputy Administrator finds that on December 20, 1984, the Respondent voluntarily surrendered his DEA Certificate of Registration, AH9733862, upon admitting himself into the Ridgeview Institute in Smyrna, Georgia, for substance abuse treatment. From October 2, 1984, through February 4, 1987, the Respondent participated in a multi-phase rehabilitation treatment program. On February 20, 1986, the Mississippi State Board of Medical Licensure (Medical Board) granted the Respondent permission to re-register with the DEA in Schedules IV and V, and his DEA application was granted. The Respondent was issued a DEA Certificate of Registration, BH0570502, which was later modified to include Schedules III and IIIN.

However, in 1988, the Respondent suffered a relapse, and he admitted that he was abusing controlled and non-controlled substances during this time. In August of 1988, Medical Board investigators reviewed prescription files at pharmacies in the Respondent's local area. The investigation revealed that the Respondent had prescribed and ordered numerous controlled and non-controlled substances for himself, and had prescribed controlled substances for his wife. As a result of this investigation, the Medical Board and the Respondent entered into a Consent Agreement on September 28, 1988, which prohibited the Respondent from administering, dispensing, or prescribing addictive drugs to himself or members of his family, and which required him to submit to random, unannounced drug screening tests.

The Respondent submitted to the drug screens, and a test taken on April 28, 1989, indicated the presence of amphetamine and methamphetamine, both Schedule II drugs, and phendimetrazine, a Schedule III drug. Again on July 21, 1989, the Respondent's drug screen tested positive for amphetamine, and for phenobarbital, a Schedule IV drug. Consequently, the Medical Board served the Respondent with an Order of Prohibition dated August 11, 1989, prohibiting him from practicing medicine until such time as he was evaluated for chemical dependency.

On August 16, 1989, the Respondent entered another treatment center, where he remained until September 15, 1989. On October 24, 1989, the Respondent entered into a second consent agreement with the Medical Board, requiring him, among other things, (1) to surrender his DEA registration, (2) to refrain from administering, dispensing, or prescribing to himself or to family members, any drug having addiction-forming qualities, (3) to submit to random, unannounced, and witnessed urine and/or blood screens for a period of at least five years (4) to complete all required phases of a drug abuse treatment program, and (5) to affiliate with the Mississippi State Medical Association Impaired Professionals Program. As of the time of the hearing before Judge Tenney, the Respondent had abided by, and was still subject to, the terms of this agreement, including the drug screening provision. On October 24, 1989, the Respondent surrendered his DEA registration as required by the second consent agreement.

The Respondent continued his drug abuse rehabilitation program through February 27, 1990, completing Phase III of his treatment. He then entered into a two-year aftercare monitoring phase of recovery. On February 27, 1992, the Respondent voluntarily extended his aftercare contract for another year, after successfully having completed the required two-year period. The Respondent also successfully completed