

Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2767.

**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 (2006).

**Scope of Investigation:** Having considered the amended complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on September 17, 2007, *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 ground fault circuit interrupters and products containing the same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–36 of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,398; claims 12, 14, 19, 25, and 26 of U.S. Patent No. RE38,293; claims 52, 59, and 60 of U.S. Patent No. 7,154,718; claims 1–3, 13, 15, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,164,564; claims 1, 9, and 15–17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,212,386; and claims 1–6, 8, 12, 21, 22, and 24–34 of U.S. Patent No. 7,256,973, and whether an industry in the United States exists 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—

Pass & Seymour, Inc., 50 Boyd Avenue, Syracuse, New York 13209.

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

General Protecht Group, Inc., 555 Daxing Rd West, Liushi Yueqing, Zhejiang 325600, China.  
General Protecht Group U.S., Inc., 3353 Peachtree Road NE., Suite 1040, Atlanta, Georgia 30326.  
Shanghai ELE Manufacturing Corporation, Sec 2 Xingcheng Industrial Zone, Qingpu 201703, Shanghai, China.  
Shanghai Meihao Electric, Inc., 58 Shane Rd., Jiangqiao Town Jiading Borough 201803, Shanghai, China.  
Wenzhou Trimone Company, Zhiguang Industrial Zone, Liushi Town Yueqing, Zhejiang 325604, China.  
Cheetah USA Corp., 9091 Sandy Parkway, Sandy, Utah 84070.

GX Electric, 2001 NW 25th Avenue, Pompano Beach, Florida 33069.  
Nior Inc., 2200 Midtown Place NE., Suite A, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107.  
Orbit Industries, Inc., 2100 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, California 90007.  
The Designer's Edge, 11730 NE 12th Street, Bellevue, Washington 98005.  
Universal Security Instruments, Inc., 7–A Gwynns Mills Court, Owings Mills, Maryland 21117.  
Colacino Electric Supply, Inc., 319 West Union Street, Newark, New York 14513.  
Ingram Products, Inc., 8725 Youngerman Court, Suite 206, Jacksonville, Florida 32244.  
Lunar Industrial & Electrical, Inc., 15975 SW 117th Avenue, Miami, Florida 33177.  
Quality Distributing, LLC., 2056 NW Aloclek Drive, Suite 325, Hillsboro, Oregon 97124.

(c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Bryan F. Moore, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Carl C. Charneski is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

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 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 and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor 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 an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or cease and desist order or both directed against a respondent.

Issued: September 18, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E7-18753 Filed 9-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1103-NEW]

### Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice of information collection under review: COPS Non Hiring Progress Report.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The revision of a currently approved information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for 60 days for public comment until November 26, 2007. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Rebekah Dorr, Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 1100 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to

respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Proposed collection; comments requested.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* COPS Non-Hiring Progress Report.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* None. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Law enforcement and public safety agencies, institutions of higher learning and non-profit organizations that are recipients of COPS Non-Hiring grants.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:*

It is estimated that approximately 2,975 annual, quarterly, and final report respondents can complete the report in an average of one hour.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 3,200 total burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: September 18, 2007.

**Lynn Bryant,**

Department Clearance Officer, PRA,  
Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. E7-18780 Filed 9-21-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Andrew Desonia, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On September 16, 2005, the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Andrew Desonia, M.D. (Respondent), of Knox, Indiana. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA

Certificate of Registration, BD4985531, as a practitioner, on the ground that Respondent's "continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest." Show Cause Order at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) & 824(a)(4)). The Show Cause Order also proposed to deny any pending applications for renewal or modification of Respondent's registration.

More specifically, the Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent was a participant in a scheme run by Mr. Johar Saran, the owner of Carrington Health System/Infiniti Services Group (CHS/ISG) of Arlington, Texas. *Id.* at 5. According to the allegations, CHS/ISG operated several DEA-registered pharmacies, which obtained their registrations through sham-nominees and which were used to order large amounts of highly abused controlled substances from licensed distributors. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that the controlled substances were then diverted to CHS/ISG, where they were used to fill approximately 3,000 to 4,000 orders per day which had been placed by persons through various Web sites. *Id.*

The Show Cause Order further alleged that Respondent "participated in [this] scheme by authorizing drug orders under the guise of practicing medicine." *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent "did not see the customers, had no prior doctor-patient relationships with the Internet customers, did not conduct physical exams," and did not "create or maintain patient records." *Id.* at 5-6. The Show Cause Order alleged that between October 13, 2004, and January 28, 2005, Respondent issued twenty-three prescriptions for controlled substances "to [i]nternet customers in at least 13 different states," and that "in a single day," Respondent "issued ten drug orders to [i]nternet customers in ten different states." *Id.* at 6.

The Show Cause Order also alleged that a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) had gone to a Web site and ordered Bontril (phendimetrazine) by completing a questionnaire. *Id.* Subsequently, the DI received the filled prescription, which had been issued by Respondent and filled by Tri-Phasic Pharmacy of Arlington, Texas. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent issued the prescription without "contact[ing] the [DI]" and never "verif[ied] the information supplied" by the DI. *Id.*

Finally, the Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent "did not establish legitimate physician-patient relationships with the [i]nternet customers to whom [he] prescribed

controlled substances." *Id.* The Show Cause order thus alleged that Respondent had violated 21 CFR 1306.04.

On or about September 21, 2005, the Show Cause Order was personally served on Respondent. On October 20, 2005, Respondent, through his counsel, requested a hearing. The matter was assigned to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Gail Randall, who proceeded to conduct pre-hearing procedures. The matter was subsequently stayed while Respondent's counsel attempted to locate a witness.

On December 19, 2006, Respondent's counsel moved to withdraw. As grounds for the motion, Respondent's counsel established that he had sent two letters to Respondent by certified mail, which requested that Respondent contact him to discuss the case. Respondent's counsel further showed that Respondent had made no attempt to contact him. Respondent's counsel thus asserted that Respondent had "cut off all communication with [him]" thus breaching the attorney-client relationship" and violating the retainer agreement between them. Motion to Withdraw at 2. In addition to seeking leave to withdraw, Respondent's counsel asked the ALJ to grant Respondent thirty days to find replacement counsel.

Upon receipt of the motion, the ALJ ordered the Government to respond. On December 28, 2006, the Government filed its response stating that it did not object to the motion.

On December 29, 2006, the ALJ granted the motion. In her order, the ALJ also directed Respondent to notify the hearing clerk by January 29, 2007, whether he intended "to proceed with a hearing." Order Granting Resp. Counsel's Mot. to Withdraw at 3. The ALJ further informed Respondent that if he failed to file notice of his intention to proceed, he may be "deemed to have waived his right to the hearing," and that the hearing, which was already scheduled, could be cancelled. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(e)). The Order was served on Respondent by certified mail sent to his last known address.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Government counsel had earlier served Respondent with a copy of a December 19, 2006 Status Report, at the address of 1547 Ohio Avenue, Anderson, Indiana. In this filing, the Government's counsel noted that Respondent's counsel had informed her that he intended to withdraw. The Government also noted its "position that all settlement negotiations have failed," and that it "intended to seek the revocation of Respondent's \* \* \* Registration as proposed in the September 16, 2005, Order to Show Cause."

Thereafter, on December 27, 2006, the Government's counsel received an undated letter