

treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) By the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel,² solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.³

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of §§ 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 29, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-14041 Filed 7-3-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Vehicle Safety Communications 7 Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on May 31, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and

Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Vehicle Safety Communications 7 Consortium ("VSC7 Consortium") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to the venture and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties to the venture are: General Motors Holdings LLC, Warren, MI; Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, MI; Honda R&D Americas, Inc., Torrance, CA; Hyundai-Kia America Technical Center, Inc., Superior Township, MI; Mazda Motor of America, Inc., Farmington Hills, MI; Nissan Technical Center North America, Farmington Hills, MI; Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America, Plano, TX; and Volkswagen/Audi of America, Auburn Hills, MI. The general area of VSC7 Consortium's planned activity is collaboration to conduct or facilitate cooperative research, development, testing, and evaluation procedures to gain further knowledge and understanding of a security credential management system for use in a connected vehicle environment. VSC7 Consortium's objectives are to promote the interests of the automotive sector while maintaining impartiality, the independence of its members, and vendor neutrality.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-14071 Filed 7-3-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE :P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Vehicle Safety Communications 6 Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on May 31, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Vehicle Safety Communications 6 Consortium ("VSC6 Consortium") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to the venture and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture.

The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties to the venture are: General Motors Holdings LLC, Warren, MI; Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, MI; Honda R&D Americas, Inc., Torrance, CA; Hyundai-Kia America Technical Center, Inc., Superior Township, MI; Nissan Technical Center North America, Farmington Hills, MI; and Volkswagen/Audi of America, Auburn Hills, MI.

The general area of VSC6 Consortium's planned activity is collaboration to conduct or facilitate cooperative research, development, testing, and evaluation procedures to gain further knowledge and understanding of connected vehicle interactions and/or applications for vehicles that are intended to transform surface transportation safety, mobility, and environmental performance through a connected vehicle environment. VSC6 Consortium's objectives are to promote the interests of the automotive sector while maintaining impartiality, the independence of its members, and vendor neutrality.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-14074 Filed 7-3-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—UHD Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 6, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), UHD Alliance, Inc. ("UHD Alliance") filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, HP Inc., Houston, TX, and Tata Sky Limited, Mumbai, INDIA, have been added as parties to this venture. Also, The DIRECTV Group, Inc., El Segundo, CA; Arcelik AS Electronics Plant, Istanbul, TURKEY; DreamWorks

² All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

³ Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

Animation L.L.C., Glendale, CA; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA; Tongfang Global, Ltd. (Seiki), Diamond Bar, CA; and Walt Disney Pictures, Burbank, CA, have been dropped as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and UHD Alliance intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On June 17, 2015, UHD Alliance filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on July 17, 2015 (80 FR 42537).

The last notification was filed with the Department on March 9, 2017. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 10, 2017 (82 FR 17280).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-14073 Filed 7-3-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 16-31]

Phong Tran, M.D.; Decision and Order

On June 29, 2016, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause to Phong Tran, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent), the holder of 19 Certificates of Registration.¹ Order to

Show Cause, at 1–3. Citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3), the Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's 19 Certificates of Registration on the ground that Respondent does not have authority to dispense controlled substances in the State of California, the State in which he is registered. *Id.* at 4.

As the jurisdictional basis for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that each of Respondent's 19 Certificates of Registration “are current and unexpired.” Order to Show Cause, at 4. Respondent's registrations authorize him to dispense controlled substances in Schedules II through V. Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, Attachment 1, at 5–23.

As the substantive grounds for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that on or about December 9, 2015, Respondent was criminally charged in the County of San Diego Superior Court (hereinafter, Superior Court) with 45 counts related to unlawful billing under the California Workers' Compensation System and that the charges were pending resolution. *Id.* at 4. The Show Cause Order further alleged that, in response to the criminal charges, the Medical Board of California (hereinafter, MBC) petitioned the Superior Court for an order suspending Respondent's medical license during the pendency of the criminal proceedings. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that, on May 13, 2016, the Superior Court issued an Order granting the MBC's petition “and thereby . . . indefinitely suspended . . . [Respondent's] California medical license effective June 3, 2016.” *Id.* The Order to Show Cause alleged that Respondent's medical license remained suspended and, “therefore, DEA must revoke . . . [Respondent's] DEA . . . [registrations] based upon . . . [his] lack of authority to handle controlled substances in the State of California.” *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f)(1), and 824(a)(3)).

The Show Cause Order notified Respondent of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement while waiving his right to a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequences for failing to elect either option. *Id.* at 4–5 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). It also notified Respondent of his right to submit a corrective action

plan. *Id.* at 5 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

By letter dated August 25, 2016, Respondent requested a hearing stating that “Dr. Tran's medical license is still active and valid, and not suspended as alleged.” Hearing Request (August 25, 2016), at 1.

On August 29, 2016, Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney, II (hereinafter, CALJ) issued an order setting September 9, 2016 as the date for the Government to submit evidence supporting the lack of state authority allegation and for any party's motion for summary disposition to be due. Order Directing the Filing of Proof of Service, Evidence of Lack of State Authority Allegation, and Briefing Schedule, at 2.²

On September 9, 2016, the Government filed its proof of service evidence and Motion for Summary Disposition. Government's Proof of Service Evidence and Motion for Summary Disposition (hereinafter, Government's Motion). The Government's Motion argued that Respondent was “without state authorization to handle controlled substances in California, and as [sic] result, is not entitled to maintain his DEA Certificates of Registration.” *Id.* at 1.

As support for its Motion, the Government provided a sworn Certification by the Chief of DEA's Registration and Program Support Section concerning each of Respondent's DEA registrations in California. Government's Motion, at Attachment 1 (Certification of Registration History dated June 29, 2016). The Certification attached a copy of each of Respondent's DEA registrations. *Id.* at 5–23. The Government also provided the MBC's Notice “to recommend that the [Superior] Court issue an Order prohibiting . . . Phong Hung Tran, M.D. . . . from practicing or attempting to practice medicine as a physician in the State of California, as a condition of any bail or own recognizance release, during the pendency of . . . criminal proceedings.” Government's Motion, at Attachment 2 (Notice of PC23 Appearance and Recommendation at PC1275 Bail Hearing dated April 12, 2016) (hereinafter, MBC Notice), at 2. The Government's Motion also attached the MBC's brief in support of the MBC Notice. Government's Motion, at Attachment 3 (Memorandum in Support of Penal Code Section 23 Appearance

¹ The 19 Certificates of Registration referenced in the Order to Show Cause are: FT4325242 in Vista, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4123422 in Garden Grove, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4086888 in Chula Vista, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4086876 in Escondido, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4086698 in San Diego, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4086686 in San Bernardino, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FP4086864 in Long Beach, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4046707 in Van Nuys, California (expiration date: November 30, 2018); FT3965540 in Anaheim, California (expiration date: November 30, 2018); FT4046543 in Temecula, California (expiration date: November 30, 2018); BT3239945 in Westminster, California (expiration date: November 30, 2018); FT4083111 in Downey, California (expiration date: November 30, 2016); FT4932097 in Rialto, California (expiration date: November 30, 2017); FT4946957 in Indio, California (expiration date: November 30, 2017); FT4946971 in Palmdale, California (expiration date: November 30,

2017); FT4963117 in Pasadena, California (expiration date: November 30, 2017); FT4963129 in Pomona, California (expiration date: November 30, 2017); FT4963131 in Hemet, California (expiration date: November 30, 2017); and FT3933593 in San Bernardino, California (expiration date: November 30, 2018). Order to Show Cause, at 1–3.

² The Order also set the date and time for the Government to furnish proof of when it served the Order to Show Cause on Respondent. *Id.* at 1.