

information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by August 8, 2017. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules with respect to filing were revised effective July 25, 2014. See 79 FR 35920 (June 25, 2014), and the revised Commission Handbook on E-filing, available from the Commission's Web site at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document

filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (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.

Determination.—The Commission has determined this review is extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 3, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017–16677 Filed 8–7–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Registration

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: Registrants listed below have applied for and been granted registration by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) as importers of various classes of schedule I or II controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The companies listed below applied to be registered as importers of various basic classes of controlled substances. Information on previously published notices is listed in the table below. No comments or objections were submitted and no requests for hearing were submitted for these notices.

Company	FR docket	Published
Cambridge Isotope Laboratories	82 FR 19083	April 25, 2017.
Janssen Ortho LLC	82 FR 19083	April 25, 2017.
Galephar Pharmaceutical Research, Inc.	82 FR 23069	May 19, 2017.
Mallinckrodt LLC	82 FR 23071	May 19, 2017.
Cerilliant Corporation	82 FR 25335	June 1, 2017.

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823, 952(a) and 958(a) and determined that the registration of the listed registrants to import the applicable basic classes of schedule I or II controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated each company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing each company's physical security systems, verifying each company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing each company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 952(a) and 958(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34, the DEA has granted a registration as an importer for schedule I or II controlled substances to the above listed persons.

Dated: August 2, 2017.

Demetra Ashley,

Acting Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017–16698 Filed 8–7–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Leia A. Frickey, M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 28, 2017, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Leia A. Frickey, M.D. (Registrant), of New Orleans, Louisiana. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration, the denial of any applications to renew or modify her registration, and the denial of any applications for any other DEA registration on the ground that she lacks "state authority to handle controlled substances" in Louisiana, the State in which she is registered with the DEA. Order to Show Cause, at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

With respect to the Agency's jurisdiction, the Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant is registered as a practitioner in schedules II through V, pursuant to DEA Certificate of Registration BF5029574, at the address of 3312 South I–10 Service Road, Metairie, Louisiana. *Id.* The Order also

alleged that this registration does not expire until September 30, 2017. *Id.*

As substantive grounds for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that on May 6, 2016, the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners issued a "Notice of Summary Suspension of Medical License, summarily suspending [Registrant's] medical license." ¹ *Id.* at 1. As a result, the Order alleged that Registrant is "currently without authority to practice medicine or handle controlled substances in . . . Louisiana, the [S]tate in which [she is] registered with the DEA." *Id.* at 2. Thus, based on her "lack of authority to [dispense] controlled substances in . . . Louisiana," the Order asserted that "DEA must revoke" her

¹ The Show Cause Order also alleges that "on July 25, 2016, the Louisiana Board of Pharmacy issued a Notice of Suspension, suspending [Registrant's] Louisiana CDS license, number CDS.024813–MD, effective May 6, 2016." *Id.* at 1–2. Although those exact facts are not reflected in the record, the record does show that on November 16, 2016, the Louisiana State Board of Pharmacy issued an Order that Registrant's "LOUISIANA CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE LICENSE No. 024813 is hereby indefinitely suspended in accordance with the suspension of her medical license by the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners on May 6, 2016." See Government Exhibit (GX) 4, at 1.

registration. *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3); 21 CFR 1301.37(b)).

The Show Cause Order notified Registrant of her 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 for failing to elect either option. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The Show Cause Order also notified Registrant of her right to submit a corrective action plan. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

The Government states that on March 16, 2017, “[p]ersonnel from DEA’s New Orleans Field Division served the Order on Registrant.” Government Request for Final Agency Action (RFFA), at 1 (citing Government Exhibit (GX) 5). Specifically, a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) and DEA Task Force Officer traveled to a medical center in Louisiana on March 16, 2017, where the nursing staff escorted them to her room where they found the Registrant. GX5, at 1. The DI advised Registrant that he had a Show Cause Order to serve on her. *Id.* According to the DI’s affidavit, the Registrant then responded “‘You will not take my DEA number’ and she refused to take the [Show Cause Order] document.” *Id.* The DI “then placed the [Order] on the night stand next to [Registrant’s] bed.” *Id.*

On May 19, 2017, the Government forwarded its Request for Final Agency Action and an evidentiary record to my Office. Therein, the Government represents that Registrant has neither requested a hearing nor “otherwise corresponded or communicated with DEA regarding” the Show Cause Order. RFFA, at 2. Based on the Government’s representation and the record, I find that more than 30 days have passed since the Order to Show Cause was served on Registrant, and she has neither requested a hearing nor submitted a written statement in lieu of a hearing. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(d)). Accordingly, I find that Registrant has waived her right to a hearing or to submit a written statement and issue this Decision and Order based on relevant evidence submitted by the Government. I make the following findings.

Findings of Fact

Registrant is a physician who is registered as a practitioner in schedules II–V pursuant to Certificate of Registration BF5029574, at the address of 3312 South I–10 Service Road, Metairie, Louisiana. GX 1, at 1. The registration does not expire until September 30, 2017. *Id.*

On May 6, 2016, the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners summarily

suspended Registrant’s medical license and stated that the suspension was “effective immediately.” GX 3, at 1. On November 16, 2016, the Louisiana State Board of Pharmacy “indefinitely suspended” Registrant’s controlled substance license “in accordance with the suspension of her medical license by the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners on May 6, 2016.” GX 4, at 1. Based on the above, I find that Registrant does not currently have authority under the laws of Louisiana to dispense controlled substances.

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under section 823 of Title 21, “upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had [her] State license . . . suspended [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.” With respect to a practitioner, DEA has long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the State in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a registration. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper*, 76 FR 71371 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 Fed. Appx. 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *see also Frederick Marsh Blanton*, 43 FR 27616 (1978) (“State authorization to dispense or otherwise handle controlled substances is a prerequisite to the issuance and maintenance of a Federal controlled substances registration.”).

This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined “the term ‘practitioner’ [to] mean[] a . . . physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . to distribute, dispense, [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which [s]he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the Act, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever she is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the State

in which she engages in professional practice. *See, e.g., Calvin Ramsey*, 76 FR 20034, 20036 (2011); *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Blanton*, 43 FR 27616 (1978).

Moreover, because “the controlling question” in a proceeding brought under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) is whether the holder of a practitioner’s registration “is currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the [S]tate,” *Hooper*, 76 FR at 71371 (quoting *Anne Lazar Thorn*, 62 FR 12847, 12848 (1997)), the Agency has also long held that revocation is warranted even where a practitioner has lost her state authority by virtue of the State’s use of summary process and the State has yet to provide a hearing to challenge the suspension. *Bourne Pharmacy*, 72 FR 18273, 18274 (2007); *Wingfield Drugs*, 52 FR 27070, 27071 (1987). Thus, it is of no consequence that the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners has employed summary process in suspending Registrant’s state medical license. What is consequential is that Registrant is no longer currently authorized to dispense controlled substances in Louisiana, the State in which she is registered. I will therefore order that her registration be revoked.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration No. BF5029574, issued to Leia A. Frickey, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending application of Leia A. Frickey to renew or modify the above registration, or any pending application of Leia A. Frickey for any other registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective immediately.

Dated: July 31, 2017.

Chuck Rosenberg,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017–16700 Filed 8–7–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

**Importer of Controlled Substances
Application: Almac Clinical Services
Incorp (ACSI)**

ACTION: Notice of application.