

Act on November 14, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 56533).

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-6286 Filed 3-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Pine Oil Joint Venture

Notice is hereby given that, on December 28, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), SCM Glidco Organics has 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 Specifically, the following members have withdrawn their membership with SCM Glidco Organics: Sistesis quimica S.A. de C.V. and Johnson Chemical Co., Inc.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the joint venture. Membership in this joint venture remains open, and SCM Glidco Organics intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 5, 1987, American Cyanamid Company 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 February 5, 1987, 52 F. R. 37190. The last notification was filed with the Department on August 13, 1993. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 20, 1993, 58 F.R. 51103.

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-6282 Filed 3-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—X Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on December 8, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), X Consortium, Inc. (the "Corporation") has filed written notification

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, the following have become members of the Corporation: Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, Le Chesnay, FRANCE; and KL Group, Inc., Toronto, CANADA.

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

On September 15, 1993, the Corporation 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 November 10, 1993 (58 FR 59737). The last notification was filed with the Department on June 14, 1994. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 7, 1994 (59 FR 55490).

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-6283 Filed 3-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

#### Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 93-52]

##### Robert A. Leslie, M.D.; Denial of Application

On May 13, 1993, the Deputy Assistant Administrator (then-Director), Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Robert A. Leslie, M.D., of Los Angeles, California, proposing to deny his application for registration as a practitioner. The Order to Show Cause alleged that the Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest as that term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

Respondent, acting pro se, requested a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause, and the matter was placed on the docket of Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. Following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Los Angeles, California, on December 8 and 9, 1993. On July 27, 1994, in her

opinion and recommended ruling, findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision, the administrative law judge recommended that Respondent's application for DEA registration be denied. In a footnote of her recommended decision, the administrative law judge referenced specific documents that were submitted by Respondent after the administrative hearing. The administrative law judge recommended that the Deputy Administrator not consider these submissions, since most of the documents pertained to matters previously litigated and conclusively decided in a previous criminal action, and therefore, consideration of them was barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. No exceptions were filed by either party.

On August 16, 1994, Respondent filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the administrative law judge's decision recommending denial of his application for DEA registration. On August 17, 1994, the administrative law judge denied this petition as lacking in merit.

On August 30, 1994, the administrative law judge transmitted the record to the Deputy Administrator. The Deputy Administrator has carefully considered the entire record in this matter and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order in this matter based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator concurs with Judge Bittner's recommendation not to consider specific post hearing submissions of the Respondent. Accordingly, these submissions were not considered in rendering this decision.

The administrative law judge found that Respondent graduated from medical school in 1955, became licensed as a physician in 1958, and practiced medicine in Los Angeles during the period at issue in this case. On April 1, 1986, a complaint was filed in the Municipal Court of Long Beach, California, charging Respondent with seventeen misdemeanor counts, sixteen of which related to the unlawful handling of controlled substances. Following a jury trial, on October 9, 1986, Respondent was found guilty on eight counts of unlawfully prescribing, administering, furnishing or dispensing controlled substances between July 1985 and January 1986. Respondent's convictions were affirmed on appeal by the Appellate Department of the Superior Court, State of California, in a Memorandum Judgement issued on May 18, 1988.

Based on his criminal convictions, on August 17, 1988, the California Board of