

of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, and states that the disposition of the case will be consistent with the APPA.

1. On February 15, 1996, the United States filed a Complaint and a Stipulation by which the parties agreed to the Court's entry of an attached proposed Final Judgment following compliance with the APPA.

2. The United States also filed on February 15, 1996, a Competitive Impact Statement as required by 15 U.S.C. 16(b).

3. The APPA also requires the United States to publish a copy of the proposed Final Judgment and the Competitive Impact Statement in the Federal Register. It further requires the publication of summaries of the terms of the proposed Final Judgment and the Competitive Impact Statement in at least two newspapers of general circulation. This notice will inform members of the public that they may submit comments about the Final Judgment to the United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division. 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(c).

4. Following such publication in the newspapers and Federal Register, a sixty-day waiting period will begin. During this time, the United States will consider, and at the close of that period respond to, any public comments that it receives. It will publish the comments and its responses in the Federal Register. 15 U.S.C. 16(d).

5. After the expiration of the sixty-day period, the United States will file with the Court the comments, the Government's responses, and a Motion For Entry of the Final Judgment. 15 U.S.C. 16(d).

6. After the filing of the Motion For Entry of the Final Judgment, the Court may enter the Final Judgment without a hearing, if it finds that the Final Judgment is in the public interest. 15 U.S.C. 16(e)-(f).

7. The parties fully intend to comply with the requirements of the APPA.

As stated above, the Antitrust Procedures and penalties Act governs the disposition of civil antitrust cases brought and settled by the United States. Discovery between the parties, which have consented to the proposed settlement filed with the Court, is unnecessary. Accordingly, the attached Order is justified and should be entered by the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry D. Dixon, Jr.,

United States Attorney, Southern District of Georgia, 100 Bull Street, Suite 201, Savannah, GA 31401, Tel.: (912) 652-4422.

Nancy H. McMillen,

Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, Tel.: (202) 307-5777.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on February 15, 1996, a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served on the parties below by placing a copy of this MOTION OF UNITED STATES TO EXCLUDE CASE FROM ALL DISCOVERY REQUIREMENTS AND TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES OF THE ANTITRUST PROCEDURES AND PENALTIES ACT in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to the addresses given below.

For Defendants Waste Management of Georgia, Inc., Waste Management of Louisiana, Inc., and Waste Management, Inc.:

Michael Sennett, Esquire, Bell, Boyd & Lloyd, 3 First National Plaza, 70 West Madison Street, Chicago, IL 60602

Robert Bloch, Esquire, Mayer, Brown & Platt, 2000 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20006

Harold Hellin, Esquire, Glen Darbyshire, Esquire, Hunter, MacLean, Exler & Dunn, 200 East Street Julian, Savannah, GA 31401.

Nancy H. McMillen,

Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307-5777.

United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia Savannah Division

In the matter of *United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Waste Management of Georgia, Inc., d/b/a Waste Management of Savannah, Waste Management of Louisiana, Inc. d/b/a Waste Management of Central Louisiana, and Waste Management, Inc., Defendants.* Civil Action No.: CV496-35, filed: Feb. 15, 1996.

Order Excluding Case From All Discovery Requirements and To Follow the Procedures of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act

Plaintiff, the United States of America, has moved the Court to exclude this case from all discovery requirements under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, given that the disposition of negotiated civil antitrust consent decrees are governed by the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)-(h). The

Court is of the opinion that this motion should be granted.

It is therefore Ordered that this case is excluded from all discovery requirements under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia. It is further ORDERED that the Defendants are not required to file any responsive pleading to the Complaint.

It is also therefore Ordered that the procedures to be followed in this case shall be consistent with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)-(h).

Dated: _____

United States District Judge.

[FR Doc. 96-5040 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—IHDT Cooperative Agreement Program

Notice is hereby given that, on November 6, 1995, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), IHDT Cooperative Agreement Program, has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the Program. 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 are: Bell Helicopter Textron Inc., Hurst, TX; and McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems, Mesa, AZ.

The nature and objectives of this Program are the development of integrated software and database architecture that will assist U.S. aerospace companies and civilian and military program managers to reduce cycle time and to improve product affordability in the design, manufacture, and maintenance of rotocraft.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96-5038 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Joint Research and Development Venture Agreement for Industrial Refrigeration

Notice is given that, on July 14, 1995, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Philip W. Winkler, Manager, Cryrogenic Refrigerants & Systems of Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture agreement. 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 are Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., 7201 Hamilton Boulevard, Allentown, PA 18195-1501; and Lewis Energy Systems, Inc., 300 West 1100 North, North Salt Lake, UT 84054, and the general areas of their planned activity are to develop and demonstrate a new form of industrial refrigeration equipment using dry air as the working fluid in a closed cycle at high pressures; an award from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce will partially fund this joint research and development activity.

Constance K. Robinson,
Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.
[FR Doc. 96-5039 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Petroleum Environmental Research Forum Project No. 94-14

Notice is hereby given that, on February 9, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301, *et seq.* ("the Act"), the participants in the Petroleum Environmental Research Forum ("PERF") Project No. 94-14, titled "Cooperative Bioremediation Research Program," have filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and with the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to PERF Project No. 94-14 and (2) the nature and objectives of the research program to be performed in accordance with the Project. 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 current parties participating in PERF Project No. 94-14 are: Exxon Research & Engineering Company, Florham Park, NJ; Marathon Oil Company, Littleton, CO; Amoco Corporation, Chicago, IL; Texaco, Inc., Port Arthur, TX; Phillips Petroleum Company, Houston, TX; and RETEC, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.

The nature and objective of the research program performed in accordance with PERF Project No. 94-14 is to provide planning and response guidelines for the use of solidifiers for upstream/downstream petroleum (on land) operations.

Participation in this project will remain open to interested persons and organizations until issuance of the final project report. The participants intend to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in its membership.

Information about participating in PERF Project No. 94-14 may be obtained by contacting Mr. William Dahl, Exxon Research & Engineering Company, Florham Park, NJ.

Constance K. Robinson,
Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.
[FR Doc. 96-5037 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-45]

Gilbert Ross, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On May 24, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Gilbert Ross, M.D., (Respondent) of Great Neck, New York, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AR5677060, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(5), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged in substance that: (1) On November 19, 1992, the Respondent was indicated by a federal grand jury in the Southern District of New York on a 131-count indictment on charges of racketeering (RICO), mail fraud and money laundering arising from the operation of four sham medical clinics in upper Manhattan and the Bronx; (2) on November 10, 1993, after judgment

was entered against the Respondent, following a jury trial, on one count of racketeering (RICO) in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d), one count of conspiracy in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(c), ten counts of mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1341 and 1342, and one count of money laundering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 982 (a)(1) and (b)(1)(A), he was sentenced to 46 months incarceration followed by three years of supervised release and ordered to make restitution to the State of New York in the amount of \$612,855.00; and (3) on June 10, 1994, the Respondent was notified by the Department of Health and Human Services of his ten-year mandatory exclusion from participation in the Medicare/Medicaid program pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(a), as a result of the above-referenced conviction.

On June 26, 1995, the Respondent, through counsel, filed a timely request for a hearing, and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. On July 28, 1995, Counsel for the Government filed a Motion to Amend Order to Show Cause and for Summary Disposition, alleging, additionally, that on or about July 20, 1995, DEA received notice from the Administrative Review Board for Professional Medical Conduct of the Department of Health for the State of New York (Medical Board), that the Respondent's license to practice medicine in New York had been revoked effective July 24, 1995. The motion was supported by a copy of the Medical Board's Decision and Order.

On August 10, 1995, the Respondent filed a request for an adjournment of this matter, asserting that judicial review of the Medical Board's decision was pending before a State court. Judge Bittner denied that request on August 11, 1995. The Respondent did not subsequently file a response to the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition. Further, the Respondent did not deny that his State license had been revoked.

On August 24, 1995, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Decision, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Ruling, in which she (1) found that the Respondent lacked authorization to practice medicine in New York; (2) found that the Respondent therefore lacked authorization to handle controlled substances in New York; (3) granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, and (4) recommended that the Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration be revoked. Neither party filed exceptions to her decision, and on September 25, 1995, Judge Bittner transmitted her opinion and the record