

Cerritos, CA; Information Resource Engineering, Inc., Baltimore, MD; Intel Corporation, Hillsboro, OR; International Business Machines, Inc., Somers, NY; Motorola, Scottsdale, AZ; NCR, West Columbia, SC; Novell Inc., Provo, UT; Sourcefile, Atlanta, GA; Sun Microsystems, Inc., Mountain View, CA; Trusted Information Systems, Inc., McLean, VA.

KRA was formed for the following purposes: (a) Stimulate global electronic commerce by encouraging the harmonization of market driven solutions available globally for secure communication using strong encryption; (b) serve as a focal point for industry efforts to develop commercially acceptable solutions for recovery of encrypted information; (c) determine interoperability concerns and potential architectural solutions among key recovery technologies and non-key recovery technologies; (d) support the development of a global infrastructure that supports recovery of encrypted information and (e) promote the implementation, deployment and use of interoperable key recovery technologies in the market. In furtherance of the foregoing purposes, KRA may undertake research, development, analysis, testing, study, and experimentation concerning or relating to key recovery technologies, and it may engage in the collection, exchange and analysis of research information concerning key recovery technologies.

Additional parties may become members of KRA. KRA will file supplemental written notifications disclosing all new members.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.
[FR Doc. 98-5014 Filed 2-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993; Michigan Materials and Processing Institute

Notice is hereby given that, on December 16, 1997, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Michigan Materials and Processing Institute ("MMPI"), 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. The following companies were recently accepted as Class A Shareholders in MMPI, Lambda Technologies, Inc., Morrisville, NC and Vehicle Recycling Partnership, Southfield, MI. Applied Sciences, Inc., Cedarville, OH and Cybernet Systems Corporation, Ann Arbor, MI are no longer Class A Shareholders in MMPI.

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

On August 7, 1990, MMPI 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 September 6, 1990, 55 FR 36710.

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 15, 1997. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 22, 1997, 62 FR 28066.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98-5015 Filed 2-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 98-2]

Teodoro A. Ando, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On May 23, 1997, the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Teodoro A. Ando, M.D., (Respondent) of Montoursville, Pennsylvania. The Order to Show Cause notified him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AA8218249, and deny any pending applications for renewal of his registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3), for reason that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Subsequently, Respondent filed a request for a hearing. While this request was not timely filed, the Government indicated that it did not object to the untimeliness of Respondent's request for a hearing, and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. On October

23, 1997, Judge Bittner issued an Order for Prehearing Statements. On November 13, 1997, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition and Request for Extension of Time to File Prehearing Statement, alleging that Respondent is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. By order dated November 20, 1997, Judge Bittner provided Respondent with an opportunity to file a response to the Government's motion. No response was received from Respondent.

On December 19, 1997, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Decision finding that Respondent lacked authorization to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition; and recommending that Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration be revoked. Neither party filed exceptions to her opinion, and on January 22, 1998, Judge Bittner transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Acting Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, in full, the Opinion and Recommended Decision of the Administrative Law Judge.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that by affidavit dated October 27, 1997, the custodian of records for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of State, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, State Board of Medicine stated that Respondent's license was revoked on March 11, 1996, and remained revoked as of the date of the affidavit. Respondent did not offer any evidence to the contrary, and therefore the Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent is not currently authorized to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Acting Deputy Administrator further finds it reasonable to infer that Respondent is also not authorized to handle controlled substances in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where he is currently registered with DEA to handle controlled substances.

The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21