

registration is consistent with the public interest. This investigation included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with State and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to section 1008(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act and in accordance with Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, section 1301.34, the above firm is granted registration as an importer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed.

Dated: December 24, 2003.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-2340 Filed 2-4-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 03-14]

Prescriptionline.com Revocation of Registration

On December 18, 2002, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration to Prescriptiononline.com (Respondent) of Las Vegas, Nevada. Relying on 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3), (a)(4) and (d), the Order proposed revoking Respondent's retail pharmacy Certificate of Registration, BP6558069, and denying any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration. It further notified Respondent that its registration was suspended immediately, that the suspension would remain in effect until a final determination in this proceeding and that DEA agents were authorized to and directed to place under seal and remove all controlled substances possessed by Respondent and take into their possession, Respondent's certificate of registration.

As grounds for revocation, the Order to Show Cause alleged, among other things, that between March 12 and September 26, 2002, Respondent provided 1,599,828 dosage units of controlled substances via the Internet pursuant to prescriptions issued by physicians who had not established physician-patient relationships with the persons to whom the prescriptions were issued.

On January 22, 2003, Respondent, through counsel, timely requested a hearing in this matter and on January

24, 2003, the Presiding Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner (Judge Bittner) issued the Government, as well as Respondent, an Order for Prehearing Statements. On February 12, 2003, in lieu of filing a prehearing statement, the Government filed Government's Motion for Summary Judgment and to Extend the Time to File Prehearing Statements if Necessary. The Government argued Respondent had entered into a stipulation and agreement with the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy (Nevada Board) in which, among other things, Respondent agreed to revocation of its Nevada pharmacy license, that on January 27, 2003, the Nevada Board ratified the stipulation and agreement and that as a result, Respondent is no longer authorized to dispense or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Nevada, the jurisdiction in which it is registered, a prerequisite for DEA registration. Attached to the Government's motion was a copy of the stipulation and agreement and the Nevada Board's order ratifying it.

On February 14, 2003, Judge Bittner issued a Memorandum to Counsel and Order staying the filing of prehearing statements and providing Respondent until February 28, 2003, to respond to the Government's motion. Respondent did not file any response.

On March 19, 2003, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (Opinion and Recommended Decision). As part of her recommended ruling, Judge Bittner granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and found that Respondent lacked authorization to handle controlled substances in Nevada, the jurisdiction in which it was registered. Judge Bittner also recommended that the Respondent's DEA certificate of registration be revoked and that any pending applications for renewal or modification be denied. No exceptions were filed by either party to Judge Bittner's Opinion and Recommended Decision and on April 22, 2003, the record of these proceedings was transmitted to the Office of the then-DEA Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues her 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 Respondent, registered to do business in the State of Nevada, was

issued DEA Certificate of Registration BP6558069 as a retail pharmacy. The Acting Deputy Administrator further finds that on January 22, 2003, Respondent voluntarily entered into a "Stipulation and Agreement between Board Staff and Prescriptionline.com" in which Respondent agreed to revocation of its State of Nevada pharmacy license. On January 27, 2003, the Nevada Board issued an Order ratifying the stipulation and agreement. Respondent has not denied that it currently is not licensed to practice pharmacy in Nevada, its jurisdiction of registration.

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 dispense or handle controlled substances in the State in which it conducts business. See 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See *Karen Joe Smily, M.D.*, 68 FR 48944 (2003); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919 (1988); *Wingfield Drugs, Inc.*, 52 FR 27070 (1987).

Here, it is clear that Respondent is not currently licensed to handle controlled substances in Nevada, the jurisdiction in which it maintains a DEA registration. Therefore, it is not currently entitled to a DEA registration.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in her by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the DEA Certificate of Registration issued to Prescriptionline.com be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending applications for renewal of such registration be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effecting March 8, 2004.

Dated: January 7, 2004.

Michele M. Leonhart,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 04-2342 Filed 2-4-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importer of Controlled Substances Notice of Registration

By notice dated September 2, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on October 27, 2003 (68 FR 61234-61235), Sigma Aldrich Company, Subsidiary of Sigma-Aldrich

Corporation, 3500 Dekalb Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63118, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as an importer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Cathinone (1235)	I
Methcathinone (1237)	I
Aminorex (1585)	I
Gamma Hydroxybutyric Acid (2010)	I
Methaqualone (2565)	I
lBogaine (7260)	I
Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315)	I
Mescaline (7381)	I
4-Bromo-2, 5-dimethoxy-amphetamine (7391)	I
4-Bromo-2, 5-dimethoxyphenethylamine (7392)	I
2, 5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396)	I
3, 4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400)	I
N-Hydroxy-3, 4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (7402)	I
3, 4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404)	I
3, 4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404)	I
Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) (7405)	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411)	I
Bufotenine (7433)	I
Psilocyn (7438)	I
Benzylpiperazine (BZP) (7493)	I
1-[3-(trifluoro-methyl)phenyl] Piperazine (TFMPP) (7494)	I
Heroin (9200)	I
Normorphine (9313)	I
Etonitazene (9624)	II
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methamphetamine (1105)	II
Methylphenidate (1724)	II
Amobarbital (2125)	II
Pentobarbital (2270)	II
Secobarbital (2315)	II
Glutethimide (2550)	II
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
Cocaine (9041)	II
Codeine (9050)	II
Diprenorphine (9058)	II
Oxycodone (9143)	II
Hydromorphone (9150)	II
Ecgonine (9180)	II
Ethylmorphine (9190)	II
Hydrocodone (9193)	II
Levorphanol (9220)	II
Meperidine (9230)	II
Methadone (9250)	II
Dextropropoxyphene, bulk (non-dosage forms) (9273)	II
Morphine (9300)	II
Thebaine (9333)	II
Opium powdered (9649)	II
Oxymorphone (9652)	II
Fentanyl (9801)	II

The firm plans to repackage and offer as pure standards controlled substances

in small quantities for drug testing and analysis.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in title 21, United States code, section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Sigma Aldrich Company to import the listed 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, at this time. DEA has investigated Sigma Aldrich Company on a regular basis to ensure that the company's continued registration is consistent with the public interest. This investigation included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with State and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to section 1008(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act and in accordance with title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, section 1301.34, the above firm is granted registration as an importer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed.

Dated: January 12, 2004.
Laura M. Nagel,
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.
 [FR Doc. 04-2344 Filed 2-4-04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

VI Pharmacy, Rushdi Z. Salem; Revocation of Registration

On June 13, 2003, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to VI Pharmacy (VI) and Rushdi Z. Salem of St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, notifying VI of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke VI's DEA Certificate of Registration, BV5900421 under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1), (a)(2) and (a)(4) and deny any pending applications for renewal or modification of VI's retail pharmacy registration. As a basis for revocation, the Order to Show Cause alleged that VI materially falsified an application for registration, that Mr. Salem, the owner/operator of VI had been convicted of a felony related to controlled substances and that VI's continued registration was inconsistent with the public interest. The Order to Show Cause also notified VI that should

no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, its hearing right would be deemed waived.

The Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to VI and Mr. Salem, at VI's registered location at 25 Dronings Gade Main Street, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands 00801. According to the return receipt, the Order to Show Cause was received at the registered address and receipted for by B. Nelthrop on or around June 23, 2003.

DEA has not received a request for hearing or any other reply from VI or anyone purporting to represent it in this matter. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that (1) 30 days have passed since the receipt of the Order to Show Cause, and (2) no request for a hearing having been received, concludes that VI is deemed to have waived its hearing right. See *Samuel S. Jackson, D.D.S.*, 67 FR 65145 (2002); *David W. Linder*, 67 FR 12579 (2002). After considering material from the investigative file, the Acting Deputy Administrator now enters her final order without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(d) and (e) and 1301.46.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1), the Acting Deputy Administrator may revoke a DEA Certificate of Registration and deny any pending applications for such a certificate upon a finding that the registrant has materially falsified any DEA application for registration. Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(2), the Deputy Administrator may revoke a DEA Certificate of Registration and deny any pending applications for such a certificate upon a finding that the registrant has been convicted of a felony related to controlled substances under State or Federal law.

In addition, the Acting Deputy Administrator may revoke a DEA Certificate of Registration and deny any pending applications for such certificate if she determines that the issuance of such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest as determined pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(a)(4) and 823(f). Section 823(f) requires the following factors be considered:

- (1) The recommendation of the appropriate state licensing board or professional disciplinary authority.
- (2) The applicant's experience in dispensing, or conducting research with respect to controlled substances.
- (3) The applicant's conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of controlled substances.
- (4) Compliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances.
- (5) Such other conduct which may threaten the public health or safety.