

1306.04, and obviously lacked a legitimate medical purpose. *See also* 21 U.S.C. 822(a)(2) (“Every person who dispenses \* \* \* shall obtain from the Attorney General a registration. \* \* \*”); *id.* § 841(a)(1) (“Except as authorized by this subchapter, it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally \* \* \* to \* \* \* distribute, or dispense \* \* \* a controlled substance”); *id.* § 843(a)(2) (“It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally \* \* \* to use in the course of the \* \* \* distribution[] or dispensing of a controlled substance \* \* \* a registration number which is \* \* \* issued to another person”).

Respondent did not report the violations, Tr. 170, and in his brief he trivialized the violations as just “mistakes” of the sort that “[c]lerks, and other people who work for doctors, make.” Resp. Br. (Pt. II) at 22. Notwithstanding the illegal nature of these acts (which had happened shortly after Respondent began his arrangement with Just USA), and that Respondent had no way of confirming the validity of Just USA’s representation that its employees had used his name and registration to backdate prescriptions only once or twice, Respondent continued to work for them.

As the record demonstrates, Respondent issued hundreds of illegal prescriptions for highly abused and dangerous controlled substances.<sup>32</sup> While Respondent ceased his illegal activity—after engaging in it for approximately one year—he maintained throughout the hearing that his “prescribing was appropriate,” Tr. 99, and that it was illegal in only about two or three other States in addition to the seven States identified by Just USA and where he prescribed to anyway. *Id.* at 161. Moreover, when confronted with the evidence showing that that he had prescribed to persons in those seven States, Respondent’s did not accept responsibility for having done so, but rather blamed others.

I thus conclude that Respondent has not accepted responsibility for his misconduct and that he has failed to rebut the Government’s *prima facie* showing that his continued registration “would be inconsistent with the public interest.” 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Accordingly, Respondent’s registration will be

revoked and his pending application will be denied.

#### Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) & 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b) & 0.104, I hereby order that DEA Certificate of Registration, AS2352653,<sup>33</sup> issued to Patrick W. Stodola, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending application to renew or modify the registration be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective June 4, 2009.

Dated: April 24, 2009.

**Michele M. Leonhart,**

*Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc. E9–10245 Filed 5–4–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–65,680]

##### SMTC Enclosure Systems Division Franklin, MA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 26, 2009 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of SMTC, Enclosure Systems Division, Franklin, Massachusetts.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of March 2009.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9–10210 Filed 5–4–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–65,162]

##### Dana Holding Corporation, Humboldt, TN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 6, 2009 in response to a worker petition filed by the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO) on behalf of workers of Dana Holding Corporation, Humboldt, Tennessee.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of March 2009.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9–10212 Filed 5–4–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–65,231]

##### Rawlings Sporting Goods, Washington, MO; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on February 12, 2009 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers of Rawlings Sporting Goods, Washington, Missouri.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of March 2009.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9–10215 Filed 5–4–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FN–P

<sup>32</sup> As found above, Respondent maintained at the hearing that hydrocodone is not addictive or dangerous. Yet in 2002, the abuse of hydrocodone drugs resulted in more than 27,000 emergency room visits. Moreover, the drug is also highly abused by teenagers, among others. Respondent’s testimony buttresses my conclusion that Respondent cannot be trusted to acted responsibly.

<sup>33</sup> While the Show Cause Order did not expressly reference Respondent’s registration number XS2352653, which authorizes him to dispense narcotic drugs for the purposes of maintenance or detoxification treatment, the holding of a practitioner’s registration under 21 U.S.C. 823(f) is a prerequisite for obtaining the separate registration required to conduct narcotic treatment under 21 U.S.C. 823(g). *See id.* § 823(g)(2)(D)(i). Accordingly, the revocation of Respondent practitioner’s registration requires the revocation of his registration under 21 U.S.C. 823(g).