received is to email them to *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to 202–395–7285. All comments should reference the eight digit OMB number for the collection or the title of the collection. If you have any questions concerning the collection, please contact John Spencer, *fire_tech@atf.gov.*

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Summary of Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Identification Markings Placed on Firearms.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: None. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Business or other for-profit. Other: None. Abstract:

Need for Collection

Each licensed firearms manufacturer or licensed importer must legibly identify each firearm by engraving, casting, stamping (impressing), or otherwise conspicuously placing on the frame or receiver an individual serial number. Also, ATF requires minimum height and depth requirements for identification markings placed on firearms.

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: There will be an estimated 2,962 respondents who will take 5 seconds to mark the firearm.

(6) An estimate of the total burden (in hours) associated with the collection: There are an estimated 2,500 total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, Policy and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Two Constitution Square, Room 2E–508, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012–7173 Filed 3–23–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–0071]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: Notification to Fire Safety Authority of Storage of Explosive Materials

ACTION: 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for ''sixty days'' until May 25, 2012. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact William Miller, Chief, Explosives Industry Programs Branch at *eipb@atf.gov.*

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Notification to Fire Safety Authority of Storage of Explosive Materials.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: None. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Business or other for-profit. Other: Farms, State, Local, or Tribal Government, Individuals or households. The information is necessary for the safety of emergency response personnel responding to fires at sites where explosives are stored. The information is provided both orally and in writing to the authority having jurisdiction for fire safety in the locality in which explosives are stored.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 1,025 respondents will take 30 minutes to complete the notifications.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 513 annual total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, Policy and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Two Constitution

Square, Room 2E–508, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012–7190 Filed 3–23–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 11–1]

Morris W. Cochran, M.D.: Revocation of Registration

On September 22, 2010, I, the then-Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration to Morris W. Cochran, M.D. (Respondent), of Birmingham, Alabama. The Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration BC1701184, and the denial of any pending applications to renew or modify his registration, on the ground that his ''continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest.'' 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4).

More specifically, the Order alleged that while Respondent is authorized to prescribe Suboxone and Subutex ''for maintenance or detoxification treatment pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2) under DEA identification number XC1701184,'' he had ''prescribed methadone,'' a schedule II controlled substance, ''to patients for the purpose of drug addiction treatment'' without the registration required under 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). ALJ Ex.1, at 1–2.

Next, the Order alleged that Respondent had prescribed both methadone and Suboxone, the latter being a Schedule III controlled substance, to numerous patients whose charts show that he ''did not obtain a prior medical history,'' that he ''did not perform an initial physical exam,'' that he ''established little or no basis for the diagnoses,'' and that he ''offered no other treatment other than prescribing controlled substances.'' *Id.* at 2. The Order further alleged that ''[s]uch prescribing was not for a legitimate medical purpose in the usual course of professional practice in violation of 21 CFR 1306.04(a), and in violation of Alabama Administrative Code 540–X–11)(1), which requires that a physician personally obtain an appropriate history, perform a physical exam, make a diagnosis and formulate a therapeutic plan before prescribing drugs to a patient.'' *Id.* Finally, the Order alleged that Respondent had ''continue to prescribe alprazolam, a schedule IV controlled substances depressant, to a patient after [the] patient file explicitly noted that the patient abused this drug.'' *Id.*

Based on the above, I concluded that Respondent's continued registration during the pendency of the proceeding ''constitute[d] an imminent danger to the public health and safety.'' *Id.* I therefore invoked my authority under 21 U.S.C. 824(d) and immediately suspended Respondent's registration.

Respondent requested a hearing on the allegations and the matter was placed on the docket of the Agency's Administrative Law Judges (ALJs). On November 2–4, 2010, an ALJ conducted a hearing in Birmingham, Alabama. ALJ Decision (also ALJ), at 3.

On January 5, 2011, the ALJ issued her decision which recommended that Respondent's registration be revoked. *Id.* at 51. Therein, the ALJ found that the Alabama Medical Board had not made a recommendation in the matter (factor one) and that Respondent has not been convicted of an offense related to the manufacture and distribution of controlled substances (factor three). *Id.* at 43, 48.

With respect to factors two (Respondent's experience in dispensing controlled substances) and four (Respondent's compliance with applicable laws related to controlled substances), the ALJ made extensive findings. First, the ALJ found that Respondent violated DEA regulations because he prescribed drugs other than Suboxone or Subutex on prescription forms that used only his Data Waiver (or X) number. ALJ at 43. The ALJ also found that Respondent ''improperly prescribed Suboxone for substance abuse using his regular DEA registration number rather than the required ''X'' number.'' *Id.*

Next, the ALJ found that Respondent prescribed methadone for detoxification and maintenance treatment without holding the separate registration required to do so under Federal law. ALJ at 43–45. The ALJ specifically rejected Respondent's testimony that he had prescribed methadone to nine patients to treat pain (which does not require a separate registration), noting that Respondent had initially told a DEA Investigator that he was prescribing methadone for detoxification purposes, that several patients who had received methadone had told the Investigator that they were being treated for substance abuse, and that several of the patients had come to Respondent's clinic ''directly after'' being treated by a methadone clinic ''where the prescription of methadone for pain is prohibited'' and had been diagnosed by Respondent as being substance abusers. *Id.* at 44–45. The ALJ also found that Respondent had violated the limitation imposed under Federal law and regulations which limit to 100, the number of patients who can be treated for substance abuse with Suboxone. ALJ at 46–47 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(B)(iii) and 21 CFR 1301.28(b)(1)(iii)).

Next, the ALJ found that Respondent violated both Federal and State regulations because his medical charts ''fail[ed] to list the source and severity of pain when chronic pain [wa]s the diagnosis. ALJ at 47 (citing Ala. Admin. Code 540–X–4.08; 21 CFR 1306.04(a) and 1306.07(c)). The ALJ further found that Respondent's charts ''fail[ed] to record when medical examinations were conducted and the specific results of those examinations in support of diagnoses,'' and that ''[i]n some instances, patients actually reported that no examination was conducted.'' *Id.* The ALJ also found that the ''charts failed to show the use of any treatment options besides the prescribing of controlled substances,'' and that the ''lack of attempts of alternative treatment modalities prior to determining that the patient suffers from chronic pain violates 21 CFR 1306.07(c).'' *Id.*

The ALJ further found that Respondent had post-dated prescriptions for schedule II controlled substances in violation of Federal regulations. *Id.* at 47–48 (citing 21 CFR 1306.05(a) and 1306.12(b)). In addition, the ALJ found that Respondent had admitted to having issued a controlled substance prescription after he was served with the Immediate Suspension Order. *Id.* at 48. The ALJ then found that ''Respondent testified, and the record contains no expert evidence to the contrary, that his treatment of his patients met the standard of care.'' *Id.* However, based on Respondent's improper use of his data-waiver number on prescriptions, his unauthorized prescribing of methadone for maintenance and detoxification purposes, his incomplete records, his failure to recommend any treatment options for his chronic pain patients besides the prescribing of controlled substances, and his issuance of a controlled substance prescription after his registration was suspended, the ALJ concluded that these factors supported the revocation of his registration. *Id.*

With respect to factor five—such other conduct which may threaten public health or safety—the ALJ found that Respondent lacked candor. More