Estimated average hours per response: 2.0 hours.

Number of respondents: 33.

General description of report: This information collection is mandatory (12 U.S.C. 1467a(b)(2)(A)). The FR H–(b)11 covers 6 different items. However, the Federal Reserve has determined that supplemental information in response to a yes answer for the Quarterly Savings and Loan Holding Company Report (FR 2320; OMB No. 7100–0345) FR 2320's questions 24, 25, and 26 may be protected from disclosure under exemption 4 of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which covers ''trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person [that is] privileged or confidential'' (5 U.S.C. 522(b)(4)). Disclosure of this type of information is likely to cause substantial competitive harm to the SLHC providing the information and thus this information is protected from disclosure under FOIA exemption 4 (5 U.S.C. 522(b)(4)).

With regard to the supplemental information for other FR 2320 questions that would be provided in item 3 of the FR H–(b)11, as well as all other items of the FR H–(b)11, respondents may request confidential treatment of such information under one or more of the exemptions in the FOIA. All such requests for confidential treatment will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and in response to a specific request for disclosure.

Abstract: The FR H–(b)11 collects from most top-tier SLHCs information on filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, reports provided by the nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and securities analysts, supplemental information for select questions from the FR 2320, financial statements, and other materially important events and exhibits. The Federal Reserve uses the FR H–(b)11 data to analyze the overall financial condition of SLHCs to ensure safe and sound operations.

Current Actions: On July 29, 2013, the Federal Reserve published a notice in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 45534) requesting public comment for 60 days on the proposal to extend for three years, with revision, the Savings Association Holding Company Report. The comment period for this notice expired on September 27, 2013. The Federal Reserve received one comment letter of support from an SLHC. The revisions will be implemented as proposed and are effective with the September 30, 2013, report date.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, October 2, 2013.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–24397 Filed 10–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of a Bank or Bank Holding Company

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire shares of a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than October 22, 2013.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (William Lang, Senior Vice President) 100 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105–1521:

1. *Robert T. Strong and Kathleen M. Strong,* both of Southampton, Pennsylvania; to retain voting shares of Quaint Oak Bancorp, Inc., and thereby indirectly retain voting shares of Quaint Oak Bank, both of Southampton, Pennsylvania.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, October 2, 2013.

Michael J. Lewandowski,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–24391 Filed 10–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The applications will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than November 1, 2013.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Jacqueline G. King, Community Affairs Officer) 90 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480–0291:

1. *Dairy State Bancorp, Inc.,* Rice Lake, Wisconsin; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Bank of Turtle Lake, Turtle Lake, Wisconsin.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, October 2, 2013.

Michael J. Lewandowski,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–24392 Filed 10–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The applications will also be

available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1843). Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than November 1, 2013.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Chapelle Davis, Assistant Vice President) 1000 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309:

1. *C1 Financial, Inc.,* St. Petersburg, Florida; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of C1 Bank, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, October 3, 2013.

Margaret McCloskey Shanks,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2013–24398 Filed 10–7–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 12–46]

Joe W. Morgan, D.O.; Decision and Order

On September 13, 2012, Chief Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) John J. Mulrooney, II, issued the attached Recommended Decision (hereinafter, cited as R.D.). Therein, the ALJ recommended that I revoke Respondent's Certificate of Registration and deny any pending application to renew or modify his registration on two independent grounds. R.D. at 47.[1] First, the ALJ found that Respondent currently lacks authority to dispense controlled substances in Tennessee, the State in which he holds his DEA registration, and therefore no longer satisfies the Controlled Substances Act's prerequisite for holding a practitioner's registration. *See id.* at 26 (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f), and 824(a)(3)). Second, the ALJ found that Respondent had committed acts which render his registration inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* at 35–47; *see also* 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4).

Neither party filed timely exceptions to the Recommended Decision. However, on November 13, 2012, Respondent filed a pleading entitled: ''Motion and Request to Add Information Relevant to the Order to Show Cause Hearing Process.'' This pleading has been made a part of the record and treated as a Motion for Reconsideration.[2] As explained below, while I grant Respondent's motion in part and reject the ALJ's conclusion that Respondent's lack of state authority supports the revocation of his registration, I nonetheless adopt the ALJ's finding that Respondent has committed acts, which render his registration inconsistent with the public interest and that he has not rebutted the Government's *prima facie* case.

Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration

Therein, Respondent contends that his Tennessee medical license was re-instated on November 7, 2012, and that he therefore meets the requirement for registration ''found at 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3).'' Mot. for Recon. at 1. As support for his motion, Respondent attached a copy of a November 7, 2012 Order of Compliance, which was issued by the Tennessee Board of Osteopathic Examination. The Order states that Respondent's state license was suspended ''until he submitted to an assessment by the Vanderbilt Comprehensive Assessment Program'' and that Respondent ''has satisfactorily complied with the requirement by obtaining the required assessment.'' Order of Compliance, at 1. The Board further ordered that ''the suspension of [Respondent's] license is lifted'' and placed his license ''on probation for a period of not less than five (5) years.'' *Id.* at 1–2.

A motion for reconsideration is properly considered when it is based on newly discovered evidence. *See National Ecological Found.* v. *Alexander,* 496 F.3d 466, 475 (6th Cir. 2007). Because the Board's Order reinstating Respondent's medical license clearly constitutes evidence, which was not available to Respondent at the time of the hearing, I grant Respondent's motion to reconsider. I thus conclude that Respondent now holds authority in the State of Tennessee, the State in which he is registered, to dispense controlled substances, subject to the condition prohibiting him from prescribing schedule II and III controlled substances, ''with the exception of testosterone for hormone replacement therapy under an approved practice plan.'' Gov't Mot. for Summary Disposition, Ex. A., at 5. This finding thus precludes reliance on the ALJ's conclusion that Respondent's registration should be revoked in its entirety under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the provision which authorizes the Attorney General to revoke a registration ''upon a finding that the registrant . . has had his State license or registration suspended, revoked, or denied by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.''

However, in his motion, Respondent further argues that I should reject the ALJ's finding incredible, his testimony that he planned to take courses in prescribing controlled substances and recordkeeping several months subsequent to the hearing, when, as he testified, he ''hopefully [would] be financially able to'' do so.[3] Tr. 126; *see* Mot. for Recon., at 2. Respondent further argues that he has completed an intensive course in medical recordkeeping and argues that his having done so, ''gives credibility that [he] spoke the truth and is credible, [and] that he has done what he said he intends to do.'' Mot. for Recon. at 2. Respondent also argues that he has registered for a course in controlled-substance management, which was offered in December 2012. In support of his assertions, Respondent provided a copy of a Certificate of Completion for the medical recordkeeping course and an email from the registrar/coordinator of continuing medical education at the Case Western University School of Medicine forwarding to him ''a confirmation packet'' for the latter course. Mot. for Recon. Attach., at 1.

Even assuming that these documents constitute newly discovered evidence,[4] the evidence is only probative on the issue of what remedial measures Respondent has undertaken to

[1] All citations to the R.D. are to the ALJ's slip opinion.

[2] The Government did not respond to Respondent's motion.

[3] The hearing was held on August 1, 2012; Respondent testified that he planned to take the course in the November/December timeframe. Tr. 126.

[4] The evidence showed that in a March 16, 2011 order, the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine ordered Respondent to take both courses within a twenty-four month period. GX 7, at 29, 36. While Respondent was given two years to comply, certainly, Respondent could have taken both courses before the August 1, 2012 hearing in this matter. And while these courses may only be offered twice a year, Tr. 126, his evidence regarding his completion of the recordkeeping course and registering for the controlled-substance management course hardly seems to constitute ''newly discovered evidence.''