

3. Ratification List
4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–405, 406, and 408 and 731–TA–899–901 and 906–908 (Third Review) (Hot-Rolled Steel Products from China, India, Indonesia, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views on or before January 14, 2014.
5. Outstanding action jackets: None
- In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting. Earlier notification of this meeting was not possible.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 13, 2013.

**William R. Bishop,**

*Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2013–30058 Filed 12–13–13; 11:15 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–0036]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: FFL Out-of-Business Records Request

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will submit 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 February 18, 2014. 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 Tracey Robertson, [Tracey.Robertson@atf.gov](mailto:Tracey.Robertson@atf.gov) or (304) 616–4647, Chief, Federal Firearms Licensing Center, 244 Needy Road, Martinsburg, WV 25405. 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 Information Collection

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

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* FFL Out-of-Business Records Request.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: ATF F 5300.3A. 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.

*Need for Collection:* Firearms licensees are required to keep records of acquisition and disposition. These records remain with the licensee as long as they are in business. The ATF F 5300.3A, FFL Out-of-Business Records Request is used by ATF to notify licensees who go out of business. When discontinuance of the business is absolute, such records shall be delivered within thirty days following the business discontinuance to the ATF Out-of-Business Records Center.

(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 1,924 respondents will take approximately 5 minutes to complete the form.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 160.3 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, 145 N Street NE., Room 3W–1407B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 11, 2013.

**Jerri Murray,**

*Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 2013–29885 Filed 12–16–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Thomas Neuschatz, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 2, 2013, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, issued an Order to Show Cause to Thomas Neuschatz, M.D. (hereinafter, Applicant), of Marysville, California. GX 9. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Applicant’s application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, on the ground that his “registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.” *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)).

The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that on April 29, 2011, Applicant had surrendered his DEA registration, and that on May 30, 2011, Applicant applied for a new registration as a practitioner. *Id.* Next, the Order alleged that a DEA investigation had found that Applicant “prescribed and dispensed inordinate amounts of controlled substances . . . under circumstances where [he] knew or should have known the prescriptions were not for legitimate medical purposes.” *Id.*

Next, the Show Cause Order alleged that a medical Expert had reviewed the medical records of three of Applicant’s patients (E.G., R.E., and J.G.) and concluded that he “prescribed controlled substances to those patients without a legitimate medical purpose and/or outside the usual course of professional practice.” *Id.* at 1–2. More specifically, with respect to E.G., the Order alleged that over the course of E.G.’s first five visits, Applicant escalated the daily dose of medication from 22.5 mg of hydrocodone to 80 mg of hydrocodone and 320 mg of oxycodone. *Id.* at 2. The Order further alleged that “[f]rom approximately January 4, 2011 through April 16, 2011, [Applicant] prescribed Dilaudid to E.G. without conducting an in-person physical examination” and during this period, E.G. made a single office visit. *Id.* The Order then alleged that based on