

provisions of section 207.23 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is Tuesday, September 30, 2014. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.25 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is Thursday, October 16, 2014. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigations may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations, including statements of support or opposition to the petition, on or before Thursday, October 16, 2014. On Wednesday, October 29, 2014, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before Friday, October 31, 2014, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.30 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on E-Filing*, available on the Commission's Web site at <http://edis.usitc.gov>, elaborates upon the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to section 201.12 of the Commission's rules, shall not be accepted unless good cause is shown for accepting such submissions, or unless the submission is pursuant to a specific request by a Commissioner or Commission staff.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: July 8, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

Jennifer D. Rohrbach,
Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2014-16253 Filed 7-10-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On July 7, 2014, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Thoro Products Company*, Civil Action No. 1:14-cv-01867.

The Consent Decree resolves the claims of the United States set forth in the complaint against Thoro Products Company for costs incurred and to be incurred in connection with the Twins Inn Superfund Site, located in Arvada, Colorado (the "Site"), pursuant to Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9607. Under the Consent Decree, the settling defendant agrees to reimburse \$400,000 in past costs to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, based upon its limited ability to pay.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. Thoro Products Company*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-11-2-08744. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email	pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov .
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ConsentDecrees.html>. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of

reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$13.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy without the appendices and signature pages, the cost is \$6.75.

Robert Brook,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2014-16182 Filed 7-10-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 11-72]

Moore Clinical Trials, L.L.C.; Decision and Order

On August 8, 2011, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Moore Clinical Trials, L.L.C. (Respondent), of North Little Rock, Arkansas. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a researcher, on the ground that "its registration would be inconsistent with the public interest." ALJ Ex. 1, at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)).

The Show Cause Order alleged that on March 15, 2011, Ms. Greta B. Moore submitted on Respondent's behalf, an "application for a DEA research registration for [s]chedule II controlled substances." *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that while Ms. Moore would be the primary person responsible for ordering and storing controlled substances, she "has no prior experience with handling controlled substances." *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)(2)). The Show Cause Order then alleged that "Ms. Moore initially informed DEA investigators that she had experience researching with controlled substances but then admitted this assertion was not true." *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)(5)).

Next, the Show Cause Order alleged that "[t]he only DEA registered physician that plans to work at [Respondent] will have very limited hours and contact with" it. *Id.* at 2. The Show Cause Order further alleged that "[i]n 2006, the Arkansas State Medical Board suspended this physician's medical license because . . . he . . . pre-signed controlled substance