amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–6 and 11–26 of the ‘631 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to §210.10(b)(1) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is “syringes that are pre-filled with ophthalmic medication, and components of such syringes, including barrels, plungers, and stoppers”;

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule §210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties or other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(4) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainants are:
    Novartis Pharma AG, Forum 1, Novartis Campus, CH–4056 Basel, Switzerland.
    Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation,
    One Health Plaza, East Hanover, New Jersey, 07936.
    Novartis Technology LLC, One Health Plaza, East Hanover, New Jersey, 07936.

(b) The respondent is the following entity alleged to be in violation of section 337, and is the party upon which the complaint is to be served:
    Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 77 Old Saw Mill River Road, Tarrytown, New York 10591.


(5) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent in accordance with §210.13 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainants of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of the respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020–16318 Filed 7–24–20; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–449 and 731–TA–1118–1121 (Second Review)]

Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube From China, Korea, Mexico, and Turkey

Determination

On the basis of the record 1 developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from China and antidumping duty orders on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from China, Korea, Mexico, and Turkey would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on May 1, 2019 (84 FR 18577) and determined on August 5, 2019 that it would conduct full reviews (84 FR 44330, August 23, 2019). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission’s reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register on January 22, 2020 (85 FR 3717). Subsequently, the Commission cancelled its previously scheduled hearing following a request on behalf of the domestic interested parties (85 FR 31550, May 26, 2020).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on July 22, 2020. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5086 (July 2020), entitled Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe and Tube from China, Korea, Mexico, and Turkey: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–449 and 731–TA–1118–1121 (Second Review).

By order of the Commission.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020–16316 Filed 7–24–20; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–0013]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Application for Tax-Exempt Transfer of Firearms and Registration to Special Occupational Taxpayer—ATF Form 3 (5320.3)

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: 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.

1 The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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; and
—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; 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 with change of a currently approved collection.

(2) The Title of the Form/Collection: Application for Tax-Exempt Transfer of Firearm and Registration to Special Occupational Taxpayer—ATF Form 3 (5320.3) form is used by Federal firearms licensees, to apply for the transfer and registration of a National Firearms Act (NFA) firearm that is subject to exemption from transfer tax, as provided by 26 U.S.C. 5852(d).

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: An estimated 130,289 respondents will utilize the form annually, and it will take each respondent approximately 30 minutes to complete their responses.

(6) An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 65,145 hours, which is equal to 130,289 (# of respondents) * 1 (# of responses per respondent) * .5 (30 minutes or the total time taken to complete each response).

(7) An Explanation of the Change in Estimates: The adjustments to this information collection include a decrease in the total responses by 47,211. Consequently, the annual burden hours has also reduced by 23,605. However, the public cost increased to $4,292, because some respondents completed and mailed their applications to ATF for processing, although this collection can be electronically submitted.

If additional information is required contact: Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 3E405A, Washington, DC 20530.


DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Frank Joseph Stirlacci, M.D.; Decision and Order

I. Introduction

On April 5, 2017, the then-Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause to Frank Joseph Stirlacci, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent), of Agawam, Massachusetts and Hammond, Indiana. Administrative Law Judge Exhibit (hereinafter, ALJX) 1 (Order to Show Cause [hereinafter, OSC]), at 1. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent’s DEA certificate of registration (hereinafter, registration) on the ground that he “materially falsified . . . [his] application for renewal in violation of 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824a(1).” Id.

The substantive grounds for the proceeding, as more specifically alleged in the OSC, are that Respondent, “[o]n or about February 7, 2017, . . . submitted a renewal application for . . . [his registration number] BS5000411 seeking to change . . . [his] registered address to . . . Hammond, Indiana . . . [and] made two material false statements in . . . [his] renewal application”—(1) answering “no” to whether he had ever been convicted of a crime in connection with controlled substances under state or federal law, or whether any such action is pending, and (2) answering “no” to whether he had ever surrendered (for cause) or had a state professional license revoked, suspended, denied, restricted, or placed on probation, or whether any such action is pending. Id. at 2. Citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824a(1), the OSC concluded that “DEA must revoke . . . [Respondent’s registration] based upon . . . [his] material falsifications of . . . [his] renewal application.” Id.

The OSC notified Respondent of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement while waiving his right to a hearing, the procedures for electing each option, and the consequences for failing to elect either option. Id. at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Respondent timely requested a hearing by letter dated April 29, 2017. ALJX 2 [Request for Hearing].

The matter was placed on the docket of the Office of Administrative Law Judges and assigned to Chief Administrative Law Judge (hereinafter, ALJ) John J. Mulrooney, II. The parties initially agreed to eight stipulations. 1

1 “1. The Respondent is registered with the DEA as a practitioner to handle controlled substances in Schedules II to V under DEA CDR [certificate of registration] No. BS5000411, with a registered address of Regional Health Center, 559 State Street, Hammond, Indiana 46320. The Respondent’s DEA CDR expires by its own terms on February 29, 2020.

2. From April 17, 2015 to May 11, 2015, the Respondent was incarcerated in Kentucky.

3. On February 5, 2016, the Respondent entered into a Voluntary Agreement Not to Practice Medicine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with the Board of Registration.

4. On January 26, 2017, the Respondent was indicted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Continued