decisions require Applicant's unequivocal acceptance of responsibility for his actions and a demonstration that he will not engage in future misconduct. *ALRA Labs, Inc.* v. *Drug Enf't Admin.,* 54 F.3d 450, 452 (7th Cir. 1995); *Jayam Krishna-Iyer, M.D.,* 74 FR 459, 463 (2009) (collecting cases); *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.,* 84 FR 46968, 46972–73 (2019). The Agency has decided that the egregiousness and extent of the misconduct are significant factors in determining the appropriate sanction. *Garrett Howard Smith, M.D.,* 83 FR at 18910 (collecting cases). The Agency has also considered the need to deter similar acts by Applicant and by the community of registrants. *Id.*

The extent of Applicant's misconduct proven by the record evidence is eight felonies, six of which relate to controlled substances and all of which were affirmed on appeal, and the unlawful dispensing of over 2,700 dosage units of controlled substances in Schedules II, III, and IV. In addition, as already discussed, Applicant's testimony was not always marked by candor. *Supra* sections II.E. and III.D; *see also* GX 3, at 3 (''Individual I stated that in or about 2011, . . . [Applicant] instructed her to tell investigators that he had written prescriptions for pain medications for her, although this was not true.'').

While Applicant took responsibility for some of his wrongdoing, he did not take unequivocal responsibility for all of it. First, despite the Fourth Circuit Conviction Affirmance, Applicant testified that he did not conspire to distribute and dispense controlled substances in violation of 21 U.S.C. 846. Tr. 115 (denying that he ever unlawfully directed employees to go to pharmacies to pick up prescriptions and return them to him); *see also id.* at 133–34. Instead, he blamed his conspiracy conviction on false testimony of his former office manager. *Id.* at 116–17. Second, concerning his convictions for unlawfully dispensing controlled substances, Applicant denied writing prescriptions that did not have a legitimate dental purpose. *Id.* at 116. Instead, he testified that the prescriptions were legitimate. He explained that his ''problem'' was that the prescriptions lacked proof of their legitimacy in the form of proper documentation. *Id.* at 117. Third, he testified that it ''would be wrong'' for someone to say that he intentionally wrote or gave people prescriptions ''for other than a legitimate medical purpose.'' *Id.* at 121. Instead, he attributed what courts and the VBD determined were unlawful prescriptions to his not being careful enough, his making a mistake, his stupidity, and his being lax. *Id.* at 127–31.

As the Chief ALJ stated, ''It would be illogical for the Agency to entrust . . . [Applicant] with the weighty responsibilities of a DEA registrant where he is unable to even accept the proposition that he has engaged in the misconduct that he was convicted of and which was sustained by the . . . [VBD].'' RD, at 42. ''[S]o long as . . . Applicant adheres to his (almost bizarre) state of denial regarding the actual facts subsumed in his convictions (and Board findings),'' the Chief ALJ continued, ''it would be unreasonable to believe that he will alter his conduct.'' *Id.* Thus, as past Agency decisions make clear that unequivocal acceptance of responsibility is a prerequisite for the forbearance of a sanction, Applicant's failure unequivocally to accept responsibility means that he is not eligible to avoid an unfavorable disposition of his application under the record facts in this case.[28]

Applicant testified that he is not currently prescribing controlled substances in his dental practice and that he does not expect the income he realizes from his practice to increase if he had that authority. Tr. 46–48,113–14. Instead, he stated, he would like authority to prescribe Schedule V controlled substances for the sake of his patients' comfort. *Id.* at 46–48; *cf. supra* n.17 (summarizing Applicant's testimony that his not having authorization to dispense controlled substances has not dissuaded patients from using his practice). Applicant does not cite, and I am unaware of, any past Agency decision that grants a registration for the sake of patient comfort when the applicant was convicted of eight felonies and the unlawful dispensing of over 2,700 controlled substance dosage units. I decline to suggest, let alone establish, such a path.

I agree with the Chief ALJ that ''consideration of the egregiousness of . . . [Applicant's] transgressions likewise does not support a sanction less than an outright denial of . . . [Applicant's] application.'' RD, at 43.

The record in this case paints a picture of a registrant out of control. He distributed and dispensed drugs to himself and others with no justifiable reason, tasked his employees with taking controlled substance scrips to pharmacies and filling them so that he could dole them out to himself, friends, and other non-patients, slapped a fentanyl patch on himself in front of his staff, handed out powerful controlled drugs to his love interests, and prescribed scores of controlled substances to multiple patients without a legitimate medical purpose.

Id. In this context, specific and general deterrence weigh in favor of denying the application. I agree with the Chief ALJ that ''[t]o issue a registration to this . . . [Applicant] would send a message to the regulated community that misconduct (even repeated serious, intentional misconduct) will bear no meaningful consequence, even after state board findings and convictions,'' if the Applicant ''deflects blame onto others.'' *Id.*

Given my decision that Applicant's application is not in the public interest, I conclude that Applicant's proposed Corrective Action Plan provides no basis for me to discontinue or defer this proceeding.

Accordingly, I shall order the denial of Applicant's application.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby deny the application submitted by Hamada Makarita, D.D.S., Control No. W16093263C, seeking registration in Virginia as a practitioner in Schedule V, and any other pending application submitted by Hamada Makarita, D.D.S. for a DEA registration in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This Order is effective August 28, 2020

Timothy J. Shea,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2020–16355 Filed 7–28–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[28] Applicant testified about the changes he made to his dental practice after his felony convictions and the VBD Order. Those so-called ''remedial measures,'' however, ''bear no logical nexus to his established misconduct'' of misusing his controlled substance privileges, as the Chief ALJ observed. RD, at 41. While Applicant testified about the expensive educational courses he took and the ''measures calculated to protect his scripts and prescribing software from potential malfeasance of staff members and burglars,'' he introduced no remedial measure ''that might bear the capacity to protect these powerful tools from his own future malfeasance.'' *Id.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–684]

Bulk Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Application: Euticals Inc.

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before September 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33(a), this is notice that on June 5, 2020, Euticals Inc., 2460 W Bennett Street, Springfield, Missouri 65807–1229, applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substances:

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Gamma Hydroxybutyric Acid.	2010	I
Amphetamine	1100	II
Lisdexamfetamine	1205	II
Methylphenidate	1724	II
Phenylacetone	8501	II
Methadone	9250	II
Methadone intermediate	9254	II
Oripavine	9330	II
Tapentadol	9780	II

The company plans to manufacture the above-listed controlled substances in bulk for distribution to its customers. No other activities for these drug codes are authorized for this registration.

William T. McDermott,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2020–16401 Filed 7–28–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–687]

Bulk Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Application: Siegfried USA, LLC

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before September 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33(a), this is notice that on May 21, 2020, Siegfried USA, LLC, 33 Industrial Park Road, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070–3244, applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substances:

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Amphetamine	1100	II
Tapentadol	9780	II

The company plans to manufacture the above-listed controlled substances in bulk for sale to its customers.

William T. McDermott,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2020–16397 Filed 7–28–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1190–NEW]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Generic Clearance for Pilot and Field Studies for Community Relations Service Data Collection Activities

AGENCY: Community Relations Service, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Community Relations Service (CRS), intends to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for a generic information collection clearance that will allow CRS to conduct a variety of participant feedback studies. CRS will submit the request for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Over the next three years, CRS anticipates collecting program impact evaluation data for reassessing ongoing programs across several areas within community outreach. The purpose of these collections is to gather feedback from participants who attended CRS programs and to use that information to measure the impact of the programs. This work may entail redesigning and/or modifying existing programs based upon received feedback. CRS envisions using surveys, interviews, and other electronic data collection instruments.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until September 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* Find this particular information collection by selecting ''Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments'' or by using the search function.

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 Community Relations Service, 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.

—Evaluate whether (and if so, how) the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced.

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including using 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:* New Generic Information Collection Request.

(2) *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Generic Clearance for Community Relations Service Program Impact Evaluations.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* Form numbers not available for generic clearance. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Community Relations Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Participants of CRS programs in relevant jurisdictional fields; individuals; facilitators; state and local law enforcement, government officials, faith leaders, and community leaders; students; school administrators; and representatives of advocacy organizations.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* We estimate that approximately 80–90 respondents will be involved in program impact evaluations conducted under this clearance over the requested 3-year