210.5(e)(2) (19 CFR 201.6(b) & 210.5(e)(2)). Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed simultaneously with any confidential filing. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) By the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS.

This action is taken under the authority of section 357 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Katherine Hiner,
Supervisory Attorney.

Issued: September 15, 2021.

---

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION


Cold-Rolled Steel Flat Products From Brazil, China, India, Japan, Korea, and the United Kingdom; Notice of Commission Determination To Conduct Full Five-Year Reviews


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty orders on cold-rolled steel flat products from Brazil, China, India, and Korea and the antidumping duty orders on cold-rolled steel flat products from Brazil, China, India, Japan, Korea, and the United Kingdom would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date.

DATES: September 7, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caitlyn Hendricks (202–205–2058), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (https://www.usitc.gov). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at https://edis.usitc.gov. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 7, 2021, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response and the respondent interested party group responses from Brazil, Japan, and the United Kingdom to its notice of institution (86 FR 29286, June 1, 2021) were adequate and that the respondent interested party group responses from China, India, and Korea were inadequate. However, the Commission determined to conduct full reviews concerning the orders on cold-rolled steel flat products from China, India, and Korea to promote administrative efficiency considering its determinations to conduct full reviews of the orders with respect to Brazil, Japan, and the United Kingdom. A record of the Commissioners’ votes, the Commission’s statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner’s statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission’s website.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to §207.62 of the Commission’s rules.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2021–20286 Filed 9–17–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

---

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–0003]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection of eComments Requested; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; Report of Multiple Sale or Other Disposition of Pistols and Revolvers—ATF Form 3310.4

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

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), Department of Justice (DOJ) 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.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional 30 days until October 20, 2021.

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 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;
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

Type of Information Collection: Revision of a currently approved collection.

The Title of the Form/Collection: Report of Multiple Sale or Other Disposition of Pistols and Revolvers.

The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection: Form number: ATF Form 3310.4.

Component: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice.

Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:

Primary: Business or other for-profit. Other: Federal Government and State, Local, or Tribal Government.

Abstract: The Report of Multiple Sale or Other Disposition of Pistols and Revolvers—ATF Form 3310.4 is used to report multiple sale or other disposition of two or more pistols, revolvers, or any combination of pistols or revolvers to an unlicensed person, whether it occurs one time or within five consecutive business days.

An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: An estimated 82,011 respondents will complete this form approximately 6.33365 times annually, and it will take each respondent approximately 15 minutes to complete their responses.

An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 129,857 hours, which is equal to 82,011 (# of respondents) * 6.33365 (# of responses per respondent) * .25 (15 mins).

An Explanation of the Change in Estimates: The increase in total respondents, responses, and burden hours, by 4,106, 63,495, and 15,873 hours respectively, is due to the revision of agency estimates, and a general increase in the number of respondents since the last renewal in 2018.

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, Mail Stop 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: September 14, 2021.

Melody Braswell,
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 20–15]

Salman Akbar, M.D.; Decision and Order

On March 2, 2020, a former Acting Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (hereinafter, OSC) to Salman Akbar, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent). Administrative Law Judge Exhibit (hereinafter, ALJ Ex.) 1. (OSC) at 1. The OSC informed Respondent of the immediate suspension of his DEA Certificate of Registration Number BA5092856 (hereinafter, registration) and proposed its revocation, the denial of any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration, and the denial of any pending applications for additional DEA registrations pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 823(f), because Respondent’s “continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest.” Id. (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 823(f)).

In response to the OSC, Respondent timely requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, ALJ Ex. 2. The hearing in this matter was conducted from July 21–22, 2020 at the DEA Hearing Facility in Arlington, Virginia, with the parties and their witnesses participating through video teleconference. On August 20, 2020, Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney (hereinafter, Chief ALJ) issued his Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision (hereinafter, Recommended Decision or RD). In response to the OSC, Respondent timely requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. ALJ Ex. 2. The hearing in this matter was conducted from July 21–22, 2020 at the DEA Hearing Facility in Arlington, Virginia, with the parties and their witnesses participating through video teleconference. On August 20, 2020, Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney (hereinafter, Chief ALJ) issued his Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision (hereinafter, Recommended Decision or RD). On September 9, 2020, the Government and Respondent filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision (hereinafter, Gov Exceptions and Resp Exceptions, respectively). Having reviewed the entire record, I find the Respondent’s Exceptions without merit and I adopt the Chief ALJ’s rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction with minor modifications, where noted herein. *A

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. BA5092856 issued to Salman Akbar, M.D. Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I further hereby deny any pending application of Salman Akbar, M.D. to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Salman Akbar, M.D. for registration in Virginia. This Order is effective October 20, 2021.

Anne Milgram,
Administrator.

The Respondent’s Exceptions

In his Posthearing Brief, Respondent acknowledged that the Government had “offered sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie case,” but he argued that his registration should not be revoked, because he had “countered the Government’s showing with substantial mitigating evidence that demonstrates his continued registration will not be harmful to the public interest.” ALJ Ex. 20 (Resp Posthearing), at 1. The Chief ALJ disagreed with Respondent, finding that revocation was the appropriate remedy, based on Respondent’s failure to accept responsibility for his misconduct and his failure to offer sufficient remedial evidence. RD, at 33–38. In determining that Respondent had not adequately accepted responsibility, the Chief ALJ relied in part on Respondent’s statements that he always issues prescriptions within the usual course of professional practice and for a legitimate medical purpose. See, e.g., id. at 35 (citing Tr. 427–29).

Respondent takes Exception to the Chief ALJ’s reliance on these statements. Respondent argues that these statements do not negate his acceptance of responsibility, because he made them “as a layman physician and not as a person versed in law.” Resp Exceptions, at 1. Respondent asserts that he “recognized that he failed to meet the standards of care established by Virginia law,” but he “did not . . . recognize

*A I have made minor, nonsubstantive, grammatical changes to the RD. Where I have made substantive changes, omitted language for brevity or relevance, or where I have added to or modified the Chief ALJ’s opinion, I have noted the edits in brackets, and I have included specific descriptions of the modifications in brackets or in footnotes marked with an asterisk and a letter.