

### Summary of Expected Impacts

The Project's proximity to Castle Mountains National Monument and Mojave National Preserve has raised concerns that increased visual and noise disturbances from mining construction and operations might affect recreational and traditional use, cultural sites, seeps and springs, and biological resources in the area. While there are concerns over habitat loss and impacts to native vegetation, the mine continues to provide guzzlers for wildlife and has a rare native plant nursery. The mine is recognized for its successful reclamation methods and hosts on-site research dedicated exclusively to cultivating vegetation native to the Mojave Desert.

### Anticipated Permits and Authorizations

In addition to the requested authorization to perform mineral extraction under a mining plan of operations, other Federal, state, and local authorizations would be required for the project. These include authorizations under the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and other laws and regulations determined to be applicable to the project.

### Schedule for the Decision-Making Process

The BLM will provide opportunity for public participation consistent with the NEPA process. The Draft EIS is anticipated to be available for public review spring 2026 and the Final EIS is anticipated to be released in summer 2026 with a Record of Decision fall 2026.

### Public Scoping Process

This notice of intent initiates the scoping period. The BLM will hold one in-person public scoping meeting. The specific date and time of this scoping meeting will be announced at least 15 days in advance on the BLM website <https://www.blm.gov/california> and at <https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2039209/510>.

### Responsible Official

Ron Nuckles, Field Manager, Needles Field Office, California Desert District, Bureau of Land Management.

### Nature of Decision To Be Made

The BLM's potential decision relative to the proposed amendment as informed by the EIS includes: (1) approval of the proposed Castle Mountain Mine Amendment to Plan of Operations Project as submitted; (2) approval of the proposed Castle Mountain Mine Amendment to Plan of Operations Project subject to changes or conditions, as analyzed in the EIS, that the BLM

deems necessary to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of public lands; or (3) denial of the proposed Castle Mountain Mine Amendment to Plan of Operations Project if the BLM determines that the proposal would result in unnecessary or undue degradation of public lands.

### Additional Information

The BLM will utilize and coordinate the NEPA process to help support compliance with applicable procedural requirements under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. 306108) as provided in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3), including public involvement requirements of Section 106. The information about historic and cultural resources and threatened and endangered species within the area potentially affected by the proposed project will assist the BLM in identifying and evaluating impacts to such resources.

The BLM will consult with Indian Tribal Nations on a government-to-government basis in accordance with Executive Order 13175, BLM Manual Section 1780, and other Departmental policies. Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets and potential impacts to cultural resources, will be given due consideration. Federal, state, and local agencies, along with Indian Tribal Nations and other stakeholders that may be interested in or affected by the proposed action that the BLM is evaluating, are invited to participate in the scoping process and, if eligible, may request or be requested by the BLM to participate in the development of the environmental analysis as a cooperating agency.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

(Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4321–4347)

### Ronald Nuckles,

Field Manager, Needles Field Office, BLM California Desert District.

[FR Doc. 2025–19593 Filed 10–17–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4331–15-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Abolghasem Rezaei, M.D.; Decision and Order

On May 22, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Abolghasem Rezaei, M.D., of Lawton, Oklahoma (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1 at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration, No. FR0228747, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is "currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Oklahoma, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2.<sup>1</sup> "A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant's/applicant's right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC]." 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, "[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 CFR] 1316.67." *Id.* 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

### Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are deemed admitted. According to the OSC, on December 5, 2024, the Oklahoma State

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated July 28, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Government's included Notice of Service of Order to Show Cause indicates that on June 11, 2025, Registrant was personally served with a copy of the OSC. RFAAX 2, at 1; *see also id.* at 3 (Form-DEA 12 signed by Registrant, acknowledging receipt of the OSC).

Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Control (OBND) suspended Registrant's OBND registration. RFAAX 1, at 2.<sup>2</sup> According to Oklahoma online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,<sup>3</sup> Registrant's OBND registration is inactive. OBND Registrant Search, <https://obnddc.us.thenticloud.net/webs/obnddc/register> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma, the state in which he is registered with DEA.<sup>4</sup>

### Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 "upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances."

With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) ("The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances 'if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices' . . . The very definition of a 'practitioner' eligible to prescribe includes physicians 'licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices' to dispense controlled substances. 802(21).") The

<sup>2</sup> On February 13, 2025, OBND upheld the suspension. *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency "may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision." United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979).

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), "[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary." The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this decision, is not licensed to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at [dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov](mailto:dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov).

Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).<sup>5</sup>

Pursuant to Oklahoma's Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Act, "[e]very person who manufactures, distributes, dispenses, prescribes, administers or uses for scientific purposes any controlled dangerous substance within or into this state . . . shall obtain a registration issued by the Director of the [OBND], in accordance with rules promulgated by the Director." Okla. Stat. tit. 63, § 2–302(A) (2024).<sup>6</sup>

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma because his OBND registration is inactive. As discussed above, a person must hold a valid OBND registration to dispense a controlled substance in Oklahoma, subject to limited exceptions not applicable here. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant's DEA registration be revoked.

### Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. FR0228747 issued to

<sup>5</sup> This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). First, Congress defined the term "practitioner" to mean "a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice." 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner's registration, Congress directed that "[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices." 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner's registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.

<sup>6</sup> Although there are limited circumstances under which a person "may lawfully possess controlled dangerous substances" without a registration issued by the Director of the OBND, based on the information furnished by the Government, none are applicable here. *Id.* § 2–302(H).

Abolghasem Rezaei, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Abolghasem Rezaei, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Abolghasem Rezaei, M.D., for additional registration in Oklahoma. This Order is effective November 19, 2025.

### Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on October 9, 2025, by Administrator Terrance Cole. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

**Heather Achbach,**

*Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2025–19598 Filed 10–17–25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Ali Elhorr, M.D.; Decision and Order

On May 22, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Ali Elhorr, M.D. (Applicant), of Dearborn, Michigan. Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the denial of Applicant's application for DEA registration, Control No. W22137646C, alleging that Applicant is mandatorily excluded from participation in Medicare, Medicaid, and all Federal health care programs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a–7(a) and that Applicant materially falsified his application for registration. *Id.*, at 2–3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(5), 824(a)(1)).

On July 7, 2025, the Government submitted an RFAA requesting that the Agency issue a default final order denying Applicant's application. RFAA, at 1, 5. After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting the analysis as set forth in detail below, the Agency finds that Applicant is in default, finds that Applicant is