Hoxie, 419 F.3d at 483–84. The Agency also considers the need to deter similar acts by Registrant and by the community of registrants. *Stein,* 84 FR at 46,972–73.

Here, Registrant failed to answer the allegations contained in the OSC and did not otherwise avail itself of the opportunity to prove to the Agency that it can be trusted to maintain its registration. *See supra* Section II. Thus, there is no record evidence that Registrant takes responsibility, let alone unequivocal responsibility, for the misconduct. Accordingly, it has not convinced the Agency that its future controlled-substance-related actions will comply with the CSA such that it can be entrusted with the responsibilities of a registration.

Further, the interests of specific and general deterrence weigh in favor of revocation. Registrant's misconduct in this matter concerns the CSA's ''strict requirements regarding registration'' and, therefore, goes to the heart of the CSA's ''closed regulatory system'' specifically designed ''to conquer drug abuse and to control the legitimate and illegitimate traffic in controlled substances.'' *Gonzales* v. *Raich,* 545 U.S. at 12–14. If the Agency were to allow Registrant to maintain its registration under these circumstances, it would send a dangerous message that compliance with the law is not essential to maintaining a registration.

In sum, Registrant has not offered any evidence on the record that rebuts the Government's case for revocation of its registration, and Registrant has not demonstrated that it can be entrusted with the responsibility of registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order the revocation of Registrant's registration.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. RA0235146 issued to Allied Medical Products, Inc. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby deny any pending applications of Allied Medical Products, Inc., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Allied Medical Products, Inc., for additional registration in California. This Order is effective February 26, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on January 16, 2026, by Administrator Terrance C. 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. 2026–01496 Filed 1–26–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Adam Maass, M.D.; Decision and Order

On September 5, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Adam Maass, M.D., of Bentonville, Arkansas (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. BM6528369, 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 Arkansas, 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.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 3.[1] ''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 March 5, 2025, Registrant pleaded guilty to two counts of harassment. RFAAX 1, at 2. As a result of Registrant's guilty plea, he was ordered to surrender his State of Arkansas medical license. *Id.* On April 25, 2025, Registrant surrendered[2] his Arkansas medical license to the Arkansas State Medical Board. *Id.* According to Arkansas online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[3] the current status of Registrant's Arkansas medical license is ''Inactive.'' Arkansas State Medical Board License Verification, *https://www.armedicalboard.org/public/verify/default.aspx* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Arkansas, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated November 4, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Government's Declarations from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) and a DEA Task Force Officer (TFO) indicate that on September 24, 2025, Registrant was personally served with a copy of the OSC. RFAAX 2, at 2, 6 (Form–DEA 12 signed by Registrant, acknowledging receipt of the OSC); RFAAX 3, at 1.

[2] Under the Arkansas Medical Board's Definitions, ''surrendered'' means that the ''[p]ractitioner has voluntarily relinquished his license.'' Because Registrant was ordered to surrender his registration, the surrender was not voluntary, and more closely resembles the definition of a revocation. The Arkansas Medical Board defines ''revoked'' to mean that the ''[l]icense has been removed.''

[3] 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).

[4] 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 practice medicine in Arkansas. 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.*

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 Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., Merry Alice Troupe, N.P.,* 89 FR 81,549, (2024); *Rachel Jackson, P.A.,* 90 FR 13,198 (2025).[5]

According to Arkansas statute, ''dispense'' means ''to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the controlled substance for that delivery.'' Ark. Code Ann. 5–64–101(7) (2025). Further, a ''practitioner'' means a ''physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or to administer a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in [the] state.'' *Id.* 64–101(20)(A).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Arkansas. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Arkansas. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Arkansas and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Arkansas, 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. BM6528369 issued to Adam Maass, 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 Adam Maass, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Adam Maass, M.D., for additional registration in Arkansas. This Order is effective [insert Date Thirty Days From the Date of Publication in the **Federal Register**].

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on January 16, 2026, by Administrator Terrance C. 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. 2026–01499 Filed 1–26–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[5] 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 71,371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.,* 71 FR 39,130, 39,131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.,* 58 FR 51,104, 51,105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.,* 53 FR 11,919, 11,920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.,* 43 FR at 27,617.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Complete Care Pharmacy, LLC; Decision and Order

I. Introduction

On April 2, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Complete Care Pharmacy, LLC, of Corrales, New Mexico (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 6. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration, number FC4167121, alleging that its registration is inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), 824(a)(4)). Specifically, the OSC alleged that Registrant's owner and pharmacist-in-charge (PIC) issued 26 controlled substance prescriptions when he no longer had state prescriptive authority and that Registrant, acting through its owner and PIC who had also written the prescriptions without authority, then filled these 26 prescriptions, even though it knew they were issued by a person who lacked prescriptive authority.

On June 2, 2025, the Government submitted an RFAA to the Administrator requesting that the Agency [1] issue a default final order revoking Registrant's registration. RFAA, at 1, 4–5. After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting the analysis as set forth in detail below, the Agency grants the Government's request for final agency action and revokes Registrant's registration. As a preliminary matter, this Decision addresses whether Registrant is in default and finds that it is. Thereafter, this Decision makes specific factual findings on the alleged violations as set forth in the OSC; specifically, the allegation that Registrant knowingly filled 26 illegitimate controlled substance prescriptions that were issued by a person who lacked prescriptive authority. Next, this Decision considers whether Registrant's registration is inconsistent with the public interest and finds that it is. Lastly, this Decision determines that the appropriate sanction is revocation of Registrant's registration.

II. Default Determination

The Government's RFAA included a declaration by a DEA Diversion

[1] The Controlled Substances Act delegates authority to the Attorney General, who has delegated it to the Administrator of DEA (the Agency). 28 CFR 0.100.