The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that on July 29, 1995, the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners (Board) issued an Opinion and Ruling regarding Dr. Okun's license to practice medicine. The Board found that Dr. Okun had entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to a charge of assault with a dangerous weapon—an automobile; had answered untruthfully a question on his 1992 license renewal application as to whether he had been charged with a violation of any statute; and had run an advertisement in a newspaper which contained false, fraudulent or misleading representations. It was the Board's opinion that in order to determine the appropriate sanction against his medical license, Dr. Okun should be evaluated by a psychiatrist and then he should personally appear before the Board. The Board ordered that if Dr. Okun did not comply with these requirements within 60 days of the Board's Opinion and Ruling, his medical license would be suspended until he does comply. By letter dated October 27, 1995, the Board advised DEA that Dr. Okun's license to practice medicine was suspended effective September 27, 1995.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that there is no indication that Dr. Okun has complied with the Board's requirements and therefore, his medical license remains suspended. The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that it is reasonable to infer that since Dr. Okun is not currently licensed to practice medicine in Louisiana, he is also not authorized to handle controlled substances in that state.

The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See Dominick A. Ricci, M.D., 58 FR 51,104 (1993); James H. Nickens, M.D., 57 FR 59,847 (1992); Roy E. Hardman, M.D., 57 FR 49,195 (1992).

Here, it is clear that Dr. Okun is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of Louisiana. Consequently, he is not entitled to a DEA registration in that state. While it appears that Dr. Okun is currently living in California, he has not submitted a request to modify his registration to that state. Therefore, the DEA registration issued to him in Louisiana must be revoked.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration, BO1821354, previously issued to James D. Okun, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending requests for renewal of such registration, be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective May 8, 1997.

Dated: April 1, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–8944 Filed 4–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Raymond S. Sanders, D.P.M.; Revocation of Registration

On June 18, 1996, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Raymond S. Sanders, D.P.M., of Sacramento, California, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AS8739572, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) and 824(a)(4), and deny any pending applications for registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California and his continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. The order also notified Dr. Sanders that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, his hearing right would be deemed waived.

The DEA received a signed receipt indicating that the order was received by Dr. Sanders on July 1, 1996. No request for a hearing or any other reply was received by the DEA from Dr. Sanders or anyone purporting to represent him in this matter. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that (1) 30 days have passed since the receipt of the Order to Show Cause, and (2) no request for a hearing having been received, concludes that Dr. Sanders is deemed to have waived his hearing right. After considering the relevant material from the investigative file in this matter, the Acting Deputy Administrator now enters his final order without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.54(e) and 1301.57.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that on April 15, 1996, the Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, issued an interim suspension order suspending Dr. Sanders from practicing podiatric medicine. Thereafter, on April 29, 1996, the Board of Podiatric Medicine for the State of California (Board) filed an Accusation charging, in part, that Dr. Sanders engaged in unprofessional conduct by prescribing, dispensing or furnishing dangerous drugs to himself and his wife without medical indication. The Accusation proposed the revocation of Dr. Sanders' podiatric medicine license. On June 19, 1996, the Board entered a Default Decision revoking Dr. Sanders' podiatric medicine license effective July 19, 1996. The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that in light of the fact that Dr. Sanders is not currently licensed to practice podiatric medicine in the State of California, it is reasonable to infer that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in that state.

The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See Dominick A. Ricci, M.D., 58 FR 51,104 (1993); James H. Nickens, M.D., 57 FR 59,847 (1992); Roy E. Hardman, M.D., 57 FR 49,195 (1992).

Here, it is clear that Dr. Sanders is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California. Therefore, Dr. Sanders is not entitled to a DEA registration. Because Dr. Sanders is not entitled to a DEA registration due to his lack of state authorization to handle controlled substances, the Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that it is unnecessary to address whether Dr. Sanders' continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest as alleged in the Order to Show Cause.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration, AS8739572, previously issued to Raymond S. Sanders, D.P.M., be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending applications for registration, be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective May 8, 1997.

Dated: April 1, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–8946 Filed 4–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

National Institute of Justice

[OJP (NIJ) No. 1120]

RIN 1121–ZA67

National Institute of Justice Solicitation for Investigator-Initiated Research

AGENCY: Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of solicitation.

SUMMARY: Announcement of the availability of the National Institute of Justice ''Solicitation for Investigator-Initiated Research.''

ADDRESSES: Proposals should be mailed to the National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20531.

DATES: There are two deadlines for receipt of proposals, June 17, 1997 and December 16, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information about application procedures for solicitations, please call the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center 1–800–421–6771.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

This action is authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, secs. 201–03, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3721–23 (1994).

Background

The National Institute of Justice is soliciting proposals that respond to the broad mandate of the Institute's solicitation for investigator-initiated research. Applicants may submit proposals to explore topics relevant to State or local criminal justice practice or policy. Some of the current themes of interest to the Institute include: Rethinking justice to meet the challenges of the 21st century; understanding the nexus between crime and social problems; breaking the cycle of offender recidivism and other reoccurring criminal justice problems; developing new technologies, practices, and techniques for use in the criminal justice system; expanding the horizons of criminal justice by looking beyond traditional crime definitions and into new possibilities of study such as transnational and cybercrimes. These topics represent a broad vision of directions that the Institute intends to pursue in the next few years. Researchers may relate their proposals to these topics or develop projects that fall outside of these themes on the condition that the proposed research falls within NIJ's statutory mission. Interested organizations should call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) at 1–800–851–3420 to obtain a copy of ''Solicitation for Investigator-Initiated Research'' (refer to document no. SL000201). The solicitation is available electronically via the NCJRS Bulletin Board, which can be accessed via the Internet. Telnet to ncjrsbbs.ncjrs.org, or gopher to ncjrs.org:71. For World Wide Web access, connect to the NCJRS Justice Information Center at http://www.ncjrs.org. Those without Internet access can dial the NCJRS Bulletin Board via modem: dial 301–738–8895. Set the modem at 9600 baud, 8–N–1.

Dated: April 2, 1997.

Jeremy Travis,

Director, National Institute of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–8911 Filed 4–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Maryland State Standards; Approval

1. Background

Part 1953 of Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, prescribes procedures under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (hereinafter called the Act) by which the Regional Administrator for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Regional Administrator), under a delegation of authority from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health (hereinafter called the Assistant Secretary) (29 CFR 1593.4), will review and approve standards promulgated pursuant to a State plan which has been approved in accordance with section 18(c) of the Act and 29 CFR part 1902. On July 5, 1973, notice was published in the **Federal Register** (38 FR 17834) of the approval of the Maryland State plan and the adoption of subpart O to part 1952 containing the decision.

The Maryland State plan provides for the adoption of all Federal standards as State standards after comments and public hearing. Section 1952.210 of subpart O sets forth the State's schedule for the adoption of Federal standards. By letters dated (1) August 28, 1995; (2) February 15, 1996; (3) February 23, 1996; (4) February 28, 1996; (5 and 6) August 23, 1996; (7 and 8) January 6, 1997; and (9 and 10) February 13, 1997 from John P. O'Connor, Commissioner of the Maryland Division of Labor and Industry, to Linda R. Anku, Regional Administrator, and incorporated as part of the plan, the State submitted State standards identical to amendments, corrections, and revisions to: (1) 29 CFR 1910.1011 and 1910.1000, pertaining to the Occupational Exposure to Asbestos Standard, as published in the **Federal Register** of February 21, 1995 (60 FR 9624), June 28, 1995 (60 FR 33344), June 29, 1995 (60 FR 33984), July 13, 1995 (60 FR 36043) and September 29, 1995 (60 FR 50411); (2) 29 CFR part 1926, subpart E, and 29 CFR 1926.500, pertaining to the Safety Standards for Fall Protection in the Construction Industry, as published in the **Federal Register** of August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39255); (3) 29 CFR 1910.266, Safety Standards for Logging Operations, as published in the **Federal Register** of September 8, 1995 (60 FR 47035); (4) 29 CFR 1910.1025, pertaining to the Occupational Exposure to Lead Standard for General Industry, as published in the **Federal Register** of October 11, 1995 (60 FR 52858); (5) 29 CFR 1910, 1926 and 1928, pertaining to Miscellaneous Minor and Technical Amendments to OSHA Standards, as published in the **Federal Register** of March 7, 1996 (61 FR 9230); (6) 29 CFR 1910.272, pertaining to Grain Handling Facilities, as published in the **Federal Register** of March 8, 1996 (61 FR 9583); (7) 29 CFR 1910.133, 1910.135 and 1910.136, pertaining to Personal Protective Equipment for General Industry, as published in the **Federal Register** of May 2, 1996 (61 FR 19548) and May 9, 1996 (61 FR 21228); (8) 29 CFR 1910 and 1926, pertaining to Consolidation of Repetitive Provisions: Technical Amendments, as published in the **Federal Register** of July 3, 1996 (61 FR 31429); (9) 29 CFR 1926.1101 and 1910.1001, pertaining to Occupational Exposure to Asbestos, as published in the **Federal Register** of August 23, 1996 (61 FR 43456); and (10) 29 CFR 1926.416 and 1926.417, pertaining to General Industry Standards Applicable to Construction Work, as published in the **Federal Register** of August 12, 1996 (61 FR 41738).

These standards are contained in COMAR 09.12.31. Maryland Occupational Safety and Health Standards were promulgated after public hearings on (1) March 1, 1995; (2)