Adams Apple Distributing Company LP, 5100 N. Ravenswood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60640;
A-Mic Corporation, 20268 Paseo Robles, Walnut, California 91789;
Charlotte Buchanan, d/b/a Glamorama, 3414 Fremont Avenue N., Seattle, Washington 98103;
Fortune Products Inc., 2824 Old Hartford Rd., Lake Stevens, Washington 98258;
J.J.M. Novelties, 12106 Boca Grande Avenue, New Port Richey, Florida 34654;
Original Lighting Inc., 4025 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Texas 77027;

(c) Kent R. Stevens, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Room 401–L, Washington, D.C. 20436, shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(4) For the investigation and temporary relief proceedings instituted, the Honorable Sidney Harris is designated as the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint, the motion for temporary relief, and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with sections 210.13 and 210.59 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR §§ 210.13 and 210.59. Pursuant to sections 201.16(d) and 210.13(a) and 210.59 of the Commission's Rules, 19 CFR §§ 201.16(d), 210.13(a), 210.59, such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 10 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint, the motion for temporary relief, and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint, motion for temporary relief, and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint, in the motion for temporary relief, and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint, the motion for temporary relief, and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint, the motion for temporary relief, and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against such respondent.

Issued: June 26, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke.

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–17227 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–749 (Final)]

Persulfates From China

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission unanimously determines, pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from China of persulfates provided for in subheadings 2833.40.60 and 2833.40.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

Background

The Commission instituted this investigation effective July 11, 1996, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and the Department of Commerce by FMC Corporation, Chicago, IL. The final phase of the investigation was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by the Department of Commerce that imports of persulfates from China were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's investigation and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of January 23, 1997 (62 FR 3526). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on May 14, 1997, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on June 25, 1997. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3044 (June 1997), entitled ''Persulfates from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–749 (Final).''

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(f)).

Issued: June 23, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–17228 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Rights Division

Coordination and Review Section; Agency Information Collection Activities, Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; Complaint Form, Coordination and Review Section, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on April 9, 1997, at 62 FR 17202, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received by the Department of Justice.

The purpose of this notice is allow an additional 30 days for public comments until July 31, 1997. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Office, Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395–7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to (202) 514–1534.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one of more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

(2) 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) 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:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Existing collection in use without an OMB control number.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Compliant Form, Coordination and Review Section, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* No form number. Coordination and Review Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

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

Primary: Individuals or Households.

The information collected is used to find jurisdiction to investigate the alleged discrimination, to seek whether a referral is necessary, and to provide information needed to initiate investigation of the complaint. Respondents are individuals alleging discrimination.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 500 responses; ½ hour per response. The information will be submitted by the respondent only once. Thus, there will be approximately 500 total yearly responses at ½ hour per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 250 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required, contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20530.

Dated: June 25, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–17119 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 96–37]

Joseph M. Piacentile, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On June 25, 1996, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Joseph M. Piacentile, M.D., (Respondent) of Yardley, Pennsylvania and Basking Ridge, New Jersey, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificates of Registration, BP1786853 and BP2526056, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824 (a)(4) and (a)(5), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registrations as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

By letter dated July 15, 1996, Respondent, proceeding *pro se*, filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in New York, New York on November 20, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall. At the hearing, the Government called a witness to testify and introduced documentary evidence. Respondent made a brief opening statement, but did not testify under oath nor offer any documentary evidence. After the hearing, Government counsel and Respondent submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On March 26, 1997, Judge Randall issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, recommending that Respondent's DEA Certificates of Registration be revoked. Neither party filed exceptions to her decision, and on May 5, 1997, Judge Randall transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Acting Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, in full, the Opinion and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and his adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent is currently registered with DEA in both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In January 1985, the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General initiated an investigation of Electro Therapeutics (ETI) after receiving hundreds of complaints from Medicare patients concerning medical equipment they had received from ETI. Respondent was the President of ETI and was responsible for ETI's sales force.

ETI distributed transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator units (TENS units), TENS accessory kits, and lymphedema pumps. Both the TENS unit and the lymphedema pump must be prescribed by a physician in order for Medicare to pay for the equipment. Further, Medicare requires that a physician assess a patient's use of a TENS unit for 30 days prior to authorizing the purchase of the device. In addition, Medicare had very specific diagnoses criteria. If a patient did not have a condition covered by one of these criteria, Medicare would not authorize the purchase of the unit. TENS accessory kits also required a prescription, and were only authorized for distribution every three months.

Between 1984 and September 1987, ETI billed Medicare $49 million for this equipment, $22 million of which was actually paid to ETI for over 22,000 separate beneficiaries. In an attempt to verify the validity of claims submitted by ETI to Medicare, agents interviewed a number of the Medicare beneficiaries who had received equipment from ETI and physicians whose signatures had served as authorization for the distribution of the medical equipment. The investigation revealed that ETI distributed these units by either sending out sales representatives to ''health fairs'' held at supermarkets, senior citizen centers or banks, or through arrangements with specific geriatric physicians whereby the sales representatives would demonstrate the use of the equipment at the physicians' offices. ETI would then obtain a physicians's signature on a prescription, telling the physician that the patient wanted the equipment.

However, the patients were told that the equipment was a free gift from Medicare. After learning that Medicare was in fact billed for the equipment, the patients complained because they stated that had they known there would be a charge for the equipment, they would not have accepted it. The investigation