

order issued in the above-captioned investigation and what if any enforcement measures are appropriate.

The following were named as parties to the formal enforcement proceeding: (1) Crucible Materials Corporation, State Fair Boulevard, P.O. Box 977, Syracuse, New York 13201-0977 (complainant in the above-captioned investigation and requester of the formal enforcement proceeding); (2) San Huan New Materials High Tech, Inc., No. 8 South 3rd Street, Zhong Guan Cun Road, Beijing, Peoples Republic of China 100080 (enforcement proceeding respondent); (3) Ningbo Konit Industries, Inc., Ningbo Economic and Technical Development Zone, Zhejiang Province, People's Republic of China (enforcement proceeding respondent); (4) Tridus International, Inc., 8527 Alondra Boulevard, Suite 205, Paramount California 90723 (enforcement proceeding respondent); and (5) a Commission investigative attorney to be designated by the Director, Office of Unfair Import Investigations.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and section 210.75 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.75).

Copies of the Commission's order and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this enforcement proceeding are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 16, 1996.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-13127 Filed 5-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Meeting of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

AGENCY: Judicial conference of the United States, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

ACTION: Notice of Open Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure will hold a three-day meeting. The meeting will be open to public observation but not participation.

DATES: June 19-21, 1996.

TIME:

June 19, 1:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

June 20, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

June 21, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, Federal Judicial Center Classrooms, Concourse Level, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Washington, D.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

John K. Rabiej, Chief, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544, telephone (202) 273-1820.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

John K. Rabiej,

Chief, Rules Committee Support Office.

[FR Doc. 96-13082 Filed 5-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-55-M

Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Rules of Appellate Procedure

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States, Advisory Committee on Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ACTION: Notice of two open hearings.

SUMMARY: The Advisory Committee on Rules of Appellate Procedure is requesting comments to: Preliminary Draft of Proposed Revision of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure Using Guidelines for Drafting and Editing Court Rules and Preliminary Draft of Proposed Amendments to Appellate Rules 27, 28, and 32.

Two public hearings will be held on these proposals in: Washington, D.C. on July 8, 1996, at the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, Fourth Floor Conference Room, One Columbus Circle, N.E.; and Denver, Colorado on August 2, 1996, at the Byron White United States Courthouse, Ceremonial Courtroom, 1823 Stout Street.

The Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure submits both the proposed revision and the proposed amendments for public comment. All comments and suggestions with respect to them must be placed in the hands of the Secretary at least 30 days before each hearing.

Anyone interested in testifying should write to Peter G. McCabe, Secretary, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., at least 30 days before each hearing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John K. Rabiej, Chief, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544, telephone (202) 273-1820.

A copy of the proposed revision and proposed amendments can be obtained by contacting John K. Rabiej.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

John K. Rabiej,

Chief, Rules Committee Support Office.

[FR Doc. 96-13083 Filed 5-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-32]

Ying-Ming Chang, M.D., Revocation of Registration

On February 23, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Ying-Ming Chang, M.D., (Respondent), of San Diego, California, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, BC0495122, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and deny any pending applications for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for the reason that his continued registration was inconsistent with the public interest.

The Respondent filed a timely request for a hearing, and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. After a lengthy delay at the request of the Respondent, the hearing was scheduled to commence on March 12, 1996. However, prior to that date, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition, noting that the Respondent's license to practice medicine had been revoked by the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California (Board) by final order effective October 9, 1995, a copy of which was attached to the motion. The Respondent filed a response on October 27, 1995, noting that he had challenged the Board's final order in a pending Writ of Mandamus action in the Superior Court of California, San Diego, California. The Respondent then argued that the Board's final order should not be the basis for granting the motion for summary disposition. The Respondent also argued that an issue of fact remained for determination; whether the Board's