Summary: States and Indian tribes having an approved reclamation plan may establish, administer and operate self-sustaining State and Indian Tribe-administered programs to insure private property against damages caused by land subsidence resulting from underground mining. States and Indian tribes interested in requesting monies for their insurance programs would apply to the Director of OSM.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: States and Indian tribes with approved coal reclamation plans.

Total Annual Responses: 1.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 8.

Total Annual Non-Wage Costs: $0.

Dated: June 12, 2008.

John R. Craynon,

Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. E8–13711 Filed 6–17–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–744 (Second Review)]

Brake Rotors From China

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from China would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on July 2, 2007 (72 FR 36037) and determined on October 5, 2007 that it would conduct a full review (72 FR 59111, October 18, 2007). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's review 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** on November 27, 2007 (72 FR 66187). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on April 15, 2008, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on June 11, 2008. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4009 (June 2008), entitled *Brake Rotors from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–744 (Second Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 12, 2008.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8–13678 Filed 6–17–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Joint Industry Project for Fluid Properties Meter Development and Support

Notice is hereby given that, on May 20, 2008, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ('the Act'), Southwest Research Institute: Joint Industry Project for Fluid Properties Meter Development and Support (''SwRI: Fluid Properties Meter'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its nature and objective. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the period of performance has been extended to June 30, 2008.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and SwRI: Fluid Properties Meter intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 30, 2004, SwRI: Fluid Properties Meter filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5487).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 11, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 15, 2005 (70 FR 34796).

Patricia A. Brink,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. E8–13659 Filed 6–17–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 07–42]

Harriston Lee Bass, Jr., M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On June 18, 2007, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Harriston Lee Bass, M.D. (Respondent), of Las Vegas, Nevada. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration, BB0816441, as a practitioner, and the denial of any pending applications to renew or modify his registration, on three separate grounds. Show Cause Order at 1.

First, the Show Cause Order alleged that on several dates, Respondent had committed acts inconsistent with the public interest by prescribing various controlled substances including Percocet, a schedule II narcotic, as well as schedule III narcotics containing hydrocodone, to an undercover officer, without a legitimate medical purpose and outside of the usual course of professional practice. Show Cause Order at 1–2 (citing 21 CFR 1306.04(a)). Relatedly, the Show Cause Order alleged that on June 1, 2006, the State of Nevada had executed a search warrant at Respondent's office and residence and seized 10,882 dosage units of controlled substances notwithstanding that his state medical license authorized only the prescribing and administration of, and not the dispensing of, controlled substances. *Id.* at 2.

Second, the Show Cause Order alleged that on June 16, 2006, the Nevada Board of Medical Examiners summarily suspended Respondent's state medical license based on, *inter alia,* his improper prescribing of controlled substances to nine patients who became addicted to the drugs, and that his prescribing ''contribut[ed] to the deaths of six of these patients.'' *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus alleged that because Respondent lacks authority to handle controlled substances in the State in which he holds his DEA

registration, he was not entitled to maintain his registration.[1] *Id.*

On July 17, 2007, Respondent requested a hearing on the allegations; the matter was assigned to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Mary Ellen Bittner. On August 3, 2007, the Government moved for summary disposition and to stay the proceeding pending the resolution of its motion.

The basis of the Government's motion was that the state board had suspended Respondent's state medical license and Respondent therefore lacked authority to handle controlled substances in Nevada, the State in which he holds his DEA registration. Motion at 1–2. As support for its motion, the Government attached a copy of the June 16, 2006 order of the Nevada Board which suspended Respondent's state license pending the resolution of disciplinary proceedings. Order of Summary Suspension at 1–3. Citing numerous agency decisions, the Government argued that because Respondent lacked authority under Nevada law to handle controlled substances, he was not entitled to maintain his DEA registration. Gov. Mot. at 1–2. *Id.* Respondent did not respond to the Government's motion.

The ALJ granted the Government's motion. Noting that there was no dispute as to whether Respondent was without authority to handle controlled substances in Nevada, the ALJ applied the settled rule that a practitioner is not entitled to hold a DEA registration if he lacks authority to handle controlled substances under state law. ALJ Dec. at 2. The ALJ thus recommended that Respondent's registration be revoked and forwarded the record to me for final agency action. *Id.* at 2–3.

Having considered the record as a whole, I adopt the ALJ's decision in its entirety.[2] I find that on June 16, 2006, the Nevada Board of Medical Examiners suspended Respondent's state medical license pending the outcome of disciplinary proceedings.[3] Based on public information available at the Nevada's Board Web site, I further find that Respondent's state medical license remains suspended and that he is without authority under Nevada law to handle controlled substances.

Under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), a practitioner must be currently authorized to handle controlled substances in ''the jurisdiction in which he practices'' in order to maintain a DEA registration. *See* 21 U.S.C. 802(21) (''[t]he term 'practitioner' means a physician * * * 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''). *See also id.* § 823(f) (''The Attorney General shall register practitioners * * * if the applicant is authorized to dispense * * * controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.''). As these provisions make plain, possessing authority to dispense a controlled substance under the laws of the State in which a physician practices medicine is an essential condition for holding a DEA registration.

Accordingly, DEA has repeatedly held that the CSA requires the revocation of a registration issued to a practitioner whose state license has been suspended or revoked. *See Sheran Arden Yeates,* 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci,* 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts,* 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988). *See also* 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) (authorizing the revocation of a registration ''upon a finding that the registrant * * * has had his State license or registration suspended [or] revoked * * * and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the * * * distribution [or] dispensing of controlled substances''). Because Respondent's Nevada medical license has been indefinitely suspended, he is not entitled to maintain his DEA registration.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) & 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b)–0.104, I hereby order that DEA Certificate of Registration, BB0816441, issued to Harriston L. Bass, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending applications of Harriston L. Bass, M.D., for renewal or modification of his registration be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective immediately.[4]

Dated: June 11, 2008.

Michele M. Leonhart,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. E8–13741 Filed 6–17–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[1] The Show Cause Order also alleged that on June 18, 2005, Respondent had materially falsified his application to renew his DEA registration by failing to disclose a prior disciplinary action by the Nevada Board of Medical Examiners. Show Cause Order at 2.

[2] Because Respondent did not deny the allegation that Respondent's DEA registration does not expire until July 31, 2008, *see* Show Cause Order at 1, I deem the allegation admitted and find that Respondent has a current registration.

[3] I further note that in its Order of Summary Suspension, the State Board found that ''Respondent's prescribing practices cannot be ruled out as contributing factors in the deaths of 6 patients, 5 of whom died of overdoses.'' *In re Harriston L. Bass, Jr., M.D.,* Order of Summary Suspension, at 2. (Nev. Bd. of Med. Examiners, Case No. 06–9455–1).

[4] My decision that this Order be made effective immediately is based on the state's Board finding that ''Respondent's prescribing practices cannot be ruled out as contributing factors in the deaths of 6 patients, 5 of whom died of overdoses.'' Order of Summary Suspension, at 2; see also 21 CFR 1316.67.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

June 11, 2008.

The Department of Labor (DOL) hereby announces the submission of the following public information collection requests (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35). A copy of each ICR, with applicable supporting documentation; including among other things a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the RegInfo.gov Web site at *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain* or by contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) / e-mail: *king.darrin@dol.gov.*

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone: 202–395–7316 / Fax: 202–395–6974 (these are not toll-free numbers), e-mail: *OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov* within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**. In order to ensure the appropriate consideration, comments should reference the OMB Control Number (see below).

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- 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;
- 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;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and