Specifically, C & H Technologies, Round Rock, TX; BAE Systems, San Diego, CA; and Conduant Corporation, Longmont, CO, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

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 PXI Systems Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 22, 2000, PXI Systems Alliance, Inc. 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 March 8, 2001 (66 FR 13971).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 24, 2011. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 25, 2011 (76 FR 16820).

Patricia A. Brink, Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.
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Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

Notice is hereby given that, on July 1, 2011, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers ("IEEE") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. 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, Taiyo Cable (Dongguan) Co., Ltd., Gyeonggi-Do, REPUBLIC OF KOREA; Dukane Corporation, St. Charles, IL; UNIPULSE Corporation, Tokyo, JAPAN; Renesas Electronics, Tokyo, JAPAN; Jacobs Automation LLC, Hebron, KY; Welding Technology Corp., Carol Stream, IL; Micro Motion, Inc., Boulder, CO; Hitachi Cable Manchester, Inc., Manchester, NH; and Global Engineering Solutions Co., Ltd., Gyeonggi-do, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Applied Robotics, Inc., Glenville, NY; WIT, St.-Laurent-Du-Var, FRANCE; Caron Engineering, Inc., Wells, ME; and OPTO 22, Temecula, CA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

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 ODVA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 17, 2004, IEEE 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 November 3, 2004 (69 FR 64105).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 3, 2011. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2011 (76 FR 5826).

Patricia A. Brink, Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.
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Drug Enforcement Administration

Stacey J. Webb, M.D.; Denial of Application

On February 24, 2010, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an order to Show Cause to Stacey J. Webb, M.D. (Respondent), of Chesapeake, Virginia. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Respondent’s pending application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, on the ground that she had committed acts which render her registration “inconsistent with the public interest.” Order at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)).

The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that Respondent, while holding a DEA registration (which expired by its terms on May 31, 2009), had “prescribed controlled substances to individuals in Virginia and Alabama via the Internet based on online questionnaires, submissions of unverified medical records, and/or telephone consultations without a medical examination.” Id. The Order further alleged that “[t]he prescriptions * * * were issued for other than a legitimate medical purpose or outside the usual course of professional practice.” Id. (citing 21 CFR 1306.04(a)). Specifically, the Order alleged that Respondent “failed to establish a valid physician-patient relationship” as required by the laws of Virginia and Alabama. Id.; see Va. Code Ann. §§ 54.1–3303, 54.1–2915; Ala. Code § 34–24–360; Ala. Admin. Code 540–X–9–11. Finally, the Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent holds a medical license in Virginia, but prescribed controlled substances via the internet to individuals in Alabama without possessing a controlled substance certificate as required by state law. Id.