

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection of information is 1029-0080, and may be found in OSM's regulations at 30 CFR 850.10. Individuals are required to respond to obtain a benefit.

As required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), a **Federal Register** notice soliciting comments on this collection was published on November 15, 2012 (77 FR 68148). No comments were received. This notice provides the public with an additional 30 days in which to comment on the following information collection activity:

Title: 30 CFR Part 850—Permanent Regulatory Program Requirements—Standards for Certification of Blasters.

OMB Control Number: 1029-0080.

Summary: The information is used to identify and evaluate new blaster certification programs. Part 850 implements Section 719 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). Section 719 requires the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations which provide for each State regulatory authority to train, examine and certify persons for engaging in blasting or use of explosives in surface coal mining operations. Each State that wishes to certify blasters must submit a blasters certification program to OSM for approval.

Bureau Form Numbers: None.

Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: State regulatory authorities and Indian tribes.

Total Annual Responses: 1.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 267 hours.

Send comments on the need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; the accuracy of the agency's burden estimates; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and ways to minimize the information collection burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information, to the places listed in

ADDRESSES. Please refer to control number 1029-0080 in all correspondence.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: February 15, 2013.

Dennis G. Rice,

Acting Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. 2013-03960 Filed 2-20-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Revision of Certain Dollar Amounts in the Bankruptcy Code Prescribed Under Section 104(a) of the Code

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Certain dollar amounts in title 11 and title 28, United States Code, are increased.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amanda L. Anderson, Chief, Bankruptcy Judges Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1900, or by email at *Bankruptcy_Judges_Division@ao.uscourts.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 104(a) of title 11, United States Code, provides the mechanism for an automatic 3-year adjustment of dollar amounts in certain sections of titles 11 and 28. Public Law 95-598 (1978); Public Law 103-394 (1994); Public Law 109-8 (2005); and Public Law 110-406 (2008). The provision states:

(a) On April 1, 1998, and at each 3-year interval ending April 1 thereafter, each dollar amount in effect under

sections 101(3), 101(18), 101(19A), 101(51D), 109(e), 303(b), 507(a), 522(d), 522(f)(3) and 522(f)(4), 522(n), 522(p), 522(q), 523(a)(2)(C), 541(b), 547(c)(9), 707(b), 1322(d), 1325(b), and 1326(b)(3) of this title and section 1409(b) of title 28 immediately before such April 1 shall be adjusted

(1) To reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, published by the Department of Labor, for the most recent 3-year period ending immediately before January 1 preceding such April 1, and

(2) To round to the nearest \$25 the dollar amount that represents such change.

(b) Not later than March 1, 1998, and at each 3-year interval ending on March 1 thereafter, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall publish in the **Federal Register** the dollar amounts that will become effective on such April 1 under sections 101(3), 101(18), 101(19A), 101(51D), 109(e), 303(b), 507(a), 522(d), 522(f)(3) and 522(f)(4), 522(n), 522(p), 522(q), 523(a)(2)(C), 541(b), 547(c)(9), 707(b), 1322(d), 1325(b), and 1326(b)(3) of this title and section 1409(b) of title 28.

(c) Adjustments made in accordance with subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to cases commenced before the date of such adjustments.

Revision of Certain Dollar Amounts in Bankruptcy Code

Notice is hereby given that the dollar amounts are increased in the sections in title 11 and title 28, United States Code, as set out in the following chart. These increases do not apply to cases commenced before the effective date of the adjustments, April 1, 2013. Seven Official Bankruptcy Forms (1, 6C, 6E, 7, 10, 22A and 22C) and two Director's Forms (200 and 283) also will be amended to reflect these adjusted dollar amounts.

Dated: February 12, 2013.

Amanda L. Anderson,

Chief, Bankruptcy Judges Division.

28 U.S.C.	Dollar amount to be adjusted	New (adjusted) dollar amount
1409(b)—a trustee may commence a proceeding arising in or related to a case to recover:		
(1)—money judgment of or property worth less than	\$1,175	\$1,250.
(2)—a consumer debt less than	\$17,575	\$18,675.
(3)—a non consumer debt against a non insider less than.	\$11,725	\$12,475.
11 U.S.C.		
Section 101(3)—definition of assisted person	\$175,750	\$186,825.
Section 101(18)—definition of family farmer	\$3,792,650 (each time it appears)	\$4,031,575 (each time it appears).
101(19A)—definition of family fisherman	\$1,757,475 (each time it appears)	\$1,868,200 (each time it appears).
101(51D)—definition of small business debtor	\$2,343,300 (each time it appears)	\$2,490,925 (each time it appears).
Section 109(e)—allowable debt limits for individual filing bankruptcy under chapter 13.	\$360,475 (each time it appears)	\$383,175 (each time it appears)
	\$1,081,400 (each time it appears)	\$1,149,525 (each time it appears).
Section 303(b)—minimum aggregate claims needed for the commencement of involuntary chapter 7 or chapter 11 bankruptcy:		
(1)—in paragraph (1)	\$14,425	\$15,325.
(2)—in paragraph (2)	\$14,425	\$15,325.
Section 507(a)—priority expenses and claims:		
(1)—in paragraph (4)	\$11,725	\$12,475.
(2)—in paragraph (5)	\$11,725	\$12,475.
(3)—in paragraph (6)	\$5,775	\$6,150.
(4)—in paragraph (7)	\$2,600	\$2,775.
Section 522(d)—value of property exemptions allowed to the debtor:		
(1)—in paragraph (1)	\$21,625	\$22,975.
(2)—in paragraph (2)	\$3,450	\$3,675.
(3)—in paragraph (3)	\$550	\$575.
(4)—in paragraph (4)	\$11,525	\$12,250.
(5)—in paragraph (5)	\$1,450	\$1,550.
(6)—in paragraph (6)	\$1,150	\$1,225.
(7)—in paragraph (7)	\$10,825	\$11,500.
(8)—in paragraph (8)	\$2,175	\$2,300.
(8)—in paragraph (11)(D)	\$11,525	\$12,250.
(8)—in paragraph (11)(D)	\$21,625	\$22,975.
522(f)(3)—exception to lien avoidance under certain state laws.	\$5,850	\$6,225.
522(f)(4)—items excluded from definition of household goods for lien avoidance purposes.	\$600 (each time it appears)	\$650 (each time it appears).
522(n)—maximum aggregate value of assets in individual retirement accounts exempted.	\$1,171,650	\$1,245,475.
522(p)—qualified homestead exemption	\$146,450	\$155,675.
522(q)—state homestead exemption	\$146,450	\$155,675.
523(a)(2)(C)—exceptions to discharge:		
in subclause (i)(I)—consumer debts, incurred ≤90 days before filing owed to a single creditor in the aggregate.	\$600	\$650.
in subclause (i)(II)—cash advances incurred ≤70 days before filing in the aggregate.	\$875	\$925.
541(b)—property of the estate exclusions:		
(1)—in paragraph (5)(C)—education IRA funds in the aggregate.	\$5,850	\$6,225.
(2)—in paragraph (6)(C)—pre-purchased tuition credits in the aggregate.	\$5,850	\$6,225.
547(c)(9)—preferences, trustee may not avoid a transfer if, in a case filed by a debtor whose debts are not primarily consumer debts, the aggregate value of property is less than.	\$5,850	\$6,225.
707(b)—dismissal of a case or conversion to a case under chapter 11 or 13 (means test):		
(1)—in paragraph (2)(A)(i)(I)	\$7,025	\$7,475.
(2)—in paragraph (2)(A)(i)(II)	\$11,725	\$12,475.
(3)—in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(IV)	\$1,775	\$1,875.
(4)—in paragraph (2)(B)(iv)(I)	\$7,025	\$7,475.
(5)—in paragraph (2)(B)(iv)(II)	\$11,725	\$12,475.

28 U.S.C.	Dollar amount to be adjusted	New (adjusted) dollar amount
11 U.S.C.		
(6)—in paragraph (5)(B)	\$1,175	\$1,250.
(7)—in paragraph 6(C)	\$625	\$675.
(8)—in paragraph 7(A)(iii)	\$625	\$675.
1322(d)—contents of chapter 13 plan, monthly income ..	\$625 (each time it appears)	\$675 (each time it appears).
1325(b)—chapter 13 confirmation of plan, disposable income.	\$625 (each time it appears)	\$675 (each time it appears).
1326(b)(3)—payments to former chapter 7 trustee	\$25	\$25.

[FR Doc. 2013-03998 Filed 2-20-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Drug Enforcement Administration**

[Docket No. 13-4]

Brian Earl Cressman, M.D.; Decision and Order

On December 5, 2012, Chief Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) John J. Mulrooney, II, issued the attached Amended Order Granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and Recommended Decision (hereinafter, Recommended Decision). Therein, the ALJ found that Respondent is no longer authorized under Alabama law to dispense controlled substances and therefore recommended that his DEA Certificate of Registration, BC4785614, be revoked. *See* Recommended Decision at 3-5. Neither party filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision. Having reviewed the entire record, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's Recommended Decision in its entirety including his recommended order. *See Hooper v. Holder*, 2012 WL 2020079,*2 (4th Cir. 2012).

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration BC4785614, issued to Brian Earl Cressman, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending application of Brian Earl Cressman, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective March 25, 2013.

Dated: February 12, 2013.

Michele M. Leonhart,
Administrator.

Theresa Krause, Esq., for the
Government.

Brian Earl Cressman, M.D., *pro se*, for
the Respondent.

Amended Order Granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and Recommended Decision

Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney, II. On October 25, 2012, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) immediately suspending, and proposing to revoke the DEA Certificate of Registration (COR), Number BC4785614, of Brian Earl Cressman, M.D. (Respondent), pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) and (4) (2006), because the Respondent's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest as that term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(f) (2006 & Supp. III 2010). In the OSC/ISO, the Government alleges as grounds for revocation, *inter alia*, that the Respondent is "without authority to handle controlled substances in the [s]tate of Alabama." OSC/ISO at 1.

On November 14, 2012, the DEA Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) received from the Respondent, representing himself, *pro se*, a timely filed request for hearing (Hearing Request). Therein, the Respondent conceded that his Alabama Controlled Substance Certificate (ACSC) was revoked in February of 2012. Resp't Hrng. Req., at 1. The same day, this tribunal issued an order (Briefing Schedule): (1) Directing the Government to "provide evidence to support the allegation that the Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances" on or before Wednesday, November 21, 2012; (2) setting a deadline of November 21, 2012 for the Government to file a motion for summary disposition; and (3) setting a deadline of November 30, 2012 for the Respondent to respond to any motion for summary disposition. Briefing Schedule, at 1-2.

On November 20, 2012, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition ("MSD"), seeking: (1) Summary disposition; and (2) a recommendation that "the Respondent's DEA COR as a practitioner be revoked

based on the Respondent's lack of a state license." MSD, at 5. A copy of a June 21, 2010 Order issued by the Alabama Board of Medical Examiners revoking the Respondent's ACSC was attached to the MSD. MSD App. A. Additionally, the Government included a printout from the Alabama State Board of Medical Examiners Web site dated November 15, 2012, which lists the status of the Respondent's ACSC as revoked, and also a verification of controlled substances registration, dated November 15, 2012, from the Alabama State Board of Medical Examiners, confirming the revocation. MSD Apps. B, C. The Respondent did not file a response to the Government's motion within the time allowed.

On December 3, 2012, this tribunal issued an "Order Granting the Government's Unopposed Motion for Summary Disposition and Recommended Decision," (Summary Disposition Order/Recommended Decision). On the same day the Summary Disposition Order/Recommended Decision was issued, the Respondent filed with the tribunal an untitled letter (Post Order Letter). This amended order has been issued to incorporate the consideration of the matters set for in the Respondent's Post Order Letter, and supersedes the previously-issued Summary Disposition Order/Recommended Decision in all respects.

In his Post Order Letter, the Respondent represents "that the Alabama revocation decision, was dismissed in a Montgomery circuit court by the Honorable Judge Hardwick." Post Order Letter, at 1. In support of this assertion, the Respondent provided a copy of an August 25, 2010 Order from the Circuit Court of Montgomery County (Hardwick, J.). *Id.* at 2-3. Contrary to the Respondent's assertion, this Order did not dismiss the Alabama Board Order revoking the Respondent's state controlled substance privileges, but stayed the Order "pending judicial review by the Court of Civil Appeals." *Id.* at 3. In a subsequent, published decision, the Alabama Court of Civil