

Respondent's testimony regarding his various violations is especially disturbing. With respect to his conduct in distributing controlled substances to the Nagras' clinic, Respondent testified that he didn't "have any regrets" and that he "would do that again because I wasn't hurting anyone." Tr. at 390. As for his conduct at the 82nd Avenue clinic, Respondent explained that "you don't close down operations. You don't stop businesses and put 12 people on the unemployment line because of a registration that is being withheld at that time unreasonably." ¹³ *Id.* at 379.

Respondent's statements reflect a stunning disregard for the requirements of Federal law. The CSA's implementing regulations expressly provide that "[n]o person required to be registered shall engage in any activity for which registration is required until the application for registration is granted and a Certificate of Registration is issued * * * to such person." 21 CFR 1301.13(a). Contrary to Respondent's understanding, he was required to comply with the Act and its regulations even if it interfered with his business plan or violated his sense of fairness.

In sum, Respondent's repeated violations of the CSA provide ample grounds to deny his application. Moreover, Respondent's attitude leaves me with the firm impression that, if given the opportunity, he will violate the Act again. Moreover, Respondent's rehabilitation from drug abuse does not mitigate the violations of the Act he committed by distributing controlled substances to the Nagras' clinic, an unregistered location, and commencing operations at the 82nd Avenue clinic without obtaining a registration. I thus conclude that this factor is dispositive and compels a finding that granting Respondent a new registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.¹⁴

¹³ As I have previously found, the evidence in the record establishes that Respondent did not apply for a registration for this location until December 2001, shortly before opening the clinic. Furthermore, Respondent indicated on his application that his state license had previously been suspended thus triggering a more detailed investigation. DEA personnel subsequently determined that Respondent had previously been investigated for distributing controlled substances to the Nagras' clinic, that he was storing controlled substances at the 82nd Ave. clinic, and became aware of the events surrounding Respondent's abuse of Telazol and the State of California's suspension of his license. As this proceeding has established, it was not unreasonable to withhold Respondent's registration. What was unreasonable was Respondent's commencement of operations without obtaining a registration in violation of Federal law.

¹⁴ In light of Respondent's numerous violations of the CSA discussed above, it is unnecessary to decide whether Respondent's practice of employing relief veterinarians to run his clinic in Oregon while

Order

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f), and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, I hereby order that the pending application of Respondent, Daniel Koller, D.V.M., for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, be, and it hereby is, denied. This order is effective December 18, 2006.

Dated: November 3, 2006.

Michele M. Leonhart,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. E6-19400 Filed 11-16-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

TIME AND DATE: The Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation will meet on November 22, 2006 via conference call. The meeting will begin at 2 p.m. (EST), and continue until conclusion of the Board's agenda.

LOCATION: 3333 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20007, 3rd Floor Conference Center.

STATUS OF MEETING: Open. Directors will participate by telephone conference in

living in San Diego (more than 1,000 miles away) complied with the CSA. I note, however, that at the hearing, the Government asserted that if a relief veterinarian is an independent contractor, the relief vet. cannot act as an agent of the clinic owner/registrant under 21 CFR 1301.22. According to the Government, the relief vet. must be an employee of the clinic owner in order to comply with the regulation.

This position is incorrect. Neither the CSA nor the regulation precludes a relief veterinarian who is an independent contractor from acting as the agent of the registrant. In the CSA, Congress defined the term "agent" to mean "an authorized person who acts on behalf of or at the direction of a manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser." 21 U.S.C. 802(3). Moreover, the CSA further exempts from registration "[a]n agent or employee of any registered manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser of any controlled substance * * * if such agent or employee is acting in the usual course of his business or employment." *Id.* § 822(c). The plain language of the statute thus demonstrates that Congress did not limit the exemption to the employees of a practitioner. Furthermore, in appropriate circumstances, an independent contractor may act as an agent. *See, e.g.,* I Restatement of the Law (Second) Agency § 14 N, at 80 (1958) ("One who contracts to act on behalf of another and subject to the other's control except with respect to his physical conduct is an agent and also an independent contractor."). The status of the person acting under the registration as an employee or independent contractor is thus not determinative of compliance with the CSA.

What is relevant for purposes of compliance is that the registrant must exercise effective control of the agent. Doing so requires that a registrant properly supervise and monitor its agents to protect against the diversion of controlled substances; reliance solely on the CSA's existing recordkeeping requirements does not necessarily establish that a registrant is exercising effective control of its agents.

such a manner as to enable interested members of the public to hear and identify all persons participating in the meeting. Members of the public wishing to observe the meeting may do so by joining participating staff at the location indicated above. Members of the public wishing to listen to the meeting by telephone may obtain call-in information by calling LSC's FOIA Information line at (202) 295-1629.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Approval of the agenda.
2. Consider and act on Board of Directors' response to the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period of April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006.
3. Consider and act on other business.
4. Public comment.

CONTACT PERSON FOR INFORMATION:

Patricia Batie, Manager of Board Operations, at (202) 295-1500.

SPECIAL NEEDS: Upon request, meeting notices will be made available in alternate formats to accommodate visual and hearing impairments. Individuals who have a disability and need an accommodation to attend the meeting may notify Patricia Batie at (202) 295-1500.

Dated: November 15, 2006.

Victor M. Fortunato,

Vice President for Legal Affairs, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 06-9283 Filed 11-15-06; 3:31 pm]

BILLING CODE 7050-01-P

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

[MCC FR 06-19]

Report on the Selection of Eligible Countries for Fiscal Year 2007

AGENCY: Millennium Challenge Corporation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This report is provided in accordance with Section 608(d)(2) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, Pub. L. 108-199, Division D, (the "Act"), Report on the Selection of Eligible Countries for Fiscal Year 2007.

Summary

This report is provided in accordance with Section 608(d)(2) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, Pub. L. 108-199, Division D, (the "Act").

The Act authorizes the provision of Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) assistance under Section 605 of the Act to countries that enter into Compacts with the United States to support