

821, 831 (1985) (“This Court has recognized on several occasions over many years that an agency’s decision not to prosecute or enforce, whether through civil or criminal process, is a decision generally committed to an agency’s absolute discretion.”). Instead, agencies exercise their investigative and prosecutorial discretion based on matters such as enforcement priorities and the availability of resources. *See, e.g., id.* at 831–32.

Further, Petitioner has had, and continues to have, the option of submitting an application for a new DEA registration. The Agency’s decisions make clear that an applicant’s past actions that violate the law need not result in her being denied a DEA registration indefinitely. *See, e.g., Michele L. Martinho, M.D.*, 86 FR 24012 (2021).

Regarding her allegation that the sanction I assessed in my April 12, 2021 Decision/Order is “excessive, unjust, and disproportionate to her actions,” Petitioner neither submitted evidence for the record during the hearing on the OSC nor now submits evidence that substantiates it. My April 21, 2021 Decision/Order, however, explains how violations that I found Petitioner had committed go to the heart of the CSA and its implementing regulations, and rejects her arguments that minimize applicable legal requirements. *See, e.g.*, 86 FR at 19024. Accordingly, I do not find persuasive Petitioner’s arguments that there is a substantial likelihood that she will prevail on the merits upon appellate review, and I reject them.

Petitioner’s irreparable injury arguments are predictions that she does not tether to existing or new record evidence. For example, as already discussed, Petitioner provides an address for herself in Las Vegas, Nevada in the *pro se* review petition she recently filed in the District of Columbia Circuit. *Supra* n.1. There is no record evidence, and she submitted no new evidence along with this or her Review Petition filing, that Petitioner is registered in Nevada or even that she is licensed to practice medicine in Nevada. Petitioner’s irreparable injury arguments related to any future loss by her of earned income, therefore, are without a sufficient basis in record evidence. Accordingly, I reject them.

Further, Petitioner’s loss of earned income claims are of a generic nature that any practitioner whose registration had been revoked or suspended could make. Even if Petitioner had submitted record evidence substantiating these predictions, the CSA does not direct me to consider her loss of earned income or potential loss of earned income.

Accordingly, I do not accept Petitioner’s irreparable injury arguments.

*Nken* makes clear that the “first two factors of the traditional standard are the most critical.” 556 U.S. at 434. It also explains that, if the applicant satisfies the first two factors, “the traditional stay inquiry calls for assessing the harm to the opposing party and weighing the public interest.” *Id.* at 435. Here, Petitioner has not satisfied either of the first two factors. Supreme Court case law makes clear that I need not address Petitioner’s arguments regarding the third and fourth stay factors. *Id.* For the sake of having a complete record, however, I shall do so.

Assuming, *arguendo*, the accuracy of Petitioner’s arguments that she has never been accused of harming a person, and of her suggestion that the third factor addresses such harm, I find that the legal violations I sustained in my April 12, 2021 Decision/Order do not include harm to a person among their elements. Accordingly, I find Petitioner’s third factor arguments to be irrelevant, and I reject them.

Fourth, even if the record evidence substantiates Petitioner’s public interest claims, which it does not, the Agency has rejected community impact arguments. *See, e.g., Perry County Food & Drug*, 80 FR 70084 (2015). Accordingly, I reject Petitioner’s public interest arguments.

Having determined that Petitioner has not met her burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of my discretion to stay enforcement of the sanction I ordered on April 12, 2021, pending appellate review, I deny her Motion to Stay.

It is so ordered.

Dated: May 11, 2021.

**D. Christopher Evans,**  
*Acting Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2021–11982 Filed 6–7–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1103–0102]

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Progress Report

**AGENCY:** Community Oriented Policing Services, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Department of Justice (DOJ), will be submitting the following information

collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 60 days for public comment August 9, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Lashon M. Hilliard, Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 145 N Street NE, Washington, DC 20530, 202–305–5245.

Written comments and/or suggestions can also be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20530 or sent to [OIRA\\_submissions@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- 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
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* COPS Progress Report.

(3) *Agency form number:* 1103–0102 U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief*

*abstract:* Primary: Law Enforcement Agencies.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:*

There will be approximately 1,424 awardees submitting a COPS Progress Report on a semi-annually basis, or 4,042 responses annually. The average estimated time to complete a progress report is 35 minutes per awardee submission.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:*

0.4167 hours per respondent × 1424 respondents × 2 (semi-annually response) = 2,848 annual hours

*Total Annual Respondent Burden:* 2,848 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Melody D. Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, Room 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 3, 2021.

**Melody D. Braswell,**

*Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 2021-11963 Filed 6-7-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Control No. 1103-NEW]

### Information Collection; Improving Customer Experience (OMB Circular A-11, Section 280 Implementation)

**AGENCY:** Office of the Chief Information Officer, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, is announcing an opportunity for public comment on a new proposed collection of information by the Agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Federal Agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment in response to the notice. This notice solicits comments on new collection proposed by the Agency.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before: August 9, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments identified by Information Collection 1103-NEW, Improving Customer Experience (OMB Circular A-11,

Section 280 Implementation), by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking portal:* <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments to <https://www.regulations.gov>, will be posted to the docket unchanged.

- *Mail:* General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat Division (MVCB), 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405. ATTN: Ms. Mandell/IC 1103-NEW, A-11 Section 280 Improving Customer Experience.

*Instructions:* Please submit comments only and cite Information Collection 1103-NEW, Improving Customer Experience (OMB Circular A-11, Section 280 Implementation), in all correspondence related to this collection. To confirm receipt of your comment(s), please check [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), approximately two-to-three business days after submission to verify posting (except allow 30 days for posting of comments submitted by mail).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Purpose

Under the PRA, (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520) Federal Agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. "Collection of information" is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and includes Agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA requires Federal Agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, GSA is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information set forth in this document.

Whether seeking a loan, Social Security benefits, veteran's benefits, or other services provided by the Federal Government, individuals and businesses expect Government customer services to be efficient and intuitive, just like services from leading private-sector organizations. Yet the 2016 American Consumer Satisfaction Index and the 2017 Forrester Federal Customer Experience Index show that, on average, Government services lag nine percentage points behind the private sector.

A modern, streamlined and responsive customer experience means: Raising government-wide customer experience to the average of the private sector service industry; developing indicators for high-impact Federal programs to monitor progress towards excellent customer experience and mature digital services; and providing the structure (including increasing transparency) and resources to ensure customer experience is a focal point for agency leadership. To support this, OMB Circular A-11 Section 280 established government-wide standards for mature customer experience organizations in government and measurement. To enable Federal programs to deliver the experience taxpayers deserve, they must undertake three general categories of activities: Conduct ongoing customer research, gather and share customer feedback, and test services and digital products.

These data collection efforts may be either qualitative or quantitative in nature or may consist of mixed methods. Additionally, data may be collected via a variety of means, including but not limited to electronic or social media, direct or indirect observation (*i.e.*, in person, video and audio collections), interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and focus groups. The De will limit its inquiries to data collections that solicit strictly voluntary opinions or responses. Steps will be taken to ensure anonymity of respondents in each activity covered by this request.

The results of the data collected will be used to improve the delivery of Federal services and programs. It will include the creation of personas, customer journey maps, and reports and summaries of customer feedback data and user insights. It will also provide government-wide data on customer experience that can be displayed on [performance.gov](https://www.performance.gov) to help build transparency and accountability of Federal programs to the customers they serve.

##### Method of Collection

The Department will collect this information by electronic means when possible, as well as by mail, fax, telephone, technical discussions, and in-person interviews. The Department may also utilize observational techniques to collect this information.

##### Data

*Form Number(s):* None.

*Type of Review:* New.