2022. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in § 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the reviews and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,[2] and any party other than an interested party to the reviews may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the reviews. Comments are due on or before December 23, 2022 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year reviews nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to these reviews by December 23, 2022. However, should the Department of Commerce (''Commerce'') extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its reviews, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on Filing Procedures,* available on the Commission's website at *https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf,* elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Determination.—The Commission has determined these reviews are extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 13, 2022.

Katherine Hiner,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2022–27374 Filed 12–16–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[2] The Commission has found the response filed on behalf of the Rebar Trade Action Coalition and its individual members, Nucor Corporation, Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., Commercial Metals Company, Byer Steel, and Steel Dynamics, Inc., domestic producers of rebar, to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Hearing of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Notice of cancellation of open hearing.

SUMMARY: The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure has been canceled: Bankruptcy Rules Hearing on January 13, 2023. The announcement for this hearing was previously published in the **Federal Register** on August 5, 2022.

DATES: January 13, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: H. Thomas Byron III, Esq., Chief Counsel, Rules Committee Staff, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle NE, Suite 7–300, Washington, DC 20544, Phone (202) 502–1820, *RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov.*

(Authority: 28 U.S.C. 2073)

Dated: December 14, 2022.

Shelly L. Cox,

Management Analyst, Rules Committee Staff.

[FR Doc. 2022–27434 Filed 12–16–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 21–35]

Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D.; Decision and Order

On September 23, 2021, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D. (Respondent) of Charleston, South Carolina.[1] OSC/ISO, at 1.

[1] Respondent holds a DEA Certificate of Registration no. AR1001306 at the registered address of 903 Saint Andrews Blvd. Suite B, Charleston, SC 29407–7194. OSC/ISO, at 1–2.

A hearing was held before DEA Administrative Law Judge Paul E. Soeffing (the ALJ) who, on April 5, 2022, issued his Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD).[2] Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, credibility findings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, sanctions analysis, and recommended sanction in the RD and summarizes and expands upon portions thereof herein.

I. Findings of Fact

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), 824(a)(4), the Government seeks revocation of Respondent's DEA registration because Respondent allegedly committed acts rendering his continued registration inconsistent with the public interest, including: (1) improperly prescribing controlled substances; (2) failing to maintain medical records; and (3) engaging in unlawful electronic prescribing practices. OSC/ISO, at 1.

Respondent issued the controlled substance prescriptions at issue in this case to Patients W.G., P.L., T.E., D.P., N.R., and L.C. without maintaining any medical records. RD, at 28.[3] According to the credible, unrebutted, expert testimony of Dr. Gene Kennedy, Respondent issued all of these controlled substance prescriptions outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the applicable standard of care due to Respondent's lack of medical records. *Id.* at 28 (citing Tr. 118–31, 344). The record showed that Respondent could not produce any records for these six patients. RD, at 28 (citing Tr. 249–50; 323). In addition, Dr. Kennedy credibly testified that the controlled substance prescriptions for L.P. and P.B. were issued outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the applicable standard of care because Respondent's partial medical records did not adequately support his prescribing. RD, at 29–31. Finally, the record established that Respondent permitted his wife and son

[2] Neither party filed exceptions.

[3] The parties entered into 46 stipulations, all of which are incorporated into this Decision. RD, at 2–10. On January 29, 2020, Respondent entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with DEA, which remains in effect for three years, and which prohibited Respondent from prescribing Schedule II controlled substances, required Respondent to maintain proper medical files on all patients to whom Respondent issued controlled substance prescriptions, and required Respondent to maintain medical records in a readily retrievable manner. The Agency agrees with the ALJ's consideration of the violations of the MOA in the Sanctions section. *See* RD, at n.12.