

practitioner in Tennessee, the state in which he is registered with DEA.

### Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 “upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.”

With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner’s registration. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) (“The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances ‘if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.’ . . . The very definition of a ‘practitioner’ eligible to prescribe includes physicians ‘licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices’ to dispense controlled substances. § 802(21).”). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. See, e.g., *James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).<sup>3</sup>

According to Tennessee statute, “dispense” means “to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including

the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.” Tenn. Code Ann. § 39–17–402(7) (2024). Further, a “practitioner” means “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to or administer a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in [the] state.” *Id.* § 39–17–402(23)(A).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice as a nurse practitioner in Tennessee. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Tennessee. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice as a nurse practitioner in Tennessee and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Tennessee, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant’s DEA registration be revoked.

### Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. MY1093424, issued to Jeffrey W. Young, Jr., N.P. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Jeffrey W. Young, Jr., N.P., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Jeffrey W. Young, Jr., N.P., for additional registration in Tennessee. This Order is effective January 29, 2025.

### Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on December 20, 2024, by Administrator Anne Milgram. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this

document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

**Heather Achbach,**

*Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2024–31329 Filed 12–27–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act

On December 19, 2024, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia in the lawsuit entitled *United States and Commonwealth of Virginia, Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources v. FMC Corporation*, Civil Action No. 5:24–CR–108.

The lawsuit was initiated by a complaint filed by the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia (the “Trustees”) in their capacity as the legally designated trustees for natural resources in Virginia. The complaint alleged, *inter alia*, that the Defendant was liable for damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources resulting from the release of hazardous substances at and from the Avtex Fibers, Inc. Site (the “Site”) in Front Royal, Virginia, pursuant to three statutes: the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, the Virginia State Water Control Law, and the Virginia Waste Management Act.

The Consent Decree resolves the claims of the Trustees against the Defendant for a total payment of \$1,674,361. Of this amount, \$1,393,219 will be paid into the United States’ Natural Resource Damages Assessment and Restoration (“NRDAR”) Fund managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior, which will reimburse the Department’s natural resource damages assessment activities and fund projects aimed at restoring the injured natural resources at the Site. The remaining \$281,142 will be paid to the Commonwealth of Virginia for restoration of injured natural resources arising from groundwater contamination at the Site, and to reimburse the Commonwealth’s natural resource damages assessment costs. In addition, as part of the settlement the United States will pay \$2,496,305 into the NRDAR Fund to support restoration projects. This latter amount will resolve the alleged liability of four settling

<sup>3</sup> This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined the term “practitioner” to mean “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. See, e.g., *James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11,920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.

federal agencies—the U.S. Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—that allegedly contributed to the natural resource damages incurred at and from the Site. In return for these payments, the United States and the Commonwealth will confer on the Defendant and the settling federal agencies covenants not to sue for natural resource damages known or reasonably ascertainable as of the date of lodging of the Consent Decree.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States and Commonwealth of Virginia, Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources v. FMC Corporation*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–10912. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email .....	<a href="mailto:pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov">pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov</a>
By mail .....	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decree/us-et-al-v-fmc-corporation>. If you require assistance accessing the proposed Consent Decree, you may request assistance by email or by mail to the addresses provided above for submitting comments.

**Jason A. Dunn,**  
Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2024–30882 Filed 12–27–24; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act**

On December 19, 2024, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of

Wisconsin in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. The Manitowoc Company, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 2:24–cv–1635.

The United States filed a Complaint, on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, against The Manitowoc Company, Inc. and its subsidiaries Grove U.S. L.L.C. and Manitowoc Crane Group Germany GMBH, alleging violations of sections 203(a) and 213(d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7522(a) and 7547(d), and implementing regulations, by their importation, introduction into commerce, and sale of heavy nonroad construction equipment containing diesel engines that were not certified to model year engine emission standards. The Complaint also alleges violations of labeling, bonding, and reporting requirements and seeks civil penalties and appropriate injunctive relief.

Under the proposed Consent Decree, the Defendants will pay a civil penalty of \$42,600,000 and will complete a project to mitigate harm caused by excess nitrogen oxide and particulate matter emissions from the noncompliant engines.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. The Manitowoc Company, Inc., et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–12216. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email .....	<a href="mailto:pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov">pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov</a>
By mail .....	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Any comments submitted in writing may be filed by the United States in whole or in part on the public court docket without notice to the commenter.

During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. If you require assistance accessing the proposed Consent Decree, you may request assistance by email or by mail

to the addresses provided above for submitting comments.

**Jason A. Dunn,**  
Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.  
[FR Doc. 2024–30971 Filed 12–27–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Employment and Training Administration**

**Employment and Training Administration Program Year 2024 Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Section 167, National Farmworker Jobs Program Final State Allotments**

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, Labor.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This Notice announces final allotments for the National Farmworker Jobs Program (NFJP) Career Services and Training grants for Program Year (PY) 2024, finalizing the preliminary planning estimates provided in a prior **Federal Register** notice.

**DATES:** The PY 2024 NFJP allotments are effective for the grant period that began July 1, 2024.

**ADDRESSES:** Questions on this notice can be submitted via email to [NFJP@dol.gov](mailto:NFJP@dol.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Rietzke, Chief, Division of National Programs, Tools and Technical Assistance, Office of Workforce Investment, at 202–693–3980. (This is not a toll-free number). If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability, please dial 7–1–1 to access telecommunications relay services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice is published pursuant to Section 182(d) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Prompt Allotment of Funds.

**I. Background**

The Department is announcing final allotments for the National Farmworker Jobs Program (NFJP) Career Services and Training (CST) grants for Program Year (PY) 2024. Specifically, this notice provides information on the amount of funds available during PY 2024 to state service areas awarded through the PY 2024 Funding Opportunity Announcement (“the FOA”) for the NFJP CST grants (FOA–ETA–24–15). In distributing funds, the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) calculated allotments for CST grantees through an administrative formula. The