

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. 2024-31318 Filed 12-27-24; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-1475]

Importer of Controlled Substances
Application: Siegfried USA, LLC

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Siegfried USA, LLC has applied to be registered as an importer of basic class(es) of controlled substance(s). Refer to Supplementary Information listed below for further drug information.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants therefore, may submit electronic comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before January 29, 2025. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application on or before January 29, 2025.

ADDRESSES: The Drug Enforcement Administration requires that all comments be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal, which provides the ability to type short comments directly into the comment field on the web page or attach a file for lengthier comments. Please go to https://www.regulations.gov and follow the online instructions at that site for submitting comments. Upon submission of your comment, you will receive a Comment Tracking Number. Please be

aware that submitted comments are not instantaneously available for public view on https://www.regulations.gov. If you have received a Comment Tracking Number, your comment has been successfully submitted and there is no need to resubmit the same comment. All requests for a hearing must be sent to: (1) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: Hearing Clerk/OALJ, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152; and (2) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. All requests for a hearing should also be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: Administrator, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on November 20, 2024, Siegfried USA, LLC, 33 Industrial Park Road, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070, applied to be registered as an importer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substance(s):

Table with 3 columns: Controlled substance, Drug code, Schedule. Rows include Phenylacetone, Opium, Raw, and Poppy Straw Concentrate.

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances to manufacture bulk Active Pharmaceuticals Ingredients for distribution to its customers. No other activities for these drug codes are authorized for this registration.

Approval of permit applications will occur only when the registrant's business activity is consistent with what is authorized under 21 U.S.C. 952(a)(2). Authorization will not extend to the import of Food and Drug Administration approved or non-approved finished dosage forms for commercial sale.

Matthew Strait,
Deputy Assistant Administrator.
[FR Doc. 2024-31301 Filed 12-27-24; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Matthew Okeke, M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 14, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show

Cause (OSC) to Matthew Okeke, M.D., of Las Vegas, Nevada (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. FO4173845, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is "currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Nevada, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA." Id. at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. Id. (citing 21 CFR1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.¹ "A default, unless

¹ Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated April 16, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on February 26, 2024, the DI left a copy of the OSC at Registrant's registered address. RFAAX 2, at 2. On the same date, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address and to Registrant's attorney. Id. at 2; see also id., Attachment C. On February 27, 2024, the OSC was mailed to Registrant's residential address, with delivery confirmed on March 2, 2024. Id. at 2; see

excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant's/applicant's right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC]." 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, "[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 CFR] § 1316.67." Id. § 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested

also id., Attachments D-E. Finally, on February 28, 2024, the DI left another copy of the OSC at Registrant's residential address. Id. at 2-3. The Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email on February 26, 2024, as the emails to Registrant's registered email address and to Registrant's attorney were not returned as undeliverable. Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D., 82 FR 34,552, 34,552 (2017) (finding that service by email satisfies due process where the email is not returned as undeliverable and other methods have been unsuccessful). The Agency finds that the DI's efforts to serve Registrant by other means were "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise [Registrant] of the pendency of the action." Jones v. Flowers, 547 U.S. 220, 226 (2006) (quoting Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)). Therefore, due process notice requirements have been satisfied.