

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 13, 2024,

Curia New York, Inc., 33 Riverside Avenue, Rensselaer, New York 12144, applied to be registered as an importer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substance(s):

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Gamma Hydroxybutyric Acid .....	2010	I

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances for bulk manufacturing into other controlled substances to be distributed to their customers. No other activity for this drug code is 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. 2024-31292 Filed 12-27-24; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

**Samreen Riaz, D.D.S.; Decision and Order**

On February 27, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Samreen Riaz, D.D.S., of Hawthorne, California (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. FR4257792, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is "currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of California, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a

hearing. RFAA, at 3.<sup>1</sup> "A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant'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 final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

**Findings of Fact**

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, effective September 1, 2023, the Dental Board of

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated May 23, 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 March 12, 2024, the DI attempted to serve Registrant with the OSC at Registrant's registered address, a clinic. RFAAX 1, at 1. However, the clinic manager who was at the registered location claimed to not know Registrant, despite working at the location for nearly five years. *Id.* The DI then left several voicemails with the clinic's Human Resources department, which went unanswered. *Id.* at 2. On March 19, 2024, the DI mailed a copy of the OSC to a different address Registrant had on file with DEA; however, as of April 5, 2024, the mailing was never claimed by Registrant and was scheduled to be returned to DEA. *Id.* Finally, on April 5, 2024, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address. *Id.*; *see also id.*, Attachment A. The DI did not receive any error message in response to the email. *Id.* at 2. Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email. *Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D.*, 82 FR 34552, 34552 (2017) (finding that service by email satisfies due process where the email is not returned as undeliverable and other methods have been unsuccessful). Further, 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.

California revoked Registrant's California dental license. RFAAX 2, at 2. According to California online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's California dental license remains revoked.<sup>2</sup> California DCA License Search, <https://search.dca.ca.gov> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a dentist in California, the state in which she 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

<sup>2</sup> Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency "may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision." United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), "[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary." Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at [dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov](mailto:dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov).

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 71,371, 71,372 (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 California 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, furnishing, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.” Cal. Health & Safety Code section 11010 (West 2024). Further, a “practitioner” means a 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.* section 11026(c).

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

<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 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, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27617.

## 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. FR4257792 issued to Samreen Riaz, D.D.S. 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 Samreen Riaz, D.D.S., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Samreen Riaz, D.D.S., for additional registration in California. 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. 2024–31319 Filed 12–27–24; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–09–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Jeffrey W. Young, Jr., N.P.; Decision and Order

On June 8, 2021, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Jeffrey W. Young, Jr., N.P., of Jackson, Tennessee (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s Certificate of Registration No. MY1093424, alleging that Registrant’s registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Tennessee, 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.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.<sup>1</sup> “A default, unless 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 final agency action based on Registrant’s default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(e). RFAA, at 1.

## Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant’s default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, on September 30, 2019, Registrant’s Tennessee registered nurse license and Tennessee advanced practice registered nurse certificate both expired. RFAAX 2, 2. According to Tennessee online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, both Registrant’s Tennessee registered nurse license and Tennessee advanced practice registered nurse certificate are revoked.<sup>2</sup> NURSYS License Verification Search, <https://www.nursys.com/LQC/LQCSearch.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a nurse

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated June 11, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the included Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on June 14, 2021, a DEA Task Force Officer (TFO) personally served a copy of the OSC to Registrant at the West Tennessee Detention Facility in Mason, Tennessee, where Registrant remained incarcerated. RFAAX 3, at 2–3, Attachment C.

<sup>2</sup> Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency “may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.” United States Department of Justice, Attorney General’s Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), “[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.” Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency’s finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at [dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov](mailto:dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov).