

824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. BC5574048 issued to Robert Carter, D.D.S. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny pending application Number W20128194C and any other pending application of Robert Carter, D.D.S., for registration in Delaware or New Jersey. This Order is effective March 17, 2025.

### Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on February 3, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. 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. 2025-02622 Filed 2-13-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Yogesh Patel, M.D.; Decision and Order

On June 7, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Yogesh Patel, M.D., of Grand Junction, Colorado (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. FP8684931, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is "currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Colorado, 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 (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(d), (e), (f)(1), 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 on or about January 22, 2024, Registrant entered into a Non-Disciplinary Interim Cessation of Practice Agreement with the Colorado Medical Board that indefinitely prohibited him from "performing any act requiring a license issued by the Colorado Medical Board." RFAAX 1, at 1. According to Colorado online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Colorado medical license is under an "Active—Restricted" status and Registrant is not permitted to practice medicine.<sup>2</sup> Colorado Division of Professions and Occupations License Search, <https://apps2.colorado.gov/>

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated August 1, 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 July 1, 2024, Registrant was personally served a copy of the OSC at a residence located in Illinois. RFAAX 2, at 1–2. Registrant also signed a DEA Form 12 acknowledging receipt of the OSC on this date. *Id.* at 2; RFAAX 3.

<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).

[dora/licensing/lookup.aspx](#) (last visited date of signature of this Order).

Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Colorado, 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 71,371, 71,372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27,616, 27,617 (1978).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (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 71,371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39,130, 39,131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51,104, 51,105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11,919, 11,920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27,617.

According to Colorado statute, “dispense” means “to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user, patient, 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.” Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18–18–102(9) (2024). Further, a “practitioner” means a “physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by this state, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, administer, or to use in teaching or chemical analysis, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research.” *Id.* § 18–18–102(29).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado. As discussed above, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Colorado. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Colorado, 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. FP8684931, issued to Yogesh Patel, M.D. 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 Yogesh Patel, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Yogesh Patel, M.D., for additional registration in Colorado. This Order is effective March 17, 2025.

### Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on February 10, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. 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. 2025–02629 Filed 2–13–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2011–0059]

#### Occupational Exposure to Hazardous Chemicals in Laboratories; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

**AGENCY:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

**ACTION:** Request for public comments.

**SUMMARY:** OSHA solicits public comments concerning the proposal to extend the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) approval of the information collection requirements specified in the Occupational Exposure to Hazardous Chemicals in Laboratories.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted (postmarked, sent, or received) by April 15, 2025.

#### ADDRESSES:

*Electronically:* You may submit comments and attachments electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for submitting comments.

*Docket:* To read or download comments or other material in the docket, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Documents in the docket are listed in the <https://www.regulations.gov> index; however, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through the websites. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection through the OSHA Docket Office. Contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 (TTY (877) 889–5627) for assistance in locating docket submissions.

*Instructions:* All submissions must include the agency name and OSHA docket number (OSHA–2011–0059 for the Information Collection Request (ICR). OSHA will place all comments, including any personal information, in the public docket, which may be made available online. Therefore, OSHA

cautions interested parties about submitting personal information such as social security numbers and birthdates.

For further information on submitting comments, see the “Public Participation” heading in the section of this notice titled **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Seleda Perryman, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor; telephone (202) 693–2222.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of the continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (*i.e.*, employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, the collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA’s estimate of the information collection burden is accurate. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSH Act) (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the OSH Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657). The OSH Act also requires that OSHA obtain such information with minimum burden upon employers, especially those operating small businesses, and to reduce to the maximum extent feasible unnecessary duplication of effort in obtaining information (29 U.S.C. 657).

The following sections describe who uses the information collected under each requirement, as well as how they use it. The following sections describe who uses the information collected under each requirement, as well as how they use it. The purpose of these requirements is to reduce employees’ risk of death or serious injury by ensuring that employment has been tested and is in safe operating condition.

The Standard entitled “Occupational Exposure to Hazardous Chemicals in Laboratories” (29 CFR 1910.1450; the “Standard”) applies to laboratories that use hazardous chemicals in accord with the Standard’s definitions for “laboratory use of hazardous chemicals” and “laboratory scale.” The Standard