

request pertains initiates appropriate legal action in the proper venue to resolve any differences concerning the validity or interpretation of the deed, lease, easement, or other documents that form the basis of the request. This provision applies only if our decision is based on the standard in paragraph (c)(1) and (c)(2) of the VER definition in 30 CFR 761.5.

V. How do I submit comments on the request?

We will make the VER determination request and associated materials available to you for review as prescribed in 30 CFR 842.16, except to the extent that the confidentiality provisions of 30 CFR 773.6(d) apply. Subject to those restrictions, you may review a copy of the VER determination request and all comments received in response to this request at the Charleston Field Office (see **ADDRESSES**). Documents contained in the administrative record are available for public review at the Field Office during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

Electronic or Written Comments

If you wish to comment on the merits of the request for a VER determination, please send electronic or written comments to us at the addresses above (see **ADDRESSES**) by the close of the comment period (see **DATES**). Under 30 CFR 761.16(d)(1)(vii), you may request a 30-day extension of the comment period. Requests for an extension of the public comment period must be submitted to the same addresses by the date indicated.

If you submit comments by Email, please include your name and return address in your message. You may contact the Charleston Field Office at 304-977-7450 if you wish to confirm receipt of your message.

Availability of Comments

We will make all comments, including names and addresses of respondents, available for public review during normal business hours at the location listed in **ADDRESSES**. We will not consider anonymous comments. If you are commenting as an individual, you may request that we withhold your name or address from public review, except for the city or town. We will honor your request to the extent allowable by law. You must state this request prominently at the beginning of your comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of

organizations or businesses, available for public review in their entirety.

Thomas D. Shope,

*Regional Director, North Atlantic—
Appalachian Region.*

[FR Doc. 2025-04652 Filed 3-19-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-455 and 731 TA 1149 (Third Review)]

Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe From China

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that revocation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on circular welded carbon quality steel line pipe from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on September 3, 2024, (89 FR 71419) and determined on December 9, 2024, that it would conduct expedited reviews (90 FR 8301, January 28, 2025).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on March 14, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5598 (March 2025), entitled *Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-455 and 731-TA-1149 (Third Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 14, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025-04663 Filed 3-19-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

JOINT BOARD FOR THE ENROLLMENT OF ACTUARIES

Meeting of the Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

¹ The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

ACTION: Notice of Federal advisory committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries gives notice of a closed teleconference meeting of the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations.

DATES: The meeting will be held on April 25, 2025, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. eastern daylight time (EDT).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Van Osten, Designated Federal Officer, Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations, at (202) 317-3648 or elizabeth.j.vanosten@irs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations will hold a teleconference meeting on April 25, 2025, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. (EDT). The meeting will be closed to the public.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss topics and questions that may be recommended for inclusion on future Joint Board examinations in actuarial mathematics, pension law and methodology referred to in 29 U.S.C. 1242(a)(1)(B).

A determination has been made as required by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. 1009(d), that the subject of the meeting falls within the exception to the open meeting requirement set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B), and that the public interest requires that such meeting be closed to public participation.

Dated: March 17, 2025.

Thomas V. Curtin, Jr.,

Executive Director, Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

[FR Doc. 2025-04709 Filed 3-19-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Linwood A. Starks, D.V.M.; Decision and Order

On June 29, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Linwood A. Starks, D.V.M., of Grand Prairie, Texas (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. FS5936919, alleging that Registrant’s registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Texas, the

state in which [he is] registered with DEA.” *Id.* at 1–2 (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). The OSC also notified Registrant that if he requested a hearing but failed to timely file an answer, plead, or otherwise defend, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* On October 11, 2023, Registrant filed a request for a hearing, however, the request for hearing did not contain any answers to the OSC. RFAA, at 2; RFAAX 4, at 1–2. Registrant was given an extended deadline to file answers to the OSC, but failed to do so, and on October 23, 2023, the Chief Administrative Law Judge terminated the proceedings and found Registrant to be in default. RFAA, at 2–3; RFAAX 5, at 2.

“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.* section 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 4; *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 January 6, 2023, the Executive Disciplinary Committee of the Texas Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners (TBVME) issued an Order of Temporary Suspension barring Registrant from the practice of veterinary medicine in Texas. RFAAX 2, at 1–2. According to Texas online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant’s Texas veterinary license remains suspended.¹ Texas Board of Veterinary

Medical Examiners Licensee Lookup, <https://apps.veterinary.texas.gov/s/licenseelookup> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a veterinarian in Texas, 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, 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).²

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.

² 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

According to Texas statute, “dispense” means “the delivery of a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research, by a practitioner or person acting under the lawful order of a practitioner, to an ultimate user or research subject. The term includes the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for delivery.” Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. section 481.002(12) (2024). Further, a “practitioner” includes “a physician, dentist, veterinarian . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, analyze, conduct research with respect to, or administer a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in this state.” *Id.* section 481.002(39)(A).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice as a veterinarian in Texas. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Texas. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice as a veterinarian in Texas and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Texas, 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. FS5936919, issued to Linwood A. Starks, D.V.M. 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 Linwood A. Starks, D.V.M., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Linwood A. Starks, D.V.M., for additional registration in Texas. This Order is effective April 21, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed

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.

¹ 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

on March 13, 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. 2025-04746 Filed 3-19-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Rachel Jackson, P.A.; Decision and Order

On October 1, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Rachel Jackson, P.A., of Sabattus, Maine (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 4, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. MG5136723, 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 Maine, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 1-2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).¹

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.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 3.² "A default, unless

¹ According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on December 31, 2024. The fact that a registrant allows her registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.*, 84 FR 68474, 68476-79 (2019).

² Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated August 20, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on November 8, 2023, Registrant was successfully served a copy of the OSC via email to an email address associated with Registrant. RFAAX 1, at 2; *Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D.*, 82 FR 34552, 34552 (2017) (finding

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.* section 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, on June 9, 2023, Registrant requested that the Maine Board of Licensure in Medicine permit her to voluntarily surrender her Maine physician assistant license. RFAAX 4, at 2. Effective July 11, 2023, the Maine Board of Licensure in Medicine granted Registrant's request. *Id.* According to Maine online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Maine physician assistant license is inactive and listed under a status of “Voluntary Surrender.”³ Government of

that service by email satisfies due process where the email is not returned as undeliverable and other methods have been unsuccessful). As noted in the DI's Declaration, on October 5, 2023, the DI and other DEA officials attempted in-person service of the OSC to an address associated with Registrant, but the service was unsuccessful. RFAAX 1, at 1-2. On October 10, 2023, the DI provided her contact information to Registrant via email to Registrant's aforementioned email address. *Id.* at 2. On October 12, 2023, the DI called all five phone numbers listed in the information database for Registrant, as well as Registrant's spouse. *Id.* Regarding the phone numbers that were still in service, the DI was unable to reach Registrant and left a voicemail for Registrant with her contact information. *Id.* Finally, on November 9, 2023, the DI mailed copies of the OSC via certified and first-class mail to two different addresses associated with Registrant. *Id.* On November 20, 2023, the DI received confirmation of receipt of the certified mail, and upon search of the USPS mail tracking system, the DI confirmed that Registrant received and signed for the certified mail for both addresses. *Id.*; RFAAX 3. In sum, the Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email and 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.

³ 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

Maine Regulatory Licensing & Permitting Search, <https://www.pfr.maine.gov/ALMSOnline/ALMSQuery/Welcome.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a physician assistant in Maine, 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 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).⁴

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.

⁴ 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