FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick W. McDonough, Executive Director of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries, 202–622–8225.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations will meet at The Segal Company, 333 W. 34th Street, New York, NY, on April 26, 2013, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

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. App., that the subject of the meeting falls within the exception to the open meeting requirement set forth in Title 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B), and that the public interest requires that such meeting be closed to public participation.

Dated: March 21, 2013.

Patrick W. McDonough,

Executive Director, Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

[FR Doc. 2013–07160 Filed 3–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials

Notice is hereby given that, on March 11, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (''IAPMO'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the nature and scope of IAPMO's standards development activities are to provide for the erection, installation, alteration, repair, relocation, replacement, addition to, use, or maintenance of solar energy, geothermal, and hydronic systems including but not limited to equipment and appliances intended for space heating or cooling; water heating; swimming pool heating or process heating; and snow and ice melt systems.

On September 14, 2004, IAPMO filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 29, 2004 (69 FR 69396).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 10, 2004. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5485).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2013–07134 Filed 3–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Sematech, Inc. D/B/A International Sematech

Notice is hereby given that, on March 7, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Sematech, Inc. d/b/a International Sematech (''SEMATECH'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Poongsan, Seoul, REPUBLIC OF KOREA; Advantest, Tokyo, JAPAN; and Air Products, Allentown, PA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Micron, Boise, ID, has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and SEMATECH intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 22, 1988, SEMATECH filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 19, 1988 (53 FR 17987).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 16, 2013. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 12, 2013 (78 FR 9939).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2013–07136 Filed 3–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 13–7]

Gary Alfred Shearer, M.D.; Decision And Order

On February 4, 2013, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Christopher B. McNeil issued the attached recommended decision. Neither party filed exceptions to the decision.

Having reviewed the record in its entirety, including the ALJ's recommended decision, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law,[1] and

[1] In opposing the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, Respondent argues that the Kentucky Board of Medical Licensure's Order is based upon information provided by law enforcement which ''is seriously flawed, misconstrued, unverified, unsupported, or simply, untrue.'' Resp. Reply to Govt's Mot. for Summ. Disp., at 2. Respondent raises a plethora of contentions, including that the conduct of the investigators ''was highly prejudicial and, frankly, inept,'' *id.;* that the Board ''cherry-picked'' the charts its consultant reviewed and that the consultant's conclusion that Respondent ''violated the standard of care was wrong—because *there was no standard of care* in Kentucky regarding what a physician should do in the face of inconsistent [urine drug screens] at the time these patients were being treated,'' *id.* at 4; and that the Board ignored the consultant's recommendations that his prescribing issues could be addressed by educating [him] about proper follow up.'' *Id.* at 8. He then concludes by arguing that ''DEA created the case against [him] that led to his suspension[,]'' that ''[t]he agency now wants to bootstrap the suspension it caused as a reason to revoke [his] license to write controls'' [sic], and that the Board ''most likely would never have suspended [his] medical license without the DEA's biased, unfairly prejudicial input.'' *Id.* at 26–27. As relief, Respondent seeks a hearing and a stay of the matter until after the Board's hearing.

The fact remains that the Board's Order of Emergency Suspension remains in effect, and ''DEA has held repeatedly that a registrant cannot collaterally attack the result of a state criminal or administrative proceeding in a proceeding under section 304, 21 U.S.C. 824, of the CSA.'' *Zhiwei Lin,* 77 FR 18862, 18864 (2012) (citing cases). As I held in *Lin,* ''Respondent's various challenges to the validity of the [Board's] Suspension Order must be litigated in the forums provided by the State,'' and his ''contentions regarding the validity of the [Board's] Suspension Order are therefore not material to this Agency's resolution of whether he is entitled to maintain his DEA registration in''

Continued