official notice,[3] Registrant's Pennsylvania medical license has a status of ''Suspension.'' Pennsylvania BPOA License Search, *https://www.pals.pa.gov/#!/page/search* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Pennsylvania, the state in which she is registered with DEA.[4]

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General may suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 ''upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had [her] 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).[5]

According to Pennsylvania statute, ''dispense'' means ''to deliver a controlled substance, other drug or device to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare such item for that delivery.'' 35 Pa. Stat. § 780–102(b) (West 2025). Further, a ''practitioner'' means ''a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to or to administer a controlled substance, other drug or device in the course of professional practice or research in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.'' *Id.*

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant is not a currently licensed practitioner in Pennsylvania. As discussed above, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Pennsylvania. Thus, because Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in Pennsylvania and, therefore, is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in Pennsylvania, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration in Pennsylvania. 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. FG3991115 issued to Hayriye Gok, 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 Hayriye Gok, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Hayriye Gok, M.D., for additional registration in Pennsylvania.

This Order is effective August 8, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on July 1, 2025, by Acting Administrator Robert J. Murphy. 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. 2025–12703 Filed 7–8–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[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 General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979).

[4] 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.'' The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this Order, is not licensed to practice medicine in Pennsylvania. 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.*

[5] 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 or she is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he or she practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.,* 76 FR at 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 at 27617.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On July 2, 2025, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in the lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *Trialco Aluminum, LLC,* Civil Action No. 1:25–cv–07461.

The proposed Consent Decree resolves claims against Trialco Aluminum, LLC (''Trialco'') related to emissions of hazardous air pollutants from its aluminum production facility located in Chicago Heights, Illinois. The Complaint filed in this matter seeks injunctive relief and civil penalties pursuant to Section 113(b) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. 7413(b), for violation of (1) the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Pollutants (NESHAP) pertaining to secondary aluminum production facilities, 40 CFR part 63, subpart RRR; and (2) Trialco's Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit (FESOP) for its Chicago Heights facility. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Trialco will pay a $1 million civil penalty; perform an updated assessment of its capture and collection

system; adopt and implement a new Operation, Maintenance, and Monitoring (OM&M) plan; and apply for a new FESOP with revised operating limits.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States* v. *Trialco Aluminum, LLC,* D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–12888. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	*Send them to:*
By email	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.*
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Any comments submitted in writing [or at a public meeting] may be filed in whole or in part on the public court docket without notice to the commenter.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: *http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.* If you require assistance accessing the Consent Decree, you may request assistance by email or by mail to the addresses provided above for submitting comments.

Laura Thoms,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–12770 Filed 7–8–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2012–0034]

Hexavalent Chromium Standards for General Industry, Shipyard Employment, and Construction; 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 Hexavalent Chromium Standards for General Industry, Shipyard Employment, and Construction.

DATES: Comments must be submitted (postmarked, sent, or received) by September 8, 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–2012–0034) 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: Belinda Cannon, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, US 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 purpose of these requirements is to help protect workers from the adverse effects that may result from occupational exposure to hexavalent chromium. The information collection requirements contained in the standard include conducting worker exposure monitoring, notifying workers of their chromium exposures, implementing medical surveillance of workers, providing examining physicians with specific information, implementing a respiratory protection program, notifying laundry personnel of chromium hazards, and maintaining workers' exposure monitoring and medical surveillance records for specific periods.

II. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the agency's functions to protect workers, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information, and transmission techniques.