Register pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on October 11, 2024 (89 FR 82628).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–06810 Filed 4–18–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Integrated Photonics Institute for Manufacturing Innovation Operating Under the Name of the American Institute for Manufacturing Integrated Photonics

Notice is hereby given that, on March 11, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), The Integrated Photonics Institute for Manufacturing Innovation operating under the name of the American Institute for Manufacturing Integrated Photonics (''AIM Photonics'') 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, Aeluma, Inc., Goleta, CA; The Regents of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI; and MISUMI USA Inc., Schaumburg, IL, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, CSPEED Inc., Palo Alto, CA; DeepSight Technology Inc., Santa Clara, CA; Luna Innovations, Blacksburg, VA; Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc., Raritan, NJ; Seagate Technology LLC, Fremont, CA; and Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.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 AIM Photonics intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On June 16, 2016, AIM Photonics 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 July 25, 2016 (81 FR 48450).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 6, 2024. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on February 28, 2025 (90 FR 10947).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–06798 Filed 4–18–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

John Stanton, M.D.; Decision and Order

On November 22, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to John Stanton, M.D., of Clarksville, Tennessee (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration No. BS1750048, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is ''currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Tennessee, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).[1]

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. RFAAX 2, at 3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.[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.* § 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 3; *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 April 27, 2023, the State of Tennessee Department of Health, Board of Medical Examiners revoked Registrant's Tennessee medical license. RFAAX 2 at 2. According to Tennessee online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Tennessee medical license remains revoked.[3] Tennessee Department of Health Licensure Verification, *https://internet.health.tn.gov/Licensure* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a physician in Tennessee, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

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

[1] The OSC also proposed the revocation of Registrant's registration because Registrant was convicted of a federal felony related to controlled substances and was mandatorily excluded from participation in Medicare, Medicaid, and all federal health care programs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a–7(a). *Id.* at 1. In its RFAA, the Government referenced these additional allegations in the introductory paragraph, the procedural background, and the proposed findings of fact. RFAA, at 1–3. However, in the ''Proposed Conclusions of Law and Argument'' section of the RFAA through the remainder of the document, the Government only discussed the aforementioned loss of state authority allegation. *Id.* at 3–6. As such, the Government appears to have dropped the felony conviction and mandatory exclusion allegations and the Agency does not consider them in this decision.

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated February 14, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was likely adequate. Specifically, an included Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on or about December 11, 2023, Registrant was sent a copy of the OSC through certified mail to his registered address, the address where he is currently incarcerated, and two separate attorney addresses. RFAAX 3, at 1–2. Though there is no documented confirmation of receipt from either Registrant or his attorneys, all copies of the OSC that were mailed had tracking numbers attached. *Id.,* Attachments A–D.

[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 Decision, is not licensed to practice medicine in Tennessee. 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.*