

U.S. International Trade Commission Building. Oral testimony and written materials to be submitted at the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), and 207.24 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 business days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written submissions.—Each party who is an interested party shall submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.23 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is Wednesday, May 6, 2015. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.25 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is Thursday, May 21, 2015. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigations may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations, including statements of support or opposition to the petition, on or before Thursday, May 21, 2015. On Wednesday, June 10, 2015, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before Friday, June 12, 2015, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.30 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on E-Filing*, available on the Commission's Web site at <http://edis.usitc.gov>, elaborates upon the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to section 201.12 of the Commission's rules, shall not be accepted unless good cause is shown for accepting such submissions, or unless the submission is pursuant to a specific request by a Commissioner or Commission staff.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as

identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 20, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–01138 Filed 1–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1131–1132, and 1134 (Review)]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From Brazil, China, and the United Arab Emirates

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (“PET film”) from China and the United Arab Emirates would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission further determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Brazil would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.²

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on October 1, 2013 (78 FR 60311) and determined on January 23, 2014 that it would conduct full reviews (79 FR 9276, February 18, 2014). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given

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

² Vice Chairman Dean A. Pinkert determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on PET film from Brazil would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 2014 (79 FR 43509). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on November 18, 2014, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission completed and filed its determination in these reviews on January 16, 2015. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4512 (January 2015), entitled *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from Brazil, China, and the United Arab Emirates: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1131–1132, and 1134 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 16, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–01096 Filed 1–22–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Community Oriented Policing Services Public Meetings With Members of the Research Community, Subject-Matter Experts and the Public To Discuss Topics Relating to Policing; Correction

AGENCY: Community Oriented Policing Services, Justice.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Justice published a document in the **Federal Register** of January 15, 2015, concerning a public meeting notice to discuss topics relating to policing. The document contained times and topics that require updating.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ronald L. Davis, 202–514–4229 or PolicingTaskForce@usdoj.gov.

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of January 15, 2015, in FR Doc. 2015–00546, on page 2122–2123, in the first column, correct the **SUMMARY** and **DATES** caption to read:

SUMMARY: On December 18, 2014, President Barack Obama signed Executive Order 13684 titled “Establishment of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing” establishing the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (“Task Force”). The Task Force seeks to identify best practices and make recommendations to the President on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction while building public trust and examine, among other issues, how to foster strong, collaborative relationships between local law enforcement and the

communities they protect. The Task Force will be holding a public meeting to address the topics of Policy & Oversight and Technology & Social Media. The meeting agenda is as follows:

Call to Order

Invited witness testimony on Policy & Oversight (January 30)

Invited witness testimony on Technology & Social Media (January 31)

Break

Discussion

DATES: The meeting dates are:

1. January 30, 2015 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, Cincinnati, OH.

2. January 31, 2015 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, Cincinnati, OH.

Dated: January 15, 2015.

Ronald L. Davis,

Director.

[FR Doc. 2015-01102 Filed 1-22-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[CPCLO Order No. 001-2015]

Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records

AGENCY: Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice of termination of two systems of records.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), the United States Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, is terminating the systems of records entitled "Office of Legal Counsel Attorney Assignment Reports, JUSTICE/OLC-001" and "Office of Legal Counsel Central File, JUSTICE/OLC-003." The Department is eliminating the Attorney Assignment Reports system because the reports no longer exist and have been destroyed. The Department is eliminating the Central File system because the 5 x 7 card index no longer exists and the records maintained in the Central File are not retrieved by the name of individuals or by other identifying information assigned to individuals.

Accordingly, the Privacy Act system of records notices last published in the **Federal Register** on September 4, 1985, 50 FR 35878, 35879, are removed from the Department's compilation of Privacy Act systems.

Dated: January 8, 2015.

Erika Brown Lee,

Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015-01211 Filed 1-22-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-23-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Jose Raul S. Villavicencio, M.D.; Decision and Order

On June 24, 2013, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Jose Raul S. Villavicencio, M.D. (hereinafter, Registrant), of Parkersburg, West Virginia. GX 1. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration and denial of any applications for renewal or modification of the registration, and any applications for any other DEA registration, on the ground that his continued "registration would be inconsistent with the public interest." *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4)).

The Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant is registered as a practitioner in Schedules II through V, pursuant to DEA registration number BV3249643, at the location of 1909 Dudley Avenue, Parkersburg, West Virginia, and that his registration does not expire until May 31, 2016. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant had previously been registered at 1761 High Street, Columbus, Ohio, and that on September 27, 2012, the Agency had approved his request for a change from his previous registered address. *Id.* The Show Cause Order also alleged that Registrant's DEA registration authorizes him to dispense schedule III drugs to patients for maintenance or detoxification treatment, and that since July 12, 2007, Registrant has been authorized to treat up to one hundred patients, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(A) and (2)(b)(iii). *Id.*

The Show Cause Order then alleged that on September 12, 2012, the State Medical Board of Ohio permanently revoked Registrant's medical license following a hearing. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that the Ohio Board's Order was based on his failure to comply with applicable state law pertaining to the prescribing of schedule II through IV controlled substances for chronic pain, and that upon its review of sixteen (16) patient files, the Board found that he "failed to maintain minimal standards applicable to the administration or selection of drugs" for fourteen (14) of the patients, and that his "care of all [sixteen (16)] patients was 'a departure from, or the failure to conform to, minimal standards of care of similar practitioners,' in violation" of Ohio Revised Code Sections 4731.22(B)(2) and 4731.22(B)(6). *Id.* at

1-2. The Show Cause Order then alleged that the Ohio Board's findings with respect to the sixteen patients establish that Registrant prescribed controlled substances without a legitimate medical purpose and outside of the usual course of professional practice in violation of 21 CFR 1306.04(a). *Id.* at 2.

Next, the Show Cause Order alleged that a review of data obtained from the Ohio Automated Rx Reporting System (OARRS), the state database to which all Ohio pharmacies are required to report their dispensings of controlled substances, showed that on at least five separate occasions between September 1, 2010 and March 1, 2012, Registrant was treating over 100 patients with Suboxone or Subutex prescriptions at a time. *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus alleged that Registrant violated 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(B)(iii) and 21 CFR 1301.28(f). *Id.*

The Show Cause Order further alleged that on March 9, 2013, DEA served an administrative inspection warrant at Registrant's registered location seeking to inspect all of his controlled substance records pertaining to his prescribing of Subutex and Suboxone for maintenance or detoxification treatment. *Id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Investigators found that Registrant committed numerous violations of two DEA regulations, 21 CFR 1304.03(c) and 1306.05(a), including that: (1) On 116 occasions, he "failed to record dosage units prescribed"; (2) on five occasions, he "failed to record the date on which the prescriptions were signed"; (3) on three occasions, he "failed to record the drug name"; and (4) on sixteen occasions, he "failed to record any prescription information." *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1304.03(c) and 1306.05(a)). The Order also alleged that Registrant issued eleven Subutex or Suboxone prescriptions to patients from a location at which he was not registered. *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 822(e)). *Id.* at 2.

Finally, the Show Cause Order also alleged that Registrant had not been candid in providing material information in violation of 21 U.S.C. 823(f)(5). Specifically, the Order alleged that: (1) The Ohio Board found that he "provided questionable, self-serving testimony during the hearing" in three respects; (2) that on an application to a drug distributor, he had falsely stated that his medical license or registration had never been subject to "sanction or disciplinary action"; (3) and that during an inspection by an Investigator for the West Virginia Board of Medicine, Registrant had stated that he had not ordered any drugs for dispensing when he had done so two days earlier.