

even if I were to consider Respondent's remedial measures, they would not affect my ultimate decision in this matter. While I give Respondent credit for the rehabilitation he has pursued so far, it is significant that Respondent has never sustained his sobriety outside the context of a regulated drug program and has provided no documentary evidence corroborating his sobriety and remedial measures. I find it troubling that as of the date of the administrative hearing, he had no set plans for further treatment or other remedial measures once his PRN contract expired. Respondent's remedial measures also dealt only with his drug addiction, and he provided no evidence of remedial measures with respect to his fraudulent scheme aside from taking general, required courses on proper prescribing. Tr. 193–94. Thus, Respondent's remedial measures are inadequate given his lack of corroborating evidence of the measures he has already undertaken, his nonexistent plan for the future, and his failure to show any remedial measures related to his fraud.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to acceptance of responsibility, the Agency looks to the egregiousness and extent of the misconduct, *Garrett Howard Smith, M.D.*, 83 FR at 18910 (collecting cases), and gives consideration to both specific and general deterrence when determining an appropriate sanction. *Daniel A. Glick, D.D.S.*, 80 FR 74800, 74810 (2015). Here, Respondent's fraud was egregious—he perpetrated a calculated, sophisticated scheme, manipulating those who trusted him, and using his knowledge as a DEA registrant to evade detection. See *Jana Marjenhoff, D.O.*, 80 FR 29067, 29095 (2015). As for general deterrence, failing to impose a significant sanction against Respondent would send the wrong message to other registrants that the Agency does not take fraud seriously—especially a fraudulent scheme in which a registrant uses his knowledge of the controlled system of distribution to defeat it. Such a message would be inconsistent with past Agency precedent and the goals of the CSA. *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> Respondent argues the ALJ did not give proper weight to his handling of controlled substances during the five years between the fraudulent prescriptions and the OSC. Exceptions, at 20–21. I agree with the ALJ that, while the record does not contain any evidence that Respondent has issued fraudulent prescriptions or tested positive for drugs since 2016 (an assertion for which he has provided no documentary support), I cannot conclude Respondent has learned from his mistakes and can be entrusted with a new registration because of his failure to acknowledge his fraud and the impact it had on those he manipulated and placed in legal jeopardy. RD, at 34.

As for specific deterrence, the “Agency also looks to the nature of the crime in determining the likelihood of recidivism and the need for deterrence.” *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.*, 84 FR 46968, 49973 (2019). The Agency has previously found that criminal convictions and sanctions by state licensing authorities can sufficiently deter physicians from engaging in misconduct, making the revocation of a registration unnecessary to achieve specific deterrence. *Kansky J. Delisma, M.D.*, 85 FR 23845, 23854 (2020). Here, Respondent has not been criminally convicted and there is no evidence in the record that he has faced any sanctions by the state licensing authority. As a result, the interest of specific deterrence clearly favors the sanction of revocation.

As discussed above, to avoid sanction when grounds for revocation exist, a respondent must convince the Administrator that he can be entrusted with a registration. I find that Respondent has not met this burden.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, I shall order the sanctions the Government requested, as contained in the Order below.

#### Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. FH1510709 issued to Michael T. Harris, M.D. Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I further hereby deny any pending application to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending applications of

<sup>4</sup> In his Exceptions, Respondent re-raises nine DEA cases he previously cited in his posthearing brief and cites to three additional cases, which, he argues, demonstrate revocation in this matter is improper. Exceptions, at 24–27. I disagree. As noted in the RD, clear Agency precedent requires full acceptance of responsibility, and Respondent has failed to demonstrate such acceptance. See RD, at 38–39 (collecting cases). Imposing a sanction of revocation in this matter is consistent with recent agency decisions that have revoked registrations in matters where a registrant unlawfully obtained controlled substances for personal use and failed to accept full responsibility. See, e.g., *David Mwebe, M.D.*, 85 FR 51065, 51068 (2020) (revoking registration based on fraudulent issuance of prescriptions for personal use); *David W. Bailey, M.D.*, 81 FR 6045, 6047 (2016) (revoking registration of physician who issued controlled prescriptions in his wife's name for personal use). For example, in *Erica Grant, M.D.*, the Agency revoked the registration of a registrant with a substance abuse disorder because, while she had accepted responsibility for her unlawful use of controlled substances, her acceptance of responsibility did not cover all of the Agency's charges against her. 86 FR 40641, 40650 (2021); see also, *Robert Wayne Locklear, M.D.*, 86 FR 33738, 33747–48 (2021).

Michael T. Harris, M.D. This Order is effective June 17, 2022.

Anne Milgram,  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2022–10598 Filed 5–17–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2022–041]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We have submitted a request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval to continue to use a currently approved information collection. This information collection, OMB 3095–0037, covers requests for civilian service records from former Federal civilian employees or other authorized individuals—for information from, or copies of, documents in Official Personnel Files (OPF) or Employee Medical Files (EMF). We invite you to comment on this proposed information collection.

**DATES:** OMB must receive written comments on or before June 17, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** Send any comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection in writing to [www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain](http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain). You can find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tamee Fechhelm, Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, by email at [tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov](mailto:tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov) or by telephone at 301.837.1694 with any requests for additional information.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), we invite the public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. We published a notice of proposed collection for this information collection on March 8, 2022 (87 FR 13011) and we received no comments. We are therefore submitting the described information collection to OMB for approval.

If you have comments or suggestions, they should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for NARA to properly perform

its functions; (b) our estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection and its accuracy; (c) ways we could enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information we collect; (d) ways we could minimize the burden on respondents of collecting the information, including through information technology; and (e) whether this collection affects small businesses.

In this notice, we solicit comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title:* Requests for Civilian Service Records (formerly Forms Relating to Civilian Service Records).

*OMB number:* 3095–0037.

*Agency form number:* NA Forms 13022, 13064, 13068.

*Type of review:* Regular.

*Affected public:* Former Federal civilian employees, their authorized representatives, state and local governments, and businesses.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 57,899.

*Estimated time per response:* 5 minutes per form.

*Frequency of response:* On occasion, when individuals desire to acquire information from Federal civilian employee personnel or medical records.

*Estimated total annual burden hours:* 4,824 hours.

*Abstract:* In accordance with rules issued by the Office of Personnel Management, the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) administers Official Personnel Folders (OPF) and Employee Medical Folders (EMF) of former Federal civilian employees. When former Federal civilian employees and other authorized individuals request information from or copies of documents in OPF or EMF, they must provide in their requests certain information about the employee and the nature of the request so that we can determine whether they are authorized to receive the information and so that we can find the correct records. The NA Form 13022, Returned Request Form, is used to request additional information about the former Federal employee. The NA Form 13064, Reply to Request Involving Relief Agencies, is used to request additional information about the former relief agency employee. The NA Form 13068, Walk-In Request for OPM Records or Information, is used by members of the public, with proper authorization, to

request a copy of a personnel or medical record.

**Swarnali Haldar,**

*Executive for Information Services/CIO.*

[FR Doc. 2022–10640 Filed 5–17–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515–01–P**

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2022–043]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We have submitted a request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval to continue to use a currently approved information collection, Facility Access Media (FAM) Request, NA Form 6006, used by all individuals requesting recurring access to non-public areas of NARA's facilities and IT network. We invite you to comment on this proposed information collection.

**DATES:** OMB must receive written comments on or before June 17, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** Send any comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection in writing to [www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain](http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain). You can find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Tamee Fechhelm, Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, by email at [tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov](mailto:tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov) or by telephone at 301.837.1694 with any requests for additional information.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), we invite the public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. We published a notice of proposed collection for this information collection on March 8, 2022 (87 FR 13010) and we received no comments. We are therefore submitting the described information collection to OMB for approval.

If you have comments or suggestions, they should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for NARA to properly perform its functions; (b) our estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection and its accuracy; (c) ways we

could enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information we collect; (d) ways we could minimize the burden on respondents of collecting the information, including through information technology; and (e) whether this collection affects small businesses.

In this notice, we solicit comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title:* Facility Access Media (FAM) Request.

*OMB number:* 3095–0057.

*Agency form number:* NA Form 6006.

*Type of review:* Regular.

*Affected public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 1,500.

*Estimated time per response:* 3 minutes.

*Frequency of response:* On occasion.

*Estimated total annual burden hours:* 75 hours.

*Abstract:* All individuals who require recurring access to non-public areas of NARA's facilities and IT network (such as NARA employees, contractors, volunteers, NARA-related foundation employees, volunteers, interns, and other non-NARA Federal employees, such as Federal agency reviewers), herein referred to as “applicants,” complete the Facility Access Media (FAM) Request, NA Form 6006, in order to obtain NARA Facility Access Media (FAM). After we review the request, we issue the applicant a FAM, if approved, and they are then able to access non-public areas of NARA facilities and IT network. Collecting this information is necessary to comply with Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) 12 requirements for secure and reliable forms of personal identification issued by Federal agencies to their employees, contractors, and other individuals requiring recurring access to non-public areas of Government facilities and information services. We developed this form to comply with this requirement.

**Swarnali Haldar,**

*Executive for Information Services/CIO.*

[FR Doc. 2022–10642 Filed 5–17–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515–01–P**

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2022–042]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice.