industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is ''televisions with smart features and functionality'';

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) *The complainant is:* Maxell, Ltd., 1. Koizumi, Oyamazaki, Oyamazaki-cho, Otokuni-gun, Kyoto, 618–8525 Japan.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

TCL Electronics Holdings Ltd. (f/k/a TCL, Multimedia Technology Holdings, Ltd.), 7th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

TCL Industries Holdings Co., Ltd., 22nd Floor, TCL Technical Tower, Huifeng 3 Road, Zhongkai Development, Zone Huizhou, Guangdong, China, 516006

T.C.L. Industries Holdings (H.K.) Limited, 8th Floor, Building 22E, Phase Three, Hong Kong Science Park, Pak Shek Kok, New Territories, Hong Kong

TTE Technology, Inc. (d/b/a TCL North America), 1860 Compton Avenue, Corona, CA 92881

TTE Corporation, 7th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

TCL King Electrical Appliances, (Huizhou) Co. Ltd., No. 78, Huifeng 4 Road, Zhongkai Development Zone Huizhou, China, 516006

Manufacturas Avanzadas S.A. de C.V., Blvd. Independecia No. 2151, Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, 32580, Mexico

TCL Smart Device (Vietnam) Co., Ltd., No. 26 VSIP II–A, Street 32, Vietnam Singapore Industrial Park II–A, Tan Binh Commune, Bac Tan Uyen District, Binh Duong Province, 75000, Vietnam

Shenzhen TCL New Technology Co., Ltd., 9th Floor, TCL Electronics Holdings Limited Building, TCL International E City, No. 1001 Zhongshan Park Road, Nanshan, China, 518067

TCL Optoelectronics Technology (Huizhou) Co., Ltd., No. 78, Huifeng 4 Road, Zhongkai Development Zone Huizhou, China, 516006

TCL Overseas Marketing Ltd., 5th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

TCL Technology Group Corporation, (f/k/a TCL Corp.), TCL Technology Building, No. 17, Huifeng Third Road, Zhongkai High-Tech Development Zone, Huizhou, Guangdong, China 516001

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainant of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 24, 2024.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2024–22187 Filed 9–26–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Theodore S. Wright Jr., M.D.; Decision and Order

On August 30, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Theodore S. Wright Jr., M.D., of Chicago, Illinois (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. AW2016651, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Illinois, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 1–2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file with DEA 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. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.[1] ''A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant'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 1; *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, effective February 21, 2023, the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation suspended

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated October 17, 2023, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator indicates that on August 31, 2023, Registrant was personally served with the OSC at his registered address. RFAAX 2, at 1; *see also id.* at 3 (Form DEA–12 signed by Registrant on August 31, 2023).

Registrant's Illinois medical license. RFAAX 1, at 1. According to Illinois's online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Illinois medical license remains suspended.[2] Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation License Search, *https://online-dfpr.micropact.com/lookup/licenselookup.aspx/* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Illinois, the state in which he is registered with DEA.

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 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. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, D.O.,* 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.,* 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).[3]

Pursuant to the Illinois Controlled Substances Act, a practitioner in good faith (''the regular course of professional treatment'') may dispense a controlled substance. 720 Ill. Comp. Stat. 570/312(a), 570/102(u) (2024).[4] A ''practitioner'' means ''a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise lawfully permitted by the United States or [Illinois] to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, administer or use in teaching or chemical analysis, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research.'' *Id.* 570/102(kk).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in Illinois. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Illinois. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Illinois, and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Illinois, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. 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. AW2016651 issued to Theodore S. Wright Jr., 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 Theodore S. Wright Jr., M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Theodore S. Wright Jr., M.D., for additional registration in Illinois. This Order is effective October 28, 2024.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on September 19, 2024, by Administrator Anne Milgram. 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. 2024–22200 Filed 9–26–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[2] 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). 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.'' 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.*

[3] 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 is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper,* 76 FR 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, D.O.,* 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, D.O.,* 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, D.O.,* 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton,* 43 FR 27617.

[4] ''Dispense'' means ''to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a prescriber, including the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.'' *Id.* 570/102(p).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 24–46]

Wagner Gervais, P.A.; Decision and Order

On May 7, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Wagner Gervais, P.A., of Tucson, Arizona (Respondent). OSC, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration No. MG7845778, alleging that Respondent's DEA registration should be revoked because Respondent is ''without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Arizona, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

On May 21, 2024, Respondent requested a hearing and filed an Answer. On June 4, 2024, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition, to which Respondent did not respond.[1] On June 24, 2024, Administrative Law Judge Teresa A. Wallbaum (the ALJ) granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and recommended the revocation of Respondent's registration, finding that because Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances in Arizona, the state in which he is registered with DEA, ''[t]here is no genuine issue of material fact in this case.'' Order Granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, and Recommended

[1] On June 14, 2024, Respondent sought to continue the DEA proceedings while appealing the loss of his state authority; consistent with past precedent, the Administrative Law Judge denied the continuance.