confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel [2], solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.[3]

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of §§ 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 3, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–12690 Filed 7–7–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1022 (Fourth Review)]

Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide From China

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on refined brown aluminum oxide from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on February 3, 2025 (90 FR 8812, February 3, 2025) and determined on May 9, 2025, that it would conduct an expedited review (90 FR 22113, May 23, 2025).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on July 3, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5645 (July 2025), entitled *Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–1022 (Fourth Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 3, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–12665 Filed 7–7–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

William Washington, M.D.; Decision and Order

On January 22, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to William Washington, M.D., of Bellevue, Washington (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) A, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. FW5625213, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Washington, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

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. *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/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 1–2; *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 November 26, 2024, the Washington Medical Commission permanently revoked Registrant's Washington medical license. RFAAX A, at 1. According to Washington online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[2] Registrant's Washington medical license remains revoked. Washington State Department of Health Provider Credential Search, *https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/providercredentialsearch/default.aspx* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Washington, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[3]

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 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. *Gonzales* v.

---

[2] All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

[3] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *https://edis.usitc.gov*

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

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated February 24, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, a Form DEA–12, Receipt for Cash or Other Items, indicates that a DEA Diversion Investigator personally served Registrant with the OSC on January 22, 2025. RFAAX B, at 1.

[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).

[3] 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 Washington. 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.*

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).[4]

According to Washington statute, ''[a] practitioner may dispense or deliver a controlled substance to or for an individual or animal only for medical treatment or authorized research in the ordinary course of that practitioner's profession.'' Wash. Rev. Code § 69.50.308(j) (2022). Further, a ''prescription'' means ''an order for controlled substances issued by a practitioner duly authorized by law or rule in the state of Washington to prescribe controlled substances within the scope of his or her professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose.'' *Id.* at § 69.50.101(41) (West 2025). Finally, a ''practitioner'' as defined by Washington statute includes ''[a] physician licensed to practice medicine and surgery.'' *Id.* at § 69.50.101(40)(c).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in Washington. As already discussed, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense or prescribe a controlled substance in Washington. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Washington and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Washington, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration in Washington. 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. FW5625213 issued to William Washington, 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 William Washington, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of William Washington, M.D., for additional registration in Washington. This Order is effective August 7, 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. 2025–12608 Filed 7–7–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[4] This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the 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, 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

Drug Enforcement Administration

Tanya Newlove, N.P.; Decision and Order

On February 18, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Tanya Newlove, N.P., of Peoria, Illinois (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration (COR) No. MD3642077, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to . . . handle controlled substances in the State of Illinois, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (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/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.* at 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c) and (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 deemed admitted. According to the OSC, Registrant's Illinois registered professional nurse license, advanced practice registered nurse license, and advanced practice nurse controlled substance license expired on June 30, 2024. RFAAX 1, at 2. According to Illinois online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[2] Registrant's Illinois licenses have a status of ''Not Renewed.'' Illinois DFPR 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 as a practitioner in Illinois, the

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated April 9, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was proper. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on March 3, 2025, the DI personally served Registrant with a copy of the OSC. RFAAX 2, at 1.

[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).