established a schedule for the final phase of the antidumping duty investigations (89 FR 91423, November 19, 2024). On March 19, 2025, counsel for Eastman Chemical Company (''Eastman'') and counsel for BASF Corporation (''BASF'') filed requests to appear at the hearing. No other parties submitted a request to appear at the hearing. On March 20, 2025, counsel for Eastman filed a request that the Commission cancel the scheduled hearing for these investigations and withdrew its request to appear at the hearing. On March 20, 2025, counsel for BASF withdrew its request to appear at the hearing. Counsel indicated a willingness to respond to any Commission questions in lieu of an actual hearing. Consequently, the public hearing in connection with these investigations, scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, is cancelled. Parties to these investigations should respond to any written questions posed by the Commission in their posthearing briefs, which are due to be filed on April 1, 2025.

For further information concerning these investigations see the Commission's notice cited above and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 24, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–05271 Filed 3–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–1526]

Bulk Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Application; Promega Corporation

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Promega Corporation has applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of basic class(es) of controlled substance(s). Refer to **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** listed below for further drug information.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants, therefore, may submit electronic comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before May 27, 2025. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application on or before May 27, 2025.

ADDRESSES: The Drug Enforcement Administration requires that all comments be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal, which provides the ability to type short comments directly into the comment field on the web page or attach a file for lengthier comments. Please go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions at that site for submitting comments. Upon submission of your comment, you will receive a Comment Tracking Number. Please be aware that submitted comments are not instantaneously available for public view on *https://www.regulations.gov.* If you have received a Comment Tracking Number, your comment has been successfully submitted and there is no need to resubmit the same comment.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33(a), this is notice that on February 26, 2025, Promega Corporation, 3075 Sub Zero Parkway, Fitchburg, Wisconsin 53719, applied to be registered as bulk manufacturer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substance(s):

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Psilocybin	7437	I
Psilocyn	7438	I

The company plans to bulk manufacture the listed controlled substances as Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (API) for sale to its customers. No other activities for these drug codes are authorized for this registration.

Matthew Strait,

Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2025–05283 Filed 3–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 25–19]

Willard J. Davis, D.O.; Decision and Order

On November 13, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Willard J. Davis, D.O., of Round Rock, Texas (Respondent). OSC, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration No. BD9134254, alleging that Respondent's DEA registration should be revoked because Respondent is ''without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Texas, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

On December 10, 2024 Respondent filed a request for a hearing. On December 30, 2024, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition, which Respondent opposed. On January 23, 2025, 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 Texas, 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 Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD), at 6. Respondent did not file exceptions to the RD.

Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction as found in the RD and summarizes and expands upon portions thereof herein.

Findings of Fact

On May 16, 2024, the Texas Medical Board suspended Respondent's Texas medical license. RD, at 3.[1] According to Texas online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Respondent's Texas medical license remains suspended.[2] Texas Medical Board Healthcare Provider Search, *https://profile.tmb.state.tx.us* (last visited date of signature of this Order).

Accordingly, the Agency finds that Respondent is not currently licensed to

[1] *See also* Government's Notice of Filing of Evidence and Motion for Summary Disposition, Exhibit 1, at 3–6.

[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).

practice medicine in Texas, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[3]

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under section 823 of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) ''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. *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 Texas statute, ''dispense'' means ''the delivery of a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research, by a practitioner or person acting under the lawful order of a practitioner, to an ultimate user or research subject. The term includes the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for delivery.'' Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. section 481.002(12) (2024). Further, a ''practitioner'' includes ''a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, analyze, conduct research with respect to, or administer a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in this state.'' *Id.* section 481.002(39)(A).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Respondent lacks authority to practice medicine in Texas. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Texas. Thus, because Respondent lacks authority to practice medicine in Texas and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Texas, Respondent is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. RD, at 6. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Respondent'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. BD9134254 issued to Willard J. Davis, D.O. 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 Willard J. Davis, D.O., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Willard J. Davis, D.O., for additional registration in Texas. This Order is effective April 28, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on March 20, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. 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. 2025–05166 Filed 3–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[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 Texas. Accordingly, Respondent 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.*

[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 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 27617.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 25–9]

Joely Keen, A.P.R.N.; Decision and Order

On September 24, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Joely Keen, A.P.R.N., of The Woodlands, Texas (Respondent). OSC, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration No. MK4402210, 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 Texas, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

On October 22, 2024, Respondent requested a hearing,[1] and on October 23, 2024, Respondent filed an Answer to the allegations in the OSC. *See* Order For Respondent To File Answer. On November 1, 2024, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition, to which Respondent did not respond. On November 19, 2024, Administrative Law Judge Paul E. Soeffing (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 Texas, the state in which

[1] Respondent initially responded to the OSC via email on October 18, 2024, but her email did not include a hearing request. *See* Respondent's Request for Hearing (October 18, 2024). On October 21, 2024, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) directed Respondent to file a request for a hearing if she desired one, along with an answer to the allegations in the OSC. Order for Respondent to File Request for Hearing and Answer and for Government to File Evidence of Lack of State Authority.