

Privileged, Personal, or Confidential Information.” BOEM will post all comments received on *regulations.gov* unless labeled as confidential and BOEM determines that an exemption from disclosure applies.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Jennifer Miller, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific Region, Office of Strategic Resources, 760 Paseo Camarillo (CM 102), Camarillo, California 93010, at *Pacific.Region@boem.gov* or (805) 384-6305.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Comments already submitted for the June 16, 2025, RFI do not need to be resubmitted. Please refer to the RFI published in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 25369) on June 16, 2025, for more information.

*Authority:* 43 U.S.C. 1337(k)(1) and 30 CFR 581.12.

**Matthew Giacona,**

*Principal Deputy Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.*

[FR Doc. 2025-13280 Filed 7-15-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4340-38-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1145 (Third Review)]

### Steel Threaded Rod From China

#### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> 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 steel threaded rod 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 8808) and determined on May 9, 2025, that it would conduct an expedited review (90 FR 22115, 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 14, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5647 (July 2025), entitled *Steel Threaded Rod from China*:

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

*Investigation No. 731-TA-1145 (Third Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 14, 2025.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2025-13340 Filed 7-15-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Benson Sergiles, P.A.; Decision and Order

On December 2, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Benson Sergiles, P.A., of Peoria, Arizona (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. MB7529261, alleging that Registrant is “currently without authority to . . . 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)).

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.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 3.<sup>1</sup> “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).

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated May 6, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on January 15, 2025, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant at his registered email address but received an “Undeliverable” email in response stating that Registrant’s registered email address was “disabled.” RFAAX 3, at 5. On the same date, the DI sent a copy of the OSC to Registrant’s registered mailing address via USPS First Class Mail, but it was returned on January 23, 2025. *Id.* at 3. The DI also mailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant’s “mail to address” and two additional business addresses associated with Registrant. *Id.* at 4. On February 18, 2025, one of the copies was returned to the DI. *Id.* at 5. Here, the Agency finds that the DI’s efforts to serve Registrant at his registered email address, registered mailing address, and multiple other mailing addresses were “reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise [Registrant] of the pendency of the action.” *Jones v. Flowers*, 547 U.S. 220, 226 (2006) (quoting *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)). Therefore, due process notice requirements have been satisfied.

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), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 4–5; *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, Registrant’s Arizona physician assistant license expired on January 2, 2023. RFAAX 2, at 1. Further, according to the OSC, his Arizona physician assistant license specified that he was “[n]ot certified to prescribe controlled drugs,” and the prescriptive authority under his license before it expired was only for “NON-CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.” *Id.* at 2. According to Arizona online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,<sup>2</sup> Registrant’s Arizona physician assistant license remains expired. Arizona Regulatory Board of Physician Assistants Search, <https://www.azpa.gov/PASearch/PASearch> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a physician assistant in Arizona, the state in which he is registered with DEA.<sup>3</sup>

#### 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 . . .

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> 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 as a physician assistant in Arizona. 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](mailto:dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov).