Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Cocaine	9041	II
Codeine	9050	II
Dihydrocodeine	9120	II
Oxycodone	9143	II
Hydromorphone	9150	II
Diphenoxylate	9170	II
Ecgonine	9180	II
Hydrocodone	9193	II
Meperidine	9230	II
Methadone	9250	II
Methadone intermediate.	9254	II
Morphine	9300	II
Thebaine	9333	II
Opium tincture	9630	II
Oxymorphone	9652	II
Noroxymorphone	9668	II
Alfentanil	9737	II
Remifentanil	9739	II
Sufentanil	9740	II
Tapentadol	9780	II
Fentanyl	9801	II

In reference to drug codes 7360 (Marijuana), and 7370 (THC), the company plans to bulk manufacture these drugs as synthetic. No other activities for these drug codes are authorized for this registration.

Dated: February 11, 2019.

John J. Martin,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2019–02882 Filed 2–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

Bulk Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Registration

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: The registrant listed below has applied for and has been granted a registration by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) as a bulk manufacturer of various classes of schedule I and II controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The company listed below applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of various basic classes of controlled substances. Information on the previous published notice are listed in the table below. No comments or objections were submitted for this notice.

Company	FR docket	Published
Sigma Aldrich Research.	83 FR 54613	October 30, 2018.

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823(a) and determined that the registration of this registrant to manufacture the applicable basic classes of controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated the company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing the company's physical security systems, verifying the company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing the company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33, the DEA has granted a registration as a bulk manufacturer to the above listed company.

Dated: January 29, 2019.

John J. Martin,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2019–02869 Filed 2–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Registration

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: The registrant listed below has applied for and has been granted registration by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) as an importer of schedule II controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The company listed below applied to be registered as an importer of a basic class of controlled substance. Information on the previously published notice is listed in the table below. No comments or objections were submitted and no requests for hearing were submitted for this notice.

Company	FR docket	Published
Myoderm	83 FR 66751	December 27, 2018.

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823, 952(a) and 958(a) and determined that the registration of the listed registrant to import the applicable basic class of schedule II controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated the company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing the company's physical security systems, verifying the company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing the company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 952(a) and 958(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34, the DEA has granted a registration as an importer for schedule II controlled substances to the above listed company.

Dated: February 11, 2019.

John J. Martin,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2019–02870 Filed 2–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Registration

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: The registrants listed below have applied for and been granted registration by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) as importers of schedule I or schedule II controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The companies listed below applied to be registered as importers of various basic classes of controlled substances. Information on previously published notices is listed in the table below. No comments or objections were submitted and no requests for hearing were submitted for these notices.

Company	FR docket	Published
Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc	83 FR 58598	November 20, 2018.
Lipomed	83 FR 58601	November 20, 2018.
Akorn, Inc	83 FR 60896	November 27, 2018.
Cambridge Isotope Laboratories	83 FR 60897	November 27, 2018.
GE Healthcare	83 FR 60899	November 27, 2018.
Fisher Clinical Services, Inc	83 FR 60900	November 27, 2018.

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823, 952(a) and 958(a) and determined that the registration of the listed registrants to import the applicable basic classes of schedule I or II controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated each of the company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing each company's physical security systems, verifying each company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing each company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 952(a) and 958(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34, the DEA has granted a registration as an importer for schedule I or schedule II controlled substances to the above listed companies.

Dated: January 29, 2019.

John J. Martin,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2019–02866 Filed 2–20–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 17–01]

Ajay S. Ahuja, M.D.; Decision and Order

On May 25, 2017, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Charles Wm. Dorman issued the attached Recommended Decision (R.D.).[1] Neither party filed exceptions to the ALJ's Recommended Decision. Having reviewed the entire record, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's findings of fact as modified,[2] conclusions of law, and recommended sanction except as explained below.

Respondent's Registration Status

Respondent is the holder of DEA Certificate of Registration AA3029293, pursuant to which he is authorized to dispense controlled substances in schedules II through V as a practitioner, at the registered address of 825 High Ridge Road, Stamford, Connecticut. Government Exhibit (GX) 1, at 1. Although not alleged in the Order to Show Cause, *see* Administrative Law Judge Exhibit (ALJ Ex.) 1, I also find that the administrative record in this case and this Agency's registration records, of which I take official notice,[3] show that Respondent is the holder of DATA-Waiver Identification Number XA3029293. *See* GX 1, at 1. Respondent's DATA-Waiver authority authorized him to dispense or prescribe schedule III–V narcotic controlled substances which ''have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration . . . specifically for use in maintenance or detoxification treatment'' for up to 275 patients. 21 CFR 1301.28(a) & (b)(1)(iii).

Respondent's registration was due to expire on June 30, 2017. GX 1, at 1. Although the ALJ correctly indicated that the record before him did ''not contain evidence that the Respondent filed an application of renewal,'' R.D., at 2 n.1, the Agency's registration records do indicate, and I take official notice,[4] that Respondent submitted a renewal application on May 9, 2017. Because Respondent has submitted a timely renewal application, I find that Respondent's registration has remained in effect pending the issuance of this Decision and Final Order. *See* 5 U.S.C. 558(c); 21 CFR 1301.36(i). Moreover, because Respondent's DATA-Waiver authority is contingent on Respondent being a practitioner with a valid DEA registration, *see* 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(A); 21 CFR 1301.28(a), I find that Respondent's DATA-Waiver authority also remained in effect pending issuance of this Decision and Final Order. Thus, this case remains a live controversy, and I have jurisdiction to decide this matter.

Respondent's Corrective Action Plan

After submitting a timely request for a hearing on October 6, 2016, *see* ALJ Ex. 2, Respondent submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C) on October 25, 2016 to the Deputy Assistant Administrator of DEA's Office of Diversion Control. ALJ Ex. 9. As part of his CAP, Respondent promised that he: (1) ''will not order or dispense controlled substances;'' (2) ''will no longer prescribe controlled substances to his family members;'' (3) ''will retain an independent monitor to review and evaluate his practice;'' (4) ''will continue to educate himself on issues related to drug diversion and enroll in related continuing medical education;'' (5) ''will cooperate with DEA in a candid and truthful manner in future communications with DEA;'' and (6) ''will authorize DEA to access all his prescribing records for controlled substances in the Connecticut Prescription Monitoring and Reporting System ('CPMRS').'' *Id.* at 2–3.

On November 4, 2016, the Assistant Administrator of DEA's Diversion Control Division rejected Respondent's CAP and further ''determined there is no potential modification of your [ ]CAP that could or would alter my decision in this regard.'' *See* Exhibit A (Letter from then-Assistant Administrator Louis J. Millione to Respondent (dated November 4, 2016)) to ALJ Ex. 11, at 1. I conclude that the facts set forth in the adopted Recommended Decision demonstrate that the Agency had adequate grounds to deny Respondent's CAP. Thus, I agree with the Agency's denial of Respondent's CAP, and I too reject it.

Pre-Hearing Identification of Documents Used To Impeach a Witness on Cross-Examination

In his Recommended Decision, the ALJ criticized the Government's use of the Respondent's earlier deposition testimony[5] to impeach Respondent during cross-examination because, *inter alia,* ''the Government had not identified the deposition transcript as a document it intended to use prior to the hearing.'' R.D., at 10. I do not adopt the ALJ's suggestion that a party is precluded from using information or a document to impeach a witness during cross-examination unless it is identified prior to the administrative hearing. The APA states that ''[a] party is entitled . . . to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.'' 5 U.S.C. 556(d). Likewise, Agency precedent has applied this APA standard to hold that ALJs lack the authority to preclude a party from using relevant information to impeach a witness during cross-examination. *See Trinity II,* 83 FR 7304, 7322 n.43 (2018)

[1] All citations to the Recommended Decision are to the slip opinion issued by the ALJ.

[2] I have modified the Recommended Decision by replacing the full name of DEA and state law enforcement officials with their initials. I have indicated where I have made these modifications in the Recommended Decision with brackets.

[3] Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), an agency ''may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.'' U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act* 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). In accordance with the APA and DEA's regulations, Respondent is ''entitled on timely request to an opportunity to show to the contrary.'' 5 U.S.C. 556(e); *see also* 21 CFR 1316.59(e). To allow Respondent the opportunity to refute the facts of which I take official notice, Respondent may file a motion for reconsideration within 15 calendar days of service of this order which shall commence on the date this order is mailed.

[4] I take official notice of this fact pursuant to the same authority set forth *supra* in footnote 3.

[5] The deposition of Respondent apparently occurred in connection with a civil case brought by the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Connecticut against Respondent. *See* Transcript 61–62, 64, 109–10, 291; *United States* v. *Ahuja,* No. 3:14–CV–1558, 2017 WL 1807561 (D. Conn. May 5, 2017), *aff'd,* 736 F. App'x 20 (2d Cir. 2018).