Respondent ''Spa Sciences LP'' to ''Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences.'' Pursuant to Ground Rule 2.2, Complainant reported that third-party Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences (''MTB'') would ''take a position on the Motion as filed.'' *See* Mot. to Amend at 1.

On April 10, 2025, before the opposition to the Motion to Amend was due, the ALJ issued Order No. 7, granting Complainant's Motion to Amend. On April 11, 2025, MTB filed an opposition to Complainant's Motion to Amend. On April 17, 2025, MTB filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. 7.

On May 7, 2025, the Commission determined to review Order No. 7 and remanded Order No. 7 to the ALJ to consider both MTB's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. 7 and its Opposition to Complainant Aardvark Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint. *See* Order No. 7, *reviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 7, 20225).

On May 22, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 9) granting Complainant's motion for leave to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation. *See* Order No. 9 (May 22, 2025). No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The named respondent Spa Sciences LP has been changed to ''Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences.''

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 17, 2025.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR Part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 17, 2025.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory and Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–11406 Filed 6–20–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

William Thompson IV, M.D.; Decision and Order

On December 2, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to William Thompson IV, M.D., of Newport Beach, California (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. FT3578082, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of California, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).[1]

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 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 4.[2] ''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), (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, on May 15, 2024, the Medical Board of California issued a Default Decision and Order revoking Registrant's state medical license effective on June 14, 2024. RFAAX 1, at 2. According to California online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[3] Registrant's California medical license remains revoked. California DCA License Search, *https://search.dca.ca.gov* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in California, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

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. *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 71,371, 71,372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th

[1] According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on November 30, 2024. *See also* RFAAX 1, at 1. The Agency has previously held that it is within its jurisdiction and prerogative to adjudicate a matter to finality where a registration expired before issuance of the OSC. *Abdul Naushad, M.D.,* 89 FR 54,059, 54,059–60 (2024).

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated March 5, 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 December 20, 2024, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address and the email was not returned. RFAAX 2, at 1. Here, the Agency finds that the DI's efforts to serve Registrant 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.

[3] 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).

[4] 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 California. 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.*

Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.,* 43 FR 27,616, 27,617 (1978).[5]

According to California statute, ''dispense'' means ''to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, furnishing, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.'' Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11010 (West 2024). Further, a ''practitioner'' means a person ''licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or administer, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in [the] state.'' *Id.* at § 11026(c).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California. As discussed above, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in California. Thus, because Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California and, therefore, is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in California, 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. FT3578082 issued to William Thompson IV, 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 Thompson IV, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of William Thompson IV, M.D., for additional registration in California. This Order is effective July 23, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on June 17, 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**.

Gregory Aul,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2025–11480 Filed 6–20–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[5] 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, M.D.,* 76 FR at 71,371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.,* 71 FR 39,130, 39,131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.,* 58 FR 51,104, 51,105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.,* 53 FR 11,919, 11,920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.,* 43 FR at 27,617.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Federal-State Unemployment Insurance Program Data Exchange Standardization

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor's (DOL) Employment and Training Administration (ETA) is soliciting comments concerning a proposed revision to the authority to conduct the information collection request (ICR) titled, ''Federal-State Unemployment Insurance Program Data Exchange Standardization.'' This comment request is part of continuing Departmental efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA).

DATES: Consideration will be given to all written comments received by August 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES: A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation, including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden, may be obtained free by contacting Jagruti Patel by telephone at (202) 693–3059 (this is not a toll-free number), TTY 1–877–889–5627 (this is not a toll-free number), or by email at *OUI-PRA@dol.gov.* For persons with a hearing or speech disability who need assistance to use the telephone system, please dial 711 to access telecommunications relay services.

Submit written comments about, or requests for a copy of, this ICR by mail or courier to the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Unemployment Insurance, Room S–4524, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210; by email: *OUI-PRA@dol.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Jagruti Patel by telephone at (202) 693–3059 (this is not a toll-free number) or by email at *OUI-PRA@dol.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: DOL, as part of continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a pre-clearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information before submitting them to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for final approval. This program helps to ensure requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements can be properly assessed.

The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (the Act) was signed into law on February 22, 2012. Section 2104 of the Act amends Title IX, Social Security Act by adding a new section 911 (42 U.S.C. 1111), which requires DOL to issue rules that establish data exchange standards for certain functions related to administration of the unemployment insurance (UI) program. As a result, DOL issued a rule designating XML (eXtensible Markup Language) as the data exchange standard for the real-time applications on the Interstate Connection Network (ICON) and for State Information Data Exchange System (SIDES). States are required to conform to the XML data exchange standard for these applications. DOL's regulations implementing this Act, codified in 20 CFR part 619, authorizes this information collection. This is a proposed extension with revision. The only revision is because the number of states that the Data Exchange Standardization rule affects has declined from 15 to 12, as more states