

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act Of 1993—AI Infrastructure Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on April 18, 2023, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), AI Infrastructure Alliance, Inc. (“AIIA”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Kognic AB, Gothenburg, SWEDEN; Manot, Inc., Glendale, CA; Fennel AI, Menlo Park, CA; Arthur, New York, NY; and MakinaRocks, Seoul, SOUTH KOREA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Neuro Inc., San Francisco, CA; and DataRobot, Inc., Boston, MA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and AIIA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 5, 2022, AIIA filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on March 10, 2022 (87 FR 13759).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 20, 2023. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on March 27, 2023 (88 FR 18179).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2023–17345 Filed 8–11–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

David H. Marcowitz, D.O.; Decision and Order

On January 11, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to David H. Marcowitz, D.O. (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit

(RFAAX) 2, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s Certificate of Registration No. FM6860818 at the registered address of 17019 County Farm Road, Rushville, Illinois 62681. *Id.* at 1. The OSC alleged that Registrant’s registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Illinois, 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 with DEA 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. OSC, at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 1.¹ “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). *See also id.* § 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 September 9, 2021, both Registrant’s Illinois medical license and Registrant’s Illinois controlled substance license were suspended. RFAAX 2, at 1.

According to Illinois’ online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, both Registrant’s Illinois medical license and Registrant’s Illinois controlled substance license remain suspended.² Illinois Department of

Financial and Professional Regulation, License Lookup, <https://online-dfpr.micropact.com/lookup/licenselookup.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Therefore, the Agency finds that Registrant is not authorized to practice medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Illinois, the state in which he is registered with DEA.

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 . . . [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. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, D.O.*, 76 FR 71371 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).³

party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.” 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.

³ 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) (this section, formerly section 823(f), was redesignated as part of the Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act, Pub. L. 117–215, 136 Stat. 2257 (2022)). 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*, 76 FR 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, D.O.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, D.O.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, D.O.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton*, 43 FR 27617.

¹ Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated May 2, 2023, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the included Declaration of a DEA Diversion Investigator asserts that on January 11, 2023, Registrant was personally served with the OSC at his private residence. RFAAX 3, 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). 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