

(Authority: Government in the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. 552b)

Vicktoria J. Allen,

Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–02480 Filed 2–6–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 6715–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The public portions of the applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, if any, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank(s) indicated below and at the offices of the Board of Governors. This information may also be obtained on an expedited basis, upon request, by contacting the appropriate Federal Reserve Bank and from the Board's Freedom of Information Office at <https://www.federalreserve.gov/foia/request.htm>. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Comments received are subject to public disclosure. In general, comments received will be made available without change and will not be modified to remove personal or business information including confidential, contact, or other identifying information. Comments should not include any information such as confidential information that would not be appropriate for public disclosure.

Comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors, Ann E. Misback, Secretary of the Board, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20551–0001, not later than March 12, 2025.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (Colette A. Fried, Assistant Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690–1414. Comments can also be sent

electronically to *Comments*

.applications@chi.frb.org:

1. *Bosshard Financial Group, Inc., La Crosse, Wisconsin*; to merge with Bosshard Banco, Ltd., La Crosse, Wisconsin, and thereby indirectly acquire Intercity State Bank, Schofield, Wisconsin, and The First National Bank of Bangor, Bangor, Wisconsin.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Michele Taylor Fennell,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2025–02420 Filed 2–7–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 23–5]

David Bockoff, M.D.; Decision and Order

I. Introduction

On October 25, 2022, the United States Department of Justice (Agency) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (collectively, OSC) to David Bockoff, M.D., (Respondent) of Beverly Hills, California. OSC, at 1, 8. The OSC immediately suspended, and proposes the revocation of, Respondent's Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) registration, No. BB4591839, “because . . . [Respondent's] continued registration constitutes ‘an imminent danger to the public health or safety,’” and “because . . . [Respondent's] continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest, as that term is defined in 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1).”¹ *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(d) and (a)(4)).

Respondent timely requested a hearing. Request for Hearing (November 4, 2022), at 1; Prehearing Ruling (November 30, 2022), at 1. DEA Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Teresa A. Wallbaum conducted a four-day hearing at the DEA Hearing Facility, attended by Respondent and his Counsel by video teleconference, on January 19, 20, 23, and 24, 2023. Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD), at 2. On May 2, 2023, the ALJ issued her

¹ Effective December 2, 2022, the Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act, Public Law 117–215, 136 Stat. 2257 (2022) (Marijuana Research Amendments or MRA), amended the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and other statutes. Relevant to this matter, the MRA redesignated 21 U.S.C. 823(f), cited in the OSC, as 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Accordingly, this Decision cites to the current designation, 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), and to the MRA-amended CSA throughout.

RD recommending revocation of Respondent's registration.² *Id.* at 43.

Having thoroughly analyzed the record and applicable law, the Agency summarizes its findings and conclusions: (1) DEA (the Government) presented a *prima facie* case, (2) Respondent attempted, but failed, to rebut the Government's *prima facie* case, and (3) substantial and uncontroverted record evidence, including the testimony of the Government's expert witness, shows Respondent's violations of applicable law go to the core of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). Accordingly, the Agency will revoke Respondent's registration. *Infra* Order.

II. California Physicians' and Surgeons' Standard of Care

According to the CSA, “[e]xcept as authorized by this subchapter, it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally . . . to . . . distribute, . . . dispense, or possess with intent to . . . distribute[] or dispense, a controlled substance.” 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1). The CSA's implementing regulations state that a lawful controlled substance order or prescription is one that is “issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his professional practice.” 21 CFR 1306.04(a).

The OSC is addressed to Respondent at his registered address in California. Therefore, the Agency also evaluates Respondent's actions according to California law, including the applicable California standard of care.³ Authorities in the “Legal Requirements” and “Standard of Care” sections of the OSC give Respondent notice of the bases for the OSC's allegations and, accordingly, are the authorities that the Agency is using to adjudicate those allegations. OSC, at 2–3; *infra*.

The first California authority listed in the OSC's “Legal Requirements” section is California Health and Safety Code § 11153(a). During the time period alleged in the OSC, that California provision, similar to the CSA, required that a “prescription for a controlled substance shall only be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his or her professional practice.” Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11153(a) (West 2023–24); OSC, at 2.

² Neither party filed exceptions to the RD.

³ See *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 269–71 (2006); see also OSC, at 2–3. The versions of the California authorities cited in this Decision/Order were in effect from at least January 2020 through June 2022, the time period alleged in the OSC. OSC, at 3–8.