

2003, Lifepoint, Inc., 10400 Trademark Street, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymphetamine (7400).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7405).	I
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methamphetamine (1105)	II
phencyclidine (7471)	II
Benzoylcegonine (9180)	II
Morphine (9300)	II

The firm plans to produce small quantities of controlled substances for use in drug test kits.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: Federal Register Representative, Office of Chief Counsel (CCD) and must be filed no later than February 2, 2004.

Dated: November 14, 2003.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-29961 Filed 12-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated August 19, 2003, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 2, 2003, (68 FR 52225), LinZhi International, Inc., 687 North Pastoria Avenue, Sunnyvale, California 94085, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7405).	I
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methamphetamine (1105)	II
Secobarbital (2315)	II
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
Cocaine (9041)	II
Methadone (9250)	II
Dextropropoxyphene (9273)	II
Morphine (9300)	II

The firm plans to manufacture small quantities of controlled substances to make drug testing reagents and controls.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, Section 823(a) and determined that the registration of LinZhi International, Inc. to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Lin-Zhi International, Inc. to ensure that the company's registration is consistent with the public interest. This investigation has included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with state and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed is granted.

Dated: November 19, 2003.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-29975 Filed 12-1-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 03-2]

Jules M. Lusman, M.D., Revocation of Registration

On September 6, 2002, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Jules Lusman, M.D. (Respondent) notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, BL2210300 under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) and (a)(4). The

Order to Show Cause alleged that the Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration should be revoked because the Respondent was without authorization to handle controlled substances. The Order to Show Cause further sought denial of any pending applications for registration based on allegations that the Respondent's continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged that effective March 15, 2002, the California Medical Board (Medical Board) ordered that Respondent be prohibited from handling controlled substances based upon acts of negligence in both his care of patients and billing practices. The Order to Show Cause further alleged that a DEA investigation revealed the Respondent's failure to adhere to various DEA-recordkeeping requirements.

By letter dated September 30, 2002, the Respondent, acting *pro se*, timely requested a hearing in this matter. On October 15, 2002, the presiding Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner (Judge Bittner) issued to the Government as well as the Respondent an Order for Prehearing Statements.

In lieu of filing a prehearing statement, the Government filed Government's Request for Stay of Proceedings and Motion for Summary Judgment. The Government argued that the Respondent is without authorization to handle controlled substances in the State of California, and as a result, further proceedings in the matter were not required. Attached to the Government's motion was a copy of a declaration from the Medical Board's Chief of Enforcement who averred among other things, that on March 15, 2002, the Medical Board issued an Interim Order of Suspension summarily suspending the Respondent's medical license. The Medical Board representative further stated that as of October 25, 2002, the Medical Board's Interim Order of Suspension remained in effect. On November 7, 2002, Judge Bittner issued a Memorandum to Counsel staying the filing or prehearing statements and afforded the Respondent until November 26, 2002, to respond to the Government's Motion.

On or around October 30, 2002, the Respondent filed a prehearing statement where he disputed allegations that he maintained inadequate records of his handling of controlled substances. The Respondent maintained that his procedures for handling controlled substances were proper, and that prosecution witnesses offered biased testimony in the previous Board proceeding involving the Respondent's