2022. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in § 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the reviews and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,[2] and any party other than an interested party to the reviews may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the reviews. Comments are due on or before December 23, 2022 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year reviews nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to these reviews by December 23, 2022. However, should the Department of Commerce (''Commerce'') extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its reviews, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on Filing Procedures,* available on the Commission's website at *https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf,* elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Determination.—The Commission has determined these reviews are extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 13, 2022.

Katherine Hiner,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2022–27374 Filed 12–16–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[2] The Commission has found the response filed on behalf of the Rebar Trade Action Coalition and its individual members, Nucor Corporation, Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc., Commercial Metals Company, Byer Steel, and Steel Dynamics, Inc., domestic producers of rebar, to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Hearing of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Notice of cancellation of open hearing.

SUMMARY: The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure has been canceled: Bankruptcy Rules Hearing on January 13, 2023. The announcement for this hearing was previously published in the **Federal Register** on August 5, 2022.

DATES: January 13, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: H. Thomas Byron III, Esq., Chief Counsel, Rules Committee Staff, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle NE, Suite 7–300, Washington, DC 20544, Phone (202) 502–1820, *RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov.*

(Authority: 28 U.S.C. 2073)

Dated: December 14, 2022.

Shelly L. Cox,

Management Analyst, Rules Committee Staff.

[FR Doc. 2022–27434 Filed 12–16–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 21–35]

Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D.; Decision and Order

On September 23, 2021, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D. (Respondent) of Charleston, South Carolina.[1] OSC/ISO, at 1.

[1] Respondent holds a DEA Certificate of Registration no. AR1001306 at the registered address of 903 Saint Andrews Blvd. Suite B, Charleston, SC 29407–7194. OSC/ISO, at 1–2.

A hearing was held before DEA Administrative Law Judge Paul E. Soeffing (the ALJ) who, on April 5, 2022, issued his Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD).[2] Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, credibility findings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, sanctions analysis, and recommended sanction in the RD and summarizes and expands upon portions thereof herein.

I. Findings of Fact

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), 824(a)(4), the Government seeks revocation of Respondent's DEA registration because Respondent allegedly committed acts rendering his continued registration inconsistent with the public interest, including: (1) improperly prescribing controlled substances; (2) failing to maintain medical records; and (3) engaging in unlawful electronic prescribing practices. OSC/ISO, at 1.

Respondent issued the controlled substance prescriptions at issue in this case to Patients W.G., P.L., T.E., D.P., N.R., and L.C. without maintaining any medical records. RD, at 28.[3] According to the credible, unrebutted, expert testimony of Dr. Gene Kennedy, Respondent issued all of these controlled substance prescriptions outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the applicable standard of care due to Respondent's lack of medical records. *Id.* at 28 (citing Tr. 118–31, 344). The record showed that Respondent could not produce any records for these six patients. RD, at 28 (citing Tr. 249–50; 323). In addition, Dr. Kennedy credibly testified that the controlled substance prescriptions for L.P. and P.B. were issued outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the applicable standard of care because Respondent's partial medical records did not adequately support his prescribing. RD, at 29–31. Finally, the record established that Respondent permitted his wife and son

[2] Neither party filed exceptions.

[3] The parties entered into 46 stipulations, all of which are incorporated into this Decision. RD, at 2–10. On January 29, 2020, Respondent entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with DEA, which remains in effect for three years, and which prohibited Respondent from prescribing Schedule II controlled substances, required Respondent to maintain proper medical files on all patients to whom Respondent issued controlled substance prescriptions, and required Respondent to maintain medical records in a readily retrievable manner. The Agency agrees with the ALJ's consideration of the violations of the MOA in the Sanctions section. *See* RD, at n.12.

to access and use his eToken, password, and PIN to electronically submit prescriptions.[4] *Id.* at 33.

II. Discussion

The Government has the burden of proving that the requirements for revocation of a DEA registration in 21 U.S.C. 824(a) are satisfied. 21 CFR 1301.44(e). Having reviewed the record and the ALJ's RD, the Agency agrees with the RD that the Government has proven by substantial evidence that Respondent committed acts which render his continued registration inconsistent with the public interest.

The Agency agrees with the RD that the record established multiple instances where Respondent failed to comply with applicable federal and state law and dispensed controlled substances in a manner inconsistent with the public interest. The Agency finds that, based on the credible, unrebutted testimony of the Government's expert, Dr. Kennedy, the Government established that Respondent issued all of the prescriptions at issue in this case outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the standard of care in violation of 21 CFR 1306.04(a) and in violation of several South Carolina laws.[5] *See* RD, at 27–30.

Furthermore, the Agency agrees with the RD that the record established that Respondent improperly issued electronic controlled substance prescriptions by entrusting his secure credentials to his wife and son and allowing them to access and provide his PIN in the issuance of those prescriptions. *Id.* at 32. In so doing, Respondent violated 21 CFR 1311.125(c), 21 CFR 1311.135(a), and 21 CFR 1311.102(a). *See id.* at 32–34.

In sum, the Agency agrees with the RD that these factors militate strongly in favor of the Government's position that Respondent's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest and, thus, that the Government established a *prima facie* case for revocation. RD, at 34.

[4] Respondent testified regarding why he could not maintain and produce medical records and the purpose of his treatment of the patients at issue and their circumstances (including that he attempted to move patients away from controlled substance prescriptions for pain and stopped prescribing Schedule II controlled substances after DEA told him to stop in December 2019), but he does not dispute that he could not produce medical records documenting his prescribing. RD, at 27, 29, 30; Tr. 79–82; 240–331. Respondent did not dispute that he had entrusted his electronic credentials to his son and wife. *Id.* (citing Tr. 333–37).

[5] *See* S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 61–4.1002(a), 61–4.1103, 61–4.1204; S.C. Code Ann. 40–47–113(A), 44–53–360(h), 44–115–120; *see* RD, at 27–28.

III. Sanction

Where, as here, the Government has established grounds to revoke Respondent's registration, the burden shifts to the respondent to show why he can be entrusted with the responsibility carried by a registration. *Garret Howard Smith, M.D.,* 83 FR 18,882, 18,910 (2018). When a registrant has committed acts inconsistent with the public interest, he must both accept responsibility and demonstrate that he has undertaken corrective measures. *Holiday CVS LLC dba CVS Pharmacy Nos 219 and 5195,* 77 FR 62,316, 62,339 (2012).

Here, the Agency adopts the rationale of the RD that, although Respondent freely admitted that he failed to keep records that were readily retrievable, he did not unequivocally accept responsibility for his misconduct; instead, he downplayed his misconduct and placed blamed on the actions of others. RD, at 34–38 (citing Tr. 246–57, 316–19, 323–24). In addition, the record demonstrates that Respondent's violations of the law were not isolated occurrences, but took place over more than a year, involved multiple patients, and even occurred *after* the DEA had specifically notified Respondent of the violations and attempted to bring Respondent into compliance with an MOA, which Respondent then violated.

Having reviewed the record in its entirety, the Agency finds that Respondent cannot be entrusted with a DEA registration and orders that his registration be revoked.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in the Administrator by 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. AR1001306 issued to Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b), 21 U.S.C. 824(a), and 21 U.S.C. 823(f), I hereby deny any pending application of Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Allan Alexander Rashford, M.D., for registration in South Carolina. This Order is effective January 18, 2023.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on December 12, 2022, by Administrator Anne Milgram. 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**.

Heather Achbach,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2022–27479 Filed 12–16–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Pre-Implementation Planning Checklist for State Unemployment Insurance Information Technology Modernization Projects

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor's (DOL) Employment and Training Administration (ETA) is soliciting comments concerning a proposed extension for the authority to conduct the information collection request (ICR) titled, ''Pre-Implementation Planning Checklist for State Unemployment Insurance Information Technology Modernization Projects.'' 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 February 17, 2023.

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 *patel.jagruti@dol.gov.*

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: *patel.jagruti@dol.gov;* or by Fax at (202) 693–3975.