

operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix); and

(c) The quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* from each *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the *Domestic Like Product* that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country(ies)* since the *Order Date*, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the *Domestic Like Product* produced in the United States, *Subject Merchandise* produced in the *Subject Country(ies)*, and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (Optional) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the *Domestic Like Product* and *Domestic Industry*; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 24, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-18441 Filed 7-31-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Pistoia Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 29, 2012, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Pistoia Alliance, Inc. 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, Certara L.P. Portugal, Funchal, Madeira, PORTUGAL; Deloitte Consulting LLP, New York, NY; Mary Chitty (individual member), Needham, MA; and Hewlett-Packard Company, Palo Alto, CA, have been added 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 Pistoia Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 28, 2009, Pistoia Alliance, Inc. 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 July 15, 2009 (74 FR 34364).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 17, 2012. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 14, 2012 (77 FR 28404).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2012-18769 Filed 7-31-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 11-45]

Decision and Order; Perry T. Dobyns, M.D.

On November 2, 2011, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Gail A. Randall issued the attached recommended decision. Therein, the ALJ found that while the Government had established grounds for

denying Respondent's application, ALJ at 22, Respondent has been sober since December 2008, that he has been in compliance with his Indiana Physicians' Assistance Program Continuing Care Contract since November 2009, *id.* at 20, and that he "has consistently taken responsibility for his misconduct." ¹ *Id.* at 21. The ALJ thus recommended that Respondent be granted a restricted registration subject to multiple conditions. The Government did not file exceptions to the ALJ's decision.²

Having reviewed the record, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended Order. Accordingly, I will order that Respondent be granted a registration subject to the following conditions:

(1) Respondent shall be limited to prescribing controlled substances and may not administer or dispense directly any controlled substances. In addition, Respondent may not order any controlled substances or accept any samples of controlled substances. If Respondent is employed at a practice in which controlled substances are stored on the premises, Respondent shall not have access to the cabinet in which the controlled substances are stored. Respondent shall inform any medical practice at which he becomes employed of this restriction on his registration.

(2) Respondent is prohibited from prescribing controlled substances to himself or any family member.

(3) Respondent shall maintain a log of all controlled substance prescriptions he authorizes and shall file a report listing in chronological order all such prescriptions by date, and including the following information: the name and address of the patient, name and dosage of the drug, quantity of the drug, and number of refills authorized. Each report shall be filed with the local DEA field office no later than ten (10) calendar days after the end of the previous quarter, *e.g.*, April 10 (for the quarter ending on March 31), July 10

¹ No evidence was put forward showing that Respondent diverted controlled substances to others.

² In its post-hearing brief, the Government cites a prior decision of this Agency, which after having already ordered that the practitioner's application be granted, then noted "evidence of the community's need for a physician of his specialty with prescribing capabilities." Gov. Br. 11 (quoting *David M. Headley*, 61 FR 39469, 39471 (1996)). However, the Agency has since held in multiple cases that community impact evidence is not relevant in the public interest determination and provided an extensive explanation as to why. See *Linda Sue Cheek*, 76 FR 66972, 66973 (2011); *Mark De La Lama*, 76 FR 20011, 20020 n.20 (2011); *Bienvenido Tan*, 76 FR 17673, 17694 n.58 (2011); *Gregory D. Owens*, 74 FR 36571, 36757 & n.22 (2009).