

and filed its determinations in these investigations on August 5, 2024. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5532 (August 2024), entitled *Brake Drums from China and Turkey: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-729-730 and 731-TA-1698-1699 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 5, 2024.

**Sharon Bellamy,**

*Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2024-17680 Filed 8-8-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-731 and 731-TA-1700 (Preliminary)]

### Low Speed Personal Transportation Vehicles From China Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of low speed personal transportation vehicles from China, provided for in subheadings 8703.10.50, 8703.90.01, 8706.00.15, and 8707.10.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”) and imports of the subject merchandise from China that are alleged to be subsidized by the government of China.<sup>2</sup>

### Commencement of Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission’s rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in § 207.21 of the Commission’s rules, upon notice from the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under §§ 703(b) or 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in those investigations

under §§ 705(a) or 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Any other party may file an entry of appearance for the final phase of the investigations after publication of the final phase notice of scheduling. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations. As provided in section 207.20 of the Commission’s rules, the Director of the Office of Investigations will circulate draft questionnaires for the final phase of the investigations to parties to the investigations, placing copies on the Commission’s Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, <https://edis.usitc.gov>), for comment.

### Background

On June 20, 2024, the American Personal Transportation Vehicle Manufacturers Coalition filed petitions with the Commission and Commerce, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of subsidized imports of low speed personal transportation vehicles from China and LTFV imports of low speed personal transportation vehicles from China. Accordingly, effective June 20, 2024, the Commission instituted countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-731 and antidumping duty investigation No. 731-TA-1700 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission’s investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of June 26, 2024 (89 FR 53440). The Commission conducted its conference on July 11, 2024. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to §§ 703(a) and 733(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on August 5, 2024. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5533 (August

2024), entitled *Low Speed Personal Transportation Vehicles from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-731 and 731-TA-1700 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 5, 2024.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2024-17675 Filed 8-8-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Stephen Matthews, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 27, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Stephen Matthews, M.D. (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. FM0055841 at the registered address of 11700 West 2nd Place, Suite 350, Medical Plaza 2, Lakewood, CO 80228. *Id.* at 1. The OSC alleged that Registrant’s registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Colorado, 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. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.<sup>1</sup> “A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant’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

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated September 21, 2023, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Government’s included Notice of Service of Order to Show Cause asserts that Registrant was personally served with the OSC on July 31, 2023; the Government notes that “[d]ue to law enforcement safety concerns upon service, [Registrant] did not sign a Form DEA-12 acknowledging receipt of the [OSC].” RFAAX 1, at 1.

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> 89 FR 57865, 89 FR 57870 (July 16, 2024).

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), 1301.46. RFAA, at 3; *see also* 21 CFR 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 May 22, 2023, the Colorado Medical Board issued a Non-Disciplinary Interim Cessation of Practice Agreement, in which Registrant agreed to not practice medicine in the State of Colorado. RFAAX 2, at 2; *see* RFAAX 3. According to Colorado online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant’s medical license is under an “Active—Restricted” status with a stipulation that Registrant “Cannot Practice.”<sup>2</sup> Colorado Division of Professions and Occupations License Search, <https://apps2.colorado.gov/dora/licensing/lookup/licenselookup.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Colorado, 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, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).<sup>3</sup>

According to Colorado statute, “dispense” means “to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user, patient, or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.” Colo. Rev. Stat. section 18–18–102(9) (2024). Further, a “practitioner” means a “physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by this state, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, administer, or to use in teaching or chemical analysis, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research.” *Id.* section 18–18–102(29).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado. As discussed above a physician must be a licensed practitioner permitted to dispense a controlled substance in Colorado. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Colorado, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant’s DEA registration be revoked.

### Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate

of Registration No. FM0055841 issued to Stephen Matthews, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Stephen Matthews, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Stephen Matthews, M.D., for additional registration in Colorado. This Order is effective September 9, 2024.

### Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on August 2, 2024, 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. 2024–17715 Filed 8–8–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Reestablishment of the Charter of the Task Force on Research on Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women

**AGENCY:** Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of renewal of charter.

**SUMMARY:** The charter of the Task Force on Research on Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women (hereinafter “the Task Force”) has been reestablished.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sherriann C. Moore, Deputy Director, Tribal Affairs Division, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 145 N Street NE, Suite 10W.121, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307–6026.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Authority for the Task Force is found in section 904(a)(3) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005), Public Law 109–162 (codified at 34 U.S.C. 10452 note) as amended by Section 907(a) of the Violence Against

<sup>2</sup> 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 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](mailto:dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov).

<sup>3</sup> 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). 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, D.O.*, 76 FR 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, D.O.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Riccio, D.O.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, D.O.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, D.O.*, 43 FR 27617.