

substances from the pharmacy. DEA also told Registrant on three separate occasions that there was a reasonable basis to believe that M.B. was diverting controlled substances. Despite these reports, Registrant continued to employ M.B. until at least February 2018.

There is also no evidence on the record that Registrant took any real measures to increase security at the pharmacy or otherwise stop the losses. Registrant's owner told DEA on June 1, 2017, that Registrant was in the process of taking additional security measures—namely ordering a safe to store controlled substances and taking daily inventories of controlled substances—and that M.B. no longer worked at Registrant. RFAAX 15, at 2. Registrant's PIC, however, told DEA on July 27, 2017, that Registrant's narcotics were being stored in an unlocked case and that any pharmacy employee could change the inventory quantities in Registrant's computer. RFAAX 11 (text messages between PIC and DEA TFO). Registrant also admitted that “[n]either of these alleged additional safeguards were effective, as the controlled substances continued to be stored in such a way that all employees have access to them, and the daily inventories were conducted in such a way that any employee could alter the inventory.” RFAAX 12, at 2 (admitting to the factual allegations in paragraphs 2–8 of the OSC); OSC, at 4. Furthermore, PIC Clark told the DEA that, as of July 27, 2017, M.B. was working as a pharmacy tech at Registrant. RFAA 11. Registrant confirmed that M.B. was still employed by Registrant in meetings with DEA on January 8, 2018 and February 7, 2018. RFAAX 15, at 4.

“[A] DEA registrant is obligated at all times to act in the public interest.” *Peter F. Kelly, D.P.M.*, 82 FR 28,676, 28,688 (2017). Registrant's failure to take action to stop the illicit flow of controlled substances out of the pharmacy was a breach of its duty as a registrant to act in the public interest. Moreover, it likely permitted the additional diversion of hundreds (if not thousands) of units of controlled substances. I, therefore, find that Registrant's failure to stem the known diversion of controlled substances from its inventory constitutes “conduct which may threaten the public health and safety.” 21 U.S.C. 823(f)(5).

Having considered all of the factors, I conclude that the evidence pertinent to factors two, four, and five demonstrate a *prima facie* showing that Registrant “has committed such acts as would render [its] registration . . . inconsistent with the public interest.” 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4). I further conclude that

Registrant has not rebutted the Government's *prima facie* case.

III. Sanction

Where, as here, the Government has met its *prima facie* burden of showing that Registrant's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest, the burden shifts to the Registrant to show why it can be entrusted with a registration. *Garrett Howard Smith, M.D.*, 83 FR 18,882, 18,910 (2018) (collecting cases).

The CSA authorizes the Attorney General to “promulgate and enforce any rules, regulations, and procedures which he may deem necessary and appropriate for the efficient execution of his functions under this subchapter.” 21 U.S.C. 871(b). This authority specifically relates “to ‘registration’ and ‘control,’ and ‘for the efficient execution of his functions’ under the statute.” *Gonzales*, 546 U.S. at 259. “Because ‘past performance is the best predictor of future performance, *ALRA Labs, Inc. v. Drug Enf't Admin.*, 54 F.3d 450, 452 (7th Cir. 1995), [the Agency] has repeatedly held that where a registrant has committed acts inconsistent with the public interest, the registrant must accept responsibility for [the registrant's] actions and demonstrate that [registrant] will not engage in future misconduct.’” *Jayam Krishna-Iyer*, 74 FR at 463 (quoting *Medicine Shoppe*, 73 FR 364, 387 (2008)); see also *Jackson*, 72 FR at 23,853; *John H. Kennedy, M.D.*, 71 FR 35,705, 35,709 (2006); *Prince George Daniels, D.D.S.*, 60 FR 62,884, 62,887 (1995). The issue of trust is necessarily a fact-dependent determination based on the circumstances presented by the individual registrant; therefore, the Agency looks at factors, such as the acceptance of responsibility, and the credibility of that acceptance as it relates to the probability of repeat violations or behavior, and the nature of the misconduct that forms the basis for sanction, while also considering the Agency's interest in deterring similar acts. See *Arvinder Singh, M.D.*, 81 FR 8247, 8248 (2016).

Registrant accepted responsibility for most of its misconduct in the MOA, in which it admitted to many of the factual allegations in the OSC in exchange for certain agreements from the Government. Registrant, however, did not present any evidence of remorse for its past misconduct and did not provide any assurances that it would not engage in such conduct in the future. Further, it provided no evidence of rehabilitative actions taken to correct its past unlawful behavior, except an agreement from the Owner, in her individual capacity, that

“she will not serve as an officer, partner, stockholder, proprietor, owner, partial owner, or pharmacist in charge of any entity that either possesses or is seeing a DEA Certificate of Registration” for so long as the MOA between the Government and Registrant remains in effect. Absent such evidence and such assurances in this matter, I find that continued registration of Registrant is inconsistent with the public interest. Registrant's silence weighs against its continued registration. *Zvi H. Perper, M.D.*, 77 FR 64,131, 64,142 (2012) (citing *Med. Shoppe-Jonesborough*, 73 FR at 387); see also *Samuel S. Jackson*, 72 FR 23,848, 23,853 (2007).

Accordingly, I find that the factors weigh in favor of sanction and I shall order the sanction the Government requested, as contained in the Order below.

IV. 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 BW8625785 issued to Wayne Pharmacy. This Order is effective November 9, 2020.

Timothy J. Shea,
Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2020–22216 Filed 10–7–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–642]

**Importer of Controlled Substances
Application: MMJ Biopharma
Cultivation, Inc.**

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before November 9, 2020. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application on or before November 9, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. All requests for a hearing must be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: Administrator, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. All requests for a hearing should also be sent to: (1) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn:

Hearing Clerk/OALJ, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152; and (2) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on February 13, 2020, MMJ Biopharma Cultivation, Inc., 71 Margaret Terrace Memorial Way, Akwesasne, New York, 13655, applied to be registered as an importer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substances:

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Marihuana Extract.	7350	I
Marihuana	7360	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols.	7370	I

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances as mature plants to support the manufacturing of dosage forms for use in clinical trials. This notice does not constitute an evaluation or determination of the merits of the company's application.

William T. McDermott,
Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2020-22070 Filed 10-7-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

[OMB Number 1110-0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension of a Currently-Approved Collection; National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Department of Justice (DOJ).

ACTION: 30-Day Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The DOJ, FBI, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 30 days until December 7, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed

information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting "Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments" or by using the search function.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the FBI, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Evaluate whether, and if so, how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology (e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses).

Overview of This Information Collection

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently-approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* National Incident-Based Reporting System.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The form number is 1110-0058. The applicable component within the DOJ is the CJIS Division of the FBI.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies (LEAs).

Abstract: Under Title 28, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section (§) 534, subsections (a) and (c); the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988, 34 U.S.C. 41303; the Hate Crime Statistics Act, 34 U.S.C. 41305, modified by the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act (2009), Public Law (Pub. L.) § 4708; the Anti-

Arson Act of 1982, 18 U.S.C. 841 note; the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, 34 U.S.C. 41309; the USA Patriot Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, Public Law 109-177, 307, subsection (e) Reporting of Cargo Theft, 120 Statutes at Large 193, 240 (2006); and 34 U.S.C. 12532, this collection requests incident data from federal, state, local, and tribal LEAs in order for the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program to serve as the national clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of incident data and to release these statistics in the following publications: *Crime in the United States*, *Hate Crime Statistics*, *Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted*, and *National Incident-Based Reporting System*. The NIBRS is a data collection which allows LEAs to collect information on each crime occurrence. The FBI designed NIBRS to generate data as a byproduct of federal, state, and local automated records management systems (RMS). Currently, the NIBRS collects data on each incident and arrest within 28 crime categories comprised of 71 specific crimes called Group A offenses. For each of the offenses coming to the attention of law enforcement, various details about the crime are collected. In addition to the Group A offenses, arrest data only are reported for 13 Group B offense categories. When reporting data via the traditional Summary Reporting System (SRS), LEAs tally the occurrences of 10 Part I crimes.

The most significant difference between NIBRS and the traditional SRS is the degree of detail in reporting. The NIBRS is capable of producing more detailed, accurate, and meaningful information because data are collected about when and where crime takes place, what form it takes, and the characteristics of its victims and perpetrators. Although most of the general concepts for collecting, scoring, and reporting UCR data in SRS apply in NIBRS (e.g., jurisdictional rules), there are some important differences between the two data collection systems. The SRS employs the Hierarchy Rule, i.e., in a multiple-offense incident, only the most serious offense is reported, and only 10 Part I offenses can be reported. The many advantages NIBRS has over SRS include, but are not limited to, reports up to 10 offenses occurring during the incident; revised, expanded, and new offense definitions; more specificity in reporting and using offense and arrest data for 28 Group A offense categories encompassing 71 crimes; distinguishes between