

83 FR 18882, 18904 (2018); *supra* sections III and IV.

The issue of trust is necessarily a fact-dependent determination based on the circumstances presented by the individual registrant. *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.*, 84 FR 46968, 46972 (2019); *see also Jones Total Health Care Pharmacy*, 881 F.3d at 833. Moreover, as past performance is the best predictor of future performance, DEA Administrators have required that a registrant who has committed acts inconsistent with the public interest must accept responsibility for those acts and demonstrate that he will not engage in future misconduct. *Jones Total Health Care Pharmacy*, 881 F.3d at 833; *ALRA Labs, Inc. v. Drug Enf't Admin.*, 54 F.3d 450, 452 (7th Cir. 1995). A registrant's acceptance of responsibility must be unequivocal. *Jones Total Health Care Pharmacy*, 881 F.3d at 830–31. In addition, a registrant's candor during the investigation and hearing has been an important factor in determining acceptance of responsibility and the appropriate sanction. *Id.* Further, the Agency has found that the egregiousness and extent of the misconduct are significant factors in determining the appropriate sanction. *Id.* at 834 & n.4. The Agency has also considered the need to deter similar acts by the registrant and by the community of registrants. *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.*, 84 FR at 46972–73.

Here, Registrants did not timely or properly request a hearing and were deemed to be in default. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(1), (e), (f)(1); RFAA, at 1–2. To date, Registrants have not filed a motion with the Office of the Administrator to excuse the default. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(1). Registrants have thus failed to answer the allegations contained in the OSC and have not otherwise availed themselves of the opportunity to refute the Government's case. As such, Registrants have made no representations as to their future compliance with the CSA nor made any demonstration that they can be entrusted with registration. Moreover, the evidence presented by the Government shows that Registrants violated the CSA, further indicating that Registrants cannot be entrusted.

Accordingly, the Agency will order the revocation of Registrants' registrations.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby revoke DEA Certificates of Registration Nos. FL2056908, FM2936120, FR5934244, and FU0598790 issued to

Liberty Pharmacy Inc., Metro Care Pharmacy Inc., RiteCare Pharmacy Inc., and United Pharmacy Upper Darby Inc. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a) and 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Liberty Pharmacy Inc., Metro Care Pharmacy Inc., RiteCare Pharmacy Inc., and/or United Pharmacy Upper Darby Inc. to renew or modify the named registrations, as well as any other pending application of Liberty Pharmacy Inc., Metro Care Pharmacy Inc., RiteCare Pharmacy Inc., and/or United Pharmacy Upper Darby Inc. for additional registration in Pennsylvania. This Order is effective May 27, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on April 18, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. 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. 2025–07175 Filed 4–24–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Syed Warsi, M.D.; Decision and Order

On August 25, 2022, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Syed Warsi, M.D., of North Aurora, Illinois (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Appendix (RFAAX) A, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. BW8048022, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in Illinois, the jurisdiction in which [he is]

registered with DEA.” *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).¹

The Agency makes the following findings of fact based on the uncontroverted evidence submitted by the Government in its RFAA dated October 12, 2023.²

Findings of Fact

On July 13, 2022, the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation suspended Registrant's Illinois medical license and Illinois controlled substance license. RFAAX C, at 4–5. According to Illinois's online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Illinois medical license and Illinois controlled substance license both remain suspended.³ Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation License Search, <https://online-dfpr.micropact.com/lookup/licenselookup.aspx/> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Illinois, the state in which he is registered with DEA.⁴

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to

¹ According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on May 31, 2023. The fact that a registrant allows his registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.*, 84 FR 68474, 68476–79 (2019).

² Based on the Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator, the Agency finds that the Government's service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. RFAAX B, at 1. Further, based on the Government's assertions in its RFAA, the Agency finds that more than thirty days have passed since Registrant was served with the OSC and Registrant has neither requested a hearing nor submitted a corrective action plan and therefore has waived any such rights. RFAA, at 2; *see also* 21 CFR 1301.43 and 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2).

³ 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).

⁴ 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.” The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this decision, is not licensed to practice medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Illinois. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding this fact 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.

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. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) (“The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances ‘if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.’ . . . The very definition of a ‘practitioner’ eligible to prescribe includes physicians ‘licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices’ to dispense controlled substances. § 802(21).”). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. See, e.g., *James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).⁵

Pursuant to the Illinois Controlled Substances Act, a “practitioner” means “a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise lawfully permitted by the United States or this State to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, administer or use in teaching or chemical analysis, a controlled substance in the course of professional

practice or research.” 720 Ill. Comp. Stat. 570/102(kk) (2024). Further, the Illinois Controlled Substances Act requires that “[e]very person who manufactures, distributes, or dispenses any controlled substances . . . must obtain a registration issued by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation in accordance with its rules.” *Id.* 570/302(a). The Illinois Controlled Substances Act also authorizes the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation to discipline a practitioner holding an Illinois controlled substance license, stating that such license “may be denied, refused renewal, suspended, or revoked by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation.” *Id.* 570/304(a).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Illinois because both his Illinois medical license and his Illinois controlled substance license are suspended. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner and must hold a valid controlled substance license to dispense a controlled substance in Illinois. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Illinois, 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. BW8048022 issued to Syed Warsi, 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 Syed Warsi, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Syed Warsi, M.D., for additional registration in Illinois. This Order is effective May 27, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on April 18, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. 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. 2025–07174 Filed 4–24–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petition for Modification of Application of Existing Mandatory Safety Standards

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice is a summary of a petition for modification submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) by Century Mining, LLC.

DATES: All comments on the petition must be received by MSHA’s Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances on or before May 27, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket No. MSHA–2025–0041 by any of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments for MSHA–2025–0041.

2. *Fax:* 202–693–9441.

3. *Email:* petitioncomments@dol.gov.

4. *Regular Mail or Hand Delivery:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Room C3522, 200 Constitution Ave NW, Washington, DC 20210.

Attention: S. Aromie Noe, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances. Persons delivering documents are required to check in at the receptionist’s desk. Individuals may inspect copies of the petition and comments during normal business hours at the address listed above. Before visiting MSHA in person, call 202–693–9455 to make an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: S. Aromie Noe, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances at 202–693–9440 (voice), Petitionsformodification@dol.gov (email), or 202–693–9441 (fax). [These are not toll-free numbers.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification.

⁵ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the 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, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeats, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104, 51,105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.