INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–567–569 and 731–TA–1343–1345 (Preliminary)]

Silicon Metal from Australia, Brazil, Kazakhstan, and Norway

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] 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 silicon metal from Australia, Brazil, and Norway, provided for in subheadings 2804.69.10 and 2804.69.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold at less-than-fair-value (''LTFV'') and imports of silicon metal alleged to be subsidized by the governments of Australia, Brazil, and Kazakhstan.

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 section 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the Department of Commerce (''Commerce'') of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 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 sections 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. 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.

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Background

On March 8, 2017, Globe Specialty Metals, Inc., Beverly, Ohio filed a petition 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 silicon metal from Australia, Brazil, and Kazakhstan, and LTFV imports of silicon metal from Australia, Brazil, and Norway. Accordingly, effective March 8, 2017, the Commission, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)), instituted countervailing duty investigation Nos. 701–TA–567–569 and antidumping duty investigation Nos. 731–TA–1343–1345 (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 March 14, 2017 (82 FR 16353). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on March 29, 2017, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 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 April 24, 2017. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4685 (May 2017), entitled *Silicon Metal from Australia, Brazil, Kazakhstan, and Norway: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–567–569 and 731–TA–1343–1345 (Preliminary).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 24, 2017.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017–08535 Filed 4–26–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 17–4]

Robert Clark Maiocco, M.D.; Decision and Order

On September 22, 2016, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Robert Clark Maiocco, M.D. (Respondent), of Denver, Colorado. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration No. AM2281688, and the denial of any applications to renew or modify his registration, as well as the denial of ''any applications for any other DEA registrations,'' on the ground that he has ''no state authority to handle controlled substances.'' Show Cause Order, at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) and 823(a)(3)).[1]

As to the Agency's jurisdiction, the Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent is registered ''as a practitioner in Schedules II through V'' under the above registration, at the location of ''Colorado Lipidology Associates, 633 17th Street, Ste. 100, Denver, Co.'' *Id.* The Order alleges that Respondent's registration does not expire until January 31, 2019. *Id.*

As to the substantive ground for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that ''[o]n July 19, 2016, the Colorado Medical Board suspended [Respondent's] medical license.'' *Id.* at 2. The Show Cause Order then alleged that Respondent is ''currently without authority to practice medicine or handle controlled substances in the State of Colorado, the [S]tate in which [he is] registered with'' DEA, and that as a consequence, his registration is subject to revocation.[2]

Following service of the Show Cause Order, Respondent requested a hearing. The matter was placed on the docket of the Office of Administrative Law Judges and assigned to ALJ Charles Wm. Dorman who issued an order directing the Government to file evidence supporting the allegation and ''any motion for summary disposition'' by 2 p.m. on November 7, 2016. Briefing Schedule For Lack Of State Authority Allegations (Briefing Schedule), at 1. In

[1] As for the citation to 21 U.S.C. 823(a)(3), this provision is a public interest factor applicable to applicants for registration to manufacture schedule I and II controlled substances, which directs the Agency to consider the ''promotion of technical advances in the art of manufacturing these substances and the development of new substances.'' This provision is not applicable to this case, which involves a practitioner registered under section 823(f).

While the Government also proposes the denial of ''any applications for any other DEA registrations,'' because this proceeding is based solely on Respondent's lack of state authority in Colorado, the Agency's authority to deny an application is limited to an application for a registration in Colorado.

[2] The Show Cause Order also notified Respondent of his right to request a hearing or to submit a written statement in lieu of a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence of failing to elect either option. Show Cause Order, at 2. Also, the Show Cause Order notified Respondent of his right to submit a Corrective Action Plan. 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C).