

Huntsville, AL; and University of Florida—Institute of Applied Engineering, Tampa, FL, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, CAM2 Technologies dba RedWave Technology, Danbury, CT; Navmar Applied Sciences Corporation, Warminster, PA; Spectral Labs, Inc., San Diego, CA; and The Informatics Applications Group, Reston, VA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.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 HSTech Consortium intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 30, 2012, HSTech Consortium 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 June 18, 2012 (77 FR 36292).

The last notification was filed with the Department on July 19, 2023. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on October 5, 2023 (88 FR 69231).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–06925 Filed 4–22–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Expeditionary Missions Consortium—Crane

Notice is hereby given that, on April 14, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Expeditionary Missions Consortium—Crane (“EMC²”) 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, AForge LLC, Lorton, VA; Alpha-En Corporation, Hopewell Junction, NY; ArgenTech Solutions, Inc., Newmarket, NH; Artemis Electronics LLC, Prospect, KY; Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc., McLean, VA; Chugach Information Technology, Inc.,

Anchorage, AK; Decryptor, Inc., Richardson, TX; Empower Battery Technology, Inc., Gahanna, OH; Fathom5 Corp., Austin, TX; Hidden Level, Inc., Syracuse, NY; Industry Defense Systems LLC, Lansdale, CA; Lockheed Martin Aerostructures, Riviera Beach, FL; Ocean Power Technologies, Inc., Monroe Township, NJ; Olson Custom Designs LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Parallax Advanced Research Corporation, Beavercreek, OH; Rapid Innovation & Security Experts, Inc., Colorado Springs, CO; Raytheon Company—AZ, Tucson, AZ; Seafloor Systems, Inc., El Dorado Hills, CA; Stress Aerospace and Defense LLC, Houston, TX; Training Center Pros, Inc. dba EOD Gear, Franklin, TN; and UDC USA, Inc., Tampa, FL, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Plasan North America, Inc., Walker, MI, has withdrawn as a party 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 EMC² intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 11, 2024, EMC² 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 March 13, 2024 (89 FR 18439).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 30, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on February 28, 2025 (90 FR 10943).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–06924 Filed 4–22–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

De Novo Services, LLC; Decision and Order

I. Introduction

On June 6, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to De Novo Services, LLC, of Salt Lake City, Utah (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 5. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s DEA Certificate of Registration No. RD0424515, alleging that Registrant has committed such acts as would render its registration

inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* at 1, 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), 824(a)(4)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that between 2013 and 2023, Registrant lacked effective controls and procedures to guard against the diversion of controlled substances, as well as committed numerous recordkeeping violations, in violation of the Controlled Substances Act’s (CSA) implementing regulations and Utah state law.¹ *Id.* at 2.

The OSC notified Registrant of its right to file with DEA a written request for hearing and an answer, and that if it failed to file such a request, it would be deemed to have waived its right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 4 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.² “A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant’s/applicant’s right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].” 21 CFR 1301.43(e); *see also* RFAAX 1, at 4 (providing notice to Registrant).

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 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)(1), (f)(1), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.³

¹ The Utah state law cited by the Government in the OSC pertains to pharmacists. The applicability of these Utah laws to Registrant is not clear from the OSC and was not addressed in the RFAA. Accordingly, the Agency declines to find any violations of Utah law in this matter. *See id.* at 3. However, the Agency finds that the founded allegations in this decision are more than sufficient to support the Government’s requested sanction of revocation under these circumstances.

² Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated July 16, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, on June 10, 2024, a DEA Diversion Investigator personally served the OSC on J.C., the signatory and contact person associated with Registrant’s DEA Certificate of Registration No. RD0424515. RFAA, at 1; RFAAX 2–3.

³ On October 7, 2024, Registrant signed a DEA Form 104, Surrender for Cause of DEA Certificate of Registration. *See* 21 CFR 1301.52(a). Even when a registration is terminated, the Agency has discretion to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *See Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.*, 84 FR 68474, 68479 (2019) (declining to dismiss an immediate suspension order when the registrant allowed the registration to expire before final adjudication); *Steven M. Kotsonis, M.D.*, 85 FR 85667, 85668–85669 (2020) (concluding that termination of a registration under 21 CFR 1301.52 does not preclude DEA from issuing a final decision and that the Agency would assess such matters on a case-by-case basis to determine if a final adjudication is warranted); *The*