

The Agency rejects these arguments. First, as discussed throughout this Decision, the Agency may infer from Respondent's failure to document that Respondent failed to address and resolve red flags, and the Agency has repeatedly held that it will not credit a registrant's undocumented, *post hoc* justifications. Second, the Agency regularly revokes registrations based on documentation failures. For example, in *Coconut Grove*, the Agency revoked a pharmacy's registration based on the pharmacy's failure to document resolutions of red flags in ways and for reasons that are very similar to this case. The pharmacy's expert in *Coconut Grove* argued that the pharmacy's PIC had resolved the relevant red flags "over time in continuing conversations with the patients and the doctors," but the Agency rejected these arguments, because the pharmacy's only notation on the prescription was "verified," which was not sufficient to resolve the red flag. 89 FR 50374. Based on the pharmacy's failure to document the resolution of the red flags, the Agency found that the pharmacy had failed to address and resolve those red flags. *Id.* The Agency further concluded that the pharmacy's dispensing was outside the usual course of professional practice and beneath the standard of care. *Id.* The Agency drew similar conclusions in *Heavenly Care Pharmacy*, 85 FR 53402 (2020), also cited by Respondent. Respondent is correct in observing that the prescriptions in *Heavenly Care* raised more red flags than the prescriptions in this case, and that there was an additional ground for revocation in that case. However, the Government need not identify multiple grounds for revocation, and the Agency has never tallied a registrant's legal violations and required the Government to meet a certain numerical threshold.

Here, the Government proved that Respondent filled numerous prescriptions without adequately addressing and resolving several red flags, which rendered Respondent's dispensing beneath the standard of care, outside the usual course of professional practice, and in violation of Federal and State law. The Government also proved that Respondent filled unlawful prescriptions that were written for Ms. Neumann by Ms. Neumann's father. These violations are sufficient to revoke a registration.

In sum, Respondent has not offered any credible evidence on the record that rebuts the Government's case for revocation of its registration and Respondent has not demonstrated that it can be entrusted with the responsibility of registration. Accordingly, the Agency

will order that Respondent's 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. FN4373293 issued to Neumann's Pharmacy, LLC. 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 Neumann's Pharmacy, LLC, to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Neumann's Pharmacy, LLC, for additional registration in Louisiana. This Order is effective February 24, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on January 16, 2025, 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. 2025-01536 Filed 1-22-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed First Amended Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

On January 16, 2025, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed First Material Modification to the 2006 Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut in the lawsuit entitled *United States et al. v. Metropolitan District of Hartford, Connecticut*, Civil Action No. 3:06-cv-00728.

In this action, the United States and the State of Connecticut sought civil penalties and injunctive relief for violations of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*, in connection with the Metropolitan District of Hartford, Connecticut's ("MDC's") operation of its municipal wastewater treatment facility and sewer system. These claims were

resolved in a Consent Decree, which was approved by the Court in August 2006. Under the Consent Decree, the MDC is required to, among other things, eliminate all sanitary sewer overflow ("SSO") outfalls by a date certain and submit and implement control projects and schedules to reduce inflow and infiltration ("I/I"), which can dilute sanitary sewers and in turn, decrease treatment efficiency. Since 2006, the MDC has eliminated all but three of its SSO outfalls and has proposed several I/I reduction projects and schedules. The proposed modification extends the deadline for eliminating the remaining SSO outfalls by about 4 years and incorporates a schedule for implementing I/I reduction projects.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed First Material Modification to the 2006 Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States et al. v. Metropolitan District of Hartford, Connecticut*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-5-1-1-08404. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
By e-mail	pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov .
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, D.C. 20044-7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. If you require assistance accessing the proposed Consent Decree, you may request assistance by email or by mail to the addresses provided above for submitting comments.

Eric D. Albert,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2025-01559 Filed 1-22-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P