

Office of the Chancellor, Long Beach, CA; Cerego, San Francisco, CA; Data Recognition Corp., Maple Grove, MN; Digitalme, Leeds, UNITED KINGDOM; Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; Learning Machine, Dallas, TX; School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA; Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA; South Carolina Department of Education, Columbia, SC; and Galena Park Independent School District, Houston, TX, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Intersective, Sydney, AUSTRALIA; Intel, Santa Clara, CA; and Utah Valley University, Orem, UT, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

In addition, an existing member, CODE-OIJ, has changed its name to Online Education Center of OIJ, Chiba, JAPAN.

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 IMS Global intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 7, 2000, IMS Global 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 September 13, 2000 (65 FR 55283).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 19, 2017. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 2, 2017 (82 FR 20488).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-15583 Filed 7-24-17; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cooperative Research Group on Mechanical Stratigraphy and Natural Deformation in the Permian Strata of Texas and New Mexico: Implications for Exploitation of the Permian Basin

Notice is hereby given that, on June 22, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on Mechanical Stratigraphy and Natural

Deformation in the Permian Strata of Texas and New Mexico: Implications for Exploitation of the Permian Basin (“Permian Basin”) 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, Diamondback E&P LLC, Midland, TX; and Noble Energy, Inc., Houston, TX, have been added 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 Permian Basin intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 18, 2017, Permian Basin 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 May 12, 2017 (82 FR 22159).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 17, 2017. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 20, 2017 (82 FR 28092).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-15582 Filed 7-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Border Security Technology Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on June 8, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Border Security Technology Consortium (“BSTC”) 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, AeroVironment, Inc., SimiValley, CA; AirRobot US, Inc.,

Arlington, VA; Applied Research Associates, Inc. (ARA), Albuquerque, NM; Aventura Technologies, Inc., Hauppauge, NY; C Speed, LLC, Liverpool, NY; Capgemini Government Solutions, LLC, Herndon, VA; CCSN, LLC, Guynabo, P.R.; Chartis Consulting Corporation, Falls Church, VA; Commdex Consulting, LLC, Norcross, GA; CONVERUS, Inc., Lehi, UT; Drone Co-Habitation Services, LLC, Herndon, VA; Elbit Systems of America, Inc., McLean, VA; EnZoo, Inc., Woodinville, WA; Exelis, Inc., Fort Wayne, IN; FLIR Detection, Inc., Arlington, VA; Georgia Tech Applied Research Corporation, Atlanta, GA; Guidepost Solutions, LLC, New York, NY; HiTech Systems, Inc., D.B.A. Pulsiam, Los Angeles, CA; ICF, Fairfax, VA; IEC Infrared Systems, Middleburg Heights, OH; Innovative Wireless Technologies, Lynchburg, VA; International Business Machines Corporation (IBM), Bethesda, MD; Leidos, Reston, VA; Logos Technologies, LLC, Fairfax, VA; Lukos, LLC, Tampa, FL; Michael Baker Jr., Inc., Phoenix, AZ; Polaris Sensor Technologies, Huntsville, AL; Pricewaterhouse Coopers (PwC), McLean, VA; Priority 5 Holdings, Inc., Needham, MA; Rajant, Malvern, PA; Red Team Defense Group, Spring Branch, TX; Rhombus Power, Inc., Moffett Field, CA; Salient Federal Solutions, Fairfax, VA; SRI International, Menlo Park, CA; Stark Aerospace, Arlington, VA; StrongWatch Corporation, Tucson, AZ; TigerSwan, Inc., Apex, NC; Toyon Research Corporation, Goleta, CA; Unmanned Experts, Inc., Denver, CO; Unmanned Solutions Technology, LLC, Beavercreek, OH; USTETA, Washington, DC; ViON Corporation, Herndon, VA; and XLA Associates, Springfield, VA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, ADDSS Incorporated, Tucson, AZ; Azos AI LLC, Haymarket, VA; Digital Barriers Services, LTD, London, UK; Hurley IR, Mount Airy, MD; ICS Consulting, LLC, Arlington, VA; ICx Tactical Platforms, Forest Park, GA; Morpho Detection, Newark, CA; Morpho Trak, Alexandria, VA; NAVISTAR, Lisle, IL; ProQual-I.T., Inc., Rockville, MD; Rapiscan Systems, Torrence, CA; Symetrica, Maynard, MA; University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ; and Whitney Bradley & Brown, Inc., 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 BSTC intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 30, 2012, BSTC 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 October 5, 2012. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on November 6, 2012 (77 FR 66635).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2017-15584 Filed 7-24-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 10, 2017, the Assistant Administrator, Division of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D. (hereinafter, Registrant),¹ of West Hartford, Connecticut. Show Cause Order, at 1. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration, on the ground that he does not have authority to handle controlled substances in Connecticut, the State in which he is registered with DEA. *Id.*

As to the Agency's jurisdiction, the Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant possesses a practitioner's registration for schedules II through V, and that his registered address is 74 Park Road, West Hartford, Connecticut. *Id.* The Order further alleged that Registrant's registration "expires by its own terms on June 30, 2017." *Id.*

As to the substantive ground for the proposed action, the Show Cause Order alleged that "[o]n November 15, 2017, the State of Connecticut Medical Examining Board revoked [his] license to practice medicine due to [his] (1) inappropriate physical and/or sexual conduct with one or more female patients; and (2) false statements on [his] Connecticut medical license renewal application." *Id.* (emphasis added). The Show Cause Order also alleged that the Board's "order remains in effect." *Id.*² The Order further

¹ Notwithstanding that Dr. Aljanaby is now an ex-registrant, he is referred to as Registrant throughout this Decision.

² The Show Cause Order also notified Registrant of his right to request a hearing or to submit a written statement while waiving his right to a hearing, the procedure for electing either option,

asserted that Registrant's registration was subject to revocation based on his lack of state authority. *Id.* at 2.

The Government attempted to serve the Order to Show Cause on Registrant through a variety of ways. These included: (1) Mailing by first class mail addressed to him at his registered address; (2) a Diversion Investigator (DI) going to his registered address, where he was told that Registrant "had not worked there for a very long time" and his current location was unknown; (3) the DI going to Registrant's purported residence on Laird Drive in Bristol, Connecticut where no one answered the door;³ (4) mailing the Show Cause Order by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, addressed to him at his registered address; (5) mailing the Show Cause Order by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to his purported residence address; (6) mailing the Show Cause Order by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to a second property in Bristol, Connecticut, which is purportedly owned by Registrant; (7) mailing the Show Cause Order by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to an address in New York State where he receives his property tax bill from the Town of Bristol; and (8) email sent to an address obtained from a public access database maintained by Thomson Reuters, which also corresponds to the email address Registrant provided to the Connecticut Board. GX 3, at 1-2 (DI Declaration). The first mailing was accomplished on February 10, 2017; the other attempts at service were made on February 22-23, 2017. *Id.*; see also GX 4 (Declaration of Chief Counsel Analyst).

With the exception of the mailing to his registered address (where he no longer worked), each of the other mailings was returned to the Government and marked as undelivered. GX 3, at 2. The Government represents, however, that the attempt to email the Show Cause Order did not generate an error or undeliverable message.

Of note, several courts have held that the emailing of process can, depending on the facts and circumstances, satisfy due process, especially where service by conventional means is impracticable because a person secludes himself. See

and the consequence of failing to elect either option. Show Cause Order, at 2. The Order also notified Registrant of his right to submit a Corrective Action Plan. *Id.* at 2-3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

³ According to the Connecticut Medical Examining Board's Order, when the Board attempted to served Registrant at this address its mailing was returned and marked: "Return to sender, No Such Street, Unable to Forward." GX 3, Appendix C, at 3.

Rio Properties, Inc. v. Rio Int'l Interlink, 284 F.3d 1007, 1017-18 (9th Cir. 2002); *Snyder, et al. v. Alternate Energy Inc.*, 857 N.Y.S. 2d 442, 447-449 (N.Y. Civ. Ct. 2008); *In re International Telemedia Associates, Inc.*, 245 B.R. 713, 721-22 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2000); see also *Richard C. Quigley*, 79 FR 50945 (2014); *Emilio Luna*, 77 FR 4829, 4830 (2012). Given the multiple attempts by the Government to serve the Show Cause Order by conventional means, including by mailing it to the address where he receives his property tax bills, I conclude that the Government's use of email satisfies its obligation with respect to service of the Show Cause Order. See, e.g., *Jones v. Flowers*, 547 U.S. 220, 226 (2006) (due process does not require actual notice but only "notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.") *Id.* (quoting *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)).

On May 8, 2017, the Government submitted a Request for Final Agency Action. Therein, it represents that Registrant did not request a hearing or submit a written statement while waiving his right to a hearing. The Government thus seeks a final order revoking Registrant's registration.

I deny the Government's Request for an Order of Revocation. As support for the proposed revocation, the Government submitted a copy of the Board's Order revoking Registrant's state license, which states that it was actually issued on the "15th day of November, 2016." GX 3, Appendix C, at 9. However, as noted above, the Show Cause Order alleges that the Board revoked his state license "[o]n November 15, 2017." See GX 2, at 1. I need not decide, however, whether this typographical error renders the Show Cause Order defective as this case is now moot.⁴

As noted above, the Show Cause Order alleges that Registrant's registration was due to expire on June 30, 2017. *Id.* According to the registration records of the Agency of

⁴ Had Registrant requested a hearing, the Government could have corrected its error as to the date of the Board's Order by motion. And by offering the Board's Order to support a motion for summary disposition, the Government would have refuted any claim of prejudice. Cf. *United States v. Cina*, 699 F.2d 853, 857 (7th Cir. 1983) (holding in criminal prosecution that trial court's amendment of the alleged commencement date of conspiracy charge by two years did not "affect[] a 'material element' of the . . . charge, causing prejudice to the defendant"). Furthermore, as long as the Board's Order was still in effect, the date of its Order would not be material.