Issued: August 6, 2019.

William Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–17134 Filed 8–6–19; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–19–031]

Sunshine Act Meetings

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: August 22, 2019 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000..

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 1. *Agendas for future meetings:* None.

2. Minutes.

3. Ratification List.

4. Vote on Inv. Nos. 701–TA–627–629 and 731–TA–1458–1461 (Preliminary)(Utility Scale Wind Towers from Canada, Indonesia, Korea, and Vietnam). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations on August 23, 2019; views of the Commission are currently scheduled to be completed and filed on August 30, 2019.

5. *Outstanding action jackets:* None.

The Commission is holding the meeting under the Government in the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. 552(b). In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 6, 2019.

William Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2019–17133 Filed 8–6–19; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 19–19]

Parth S. Bharill; Decision and Order

On March 13, 2019, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, Government), issued an Order to Show Cause to Parth S. Bharill, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent) of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Order to Show Cause (hereinafter, OSC), at 1. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's Certificate of Registration No. BB3258034 on the ground that Respondent does ''not have authority to handle controlled substances in Pennsylvania, the state in which [Respondent is] registered with the DEA.'' *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Board of Medicine (hereinafter, Board) issued an Order of Temporary Suspension And Notice (hereinafter, Temporary Suspension Order 1) on June 18, 2018. *Id.* This Temporary Suspension Order, according to the OSC, immediately restricted Respondent's license to practice Medicine and Surgery because Respondent's ''continued practice of medicine and surgery in Pennsylvania constitutes 'an immediate and clear danger to the public health and safety.' '' *Id.* at 1–2. Further, the OSC alleged that on July 13, 2018, the Board ''issued an 'Order Granting Continuance with Immediate Temporary Suspension Remaining In Effect' (hereinafter, Temporary Suspension Order 2), whereby the Board maintained the suspension of [Respondent's] medical license.'' *Id.* at 2.

The OSC notified Respondent of the right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement while waiving the right to a hearing, the procedures for electing each option, and the consequences for failing to elect either option. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The OSC also notified Respondent of the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan. *Id.* at 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

By letter dated April 12, 2019, Respondent timely requested a hearing. Hearing Request, at 1. According to the Hearing Request, Respondent's interest in the proceedings is to defend his ''constitutionally protected right to pursue a gainful occupation'' and he objects to the issuance of the OSC because he applied to transfer his certificate of registration (hereinafter, COR) from his Pennsylvania address to a West Virginia address on December 31, 2018, and he ''has a current and active Medical License . . . in the State of West Virginia.'' *Id.* at 1.

Respondent argues that ''the use of the phrase 'may be suspended or revoked' [in 21 U.S.C. 824(a)] demonstrates that this is a discretionary authority of the DEA and does not take effect by operation of law based upon the loss of a license.'' *Id.* at 2 (citations omitted). He further contends that due to Respondent's request for a change of address to West Virginia, ''where an application for modification is received, it must be handled in the same manner as an application for registration.'' *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)). He argues that DEA was required to grant the modification because DEA has not found ''that Respondent's requested modification was inconsistent with the public interest,'' and he ''has not [sic] disciplinary action taken against his West Virginia Medical License and, therefore, the DEA has not [sic] authority to revoke or suspend his license.'' *Id.*

The Office of Administrative Law Judges put the matter on the docket and assigned it to Administrative Law Judge Mark M. Dowd (hereinafter, ALJ). The ALJ issued an Order for Prehearing Statements (hereinafter, PH Order) dated April 22, 2019, setting a date by which the Government should file either a Prehearing Statement or a Motion for Summary Disposition, and affording Respondent one additional week to file either its Prehearing Statement or its Reply. PH Order, at 1–2.

The Government filed its Motion for Summary Disposition and Argument in Support of Finding that Respondent Lacks State Authorization to Handle Controlled Substances (hereinafter, Government's Motion) on April 29, 2019. In its motion, the Government stated that Respondent lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Pennsylvania, the state in which he is registered with the DEA, and argued that therefore, DEA must revoke his registration. Government's Motion, at 1.

On May 2, 2019, Respondent filed both a Prehearing Statement and a separate Response in Opposition to the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition (hereinafter, Respondent's Response). In his Prehearing Statement, Respondent requested that the ''revocation of his registration be stayed pending a determination on his application for modification, or, in the alternative, that the application for modification be unaffected if revocation is approved.'' Respondent's Prehearing Statement, at 1. He also requested that ''this case be determined on the documents submitted by the parties.'' *Id.,* at 2, 3. In Respondent's Response, he contends that ''prior to seeking to revoke Respondent's registration, the DEA is required to decide the matter of the application of modification,'' or, in the alternative, if his current registration is revoked, his ''application for modification should continue and be granted, unless the Government enters