

of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is October 15, 2026. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigations may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations, including statements of support or opposition to the petition, on or before October 15, 2026. On October 29, 2026, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before November 2, 2026, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with § 207.30 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of § 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on Filing Procedures*, available on the Commission's website at https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to § 201.12 of the Commission's rules, shall not be accepted unless good cause is shown for accepting such submissions, or unless the submission is pursuant to a specific request by a Commissioner or Commission staff.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 8, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-11617 Filed 6-9-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Ashley Vermillion, N.P.; Decision and Order

On November 17, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Ashley Vermillion, N.P., of Brunswick, Maine (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. MV8750134, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is "currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Maine, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds her to be in default. RFAA, at 3.¹ "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).

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

¹ Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated January 5, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on November 18, 2025, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address and mailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's "mail to" address. RFAAX 2, at 1-2; *see also id.*, Attachments A-B. Further, on November 25, 2025, the DI and other DEA personnel attempted to personally serve Registrant at her registered address but were informed upon arrival that Registrant no longer worked there and had relocated to Ohio. *Id.* at 2. Here, the Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email and that the DI's efforts to serve Registrant by other means were "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise [Registrant] of the pendency of the action." *Jones v. Flowers*, 547 U.S. 220, 226 (2006) (quoting *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)); *see also Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D.*, 82 FR 34552, 34552 (2017) (finding that service by email satisfies due process where the email is not returned as undeliverable and other methods have been unsuccessful).

[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), (f), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are deemed admitted. According to the OSC, Registrant's state nursing license expired on July 8, 2025. RFAAX 1, at 2. According to Maine online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,² Registrant's state nursing license remains expired. Maine State Board of Nursing License Search, <https://www.pfr.maine.gov/ALMSOnline/ALMSQuery/Welcome.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed as a nurse practitioner in Maine, the state in which she is registered with DEA.³

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 "upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances."

With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) ("The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances 'if the applicant is

² Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency "may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision." United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979).

³ Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), "[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary." The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this decision, is not licensed as a nurse practitioner in Maine. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.’ . . . The very definition of a ‘practitioner’ eligible to prescribe includes physicians ‘licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices’ to dispense controlled substances. 802(21).’). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., Lawrence Rudolph, D.M.D.*, 89 FR 79310 (2024); *Henry-Norbert O. Ndekwe, M.D.*, 90 FR 15990 (2025); *Benson Sergiles, P.A.*, 90 FR 32016 (2025).⁴

According to Maine statute, a “prescription drug order” means “a lawful written or oral order of a practitioner for a drug or device. Written orders may be issued on a prescription form or by electronic transmission.” Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 32, § 13702–A(31) (2025). Further, “practitioner” means “an individual who is licensed, registered or otherwise authorized in the appropriate jurisdiction to prescribe and administer drugs in the course of professional practice.” *Id.* § 13702–A(29).” Additionally, a “prescriber” means “a licensed health care professional or veterinarian with prescriptive authority, including a licensed health care professional or veterinarian who uses telehealth in providing health care to patients located in th[e] State.” Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 22, § 7246(5) (2025). “Dispense” means “the preparation and delivery of a prescription drug in a suitable container appropriately labeled for subsequent administration to or use by a patient or other individual entitled to receive the prescription drug pursuant to a lawful order of a practitioner.” Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 32, § 13702–A(9) (2025).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority

⁴ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). First, Congress defined the term “practitioner” to mean “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A.*, 90 FR 31242 (2025); *Jason Weakley, R.N., A.P.R.N.*, 90 FR 10085 (2025); *Khurshed Haider, M.D.*, 90 FR 21950 (2025).

to practice nursing in Maine because her Maine nursing license expired. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense or prescribe a controlled substance in Maine. Thus, because Registrant currently lacks authority to practice nursing in Maine, and, therefore, is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in Maine, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant’s DEA 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. MV750134 issued to Ashley Vermillion, N.P. 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 Ashley Vermillion, N.P., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Ashley Vermillion, N.P., for additional registration in Maine. This Order is effective July 10, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on June 2, 2026, by DEA Administrator Terrance C. Cole. 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. 2026–11572 Filed 6–9–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0149]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Reinstatement, With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection for Which Approval Has Expired: Census of Prosecutor Offices

AGENCY: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Justice Statistics, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 30 days until July 10, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact George Browne, Statistician, Judicial Statistics Unit, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 999 N Capitol St. NE, Washington, DC 20531, bjspra.comments@ojp.usdoj.gov; telephone: 202–307–0765.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 30, 2026, allowing a 60-day comment period. BJS did not receive any comments during the 60-day period.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and/or
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to