

by Registrant and by the community of registrants. *Jeffrey Stein, M.D.*, 84 FR at 46972–73.

Regarding these matters, there is no record evidence that Registrant takes responsibility, let alone unequivocal responsibility, for the founded violations. As such, Registrant has not presented any evidence showing that she can be entrusted with a registration. Accordingly, the record supports the imposition of a sanction.

The interests of specific and general deterrence weigh in favor of revocation given the egregiousness of the founded violations, violations that go to the heart of the CSA and of this Agency's law enforcement mission. *E.g.*, *Jones Total Health Care Pharmacy*, 881 F.3d at 834 and n.4; *Garrett Howard Smith, M.D.*, 83 FR at 18910 (collecting cases); *supra* sections IV.A., V., and VI. In addition, as Registrant has not unequivocally accepted responsibility for the founded violations, it is not reasonable to believe that Registrant's future controlled substance-related actions will comply with legal requirements. *Supra*. Further, given the foundational nature and number of Registrant's violations, a sanction less than revocation would send a message to the existing and prospective registrant community that compliance with the law is not essential to maintaining a registration.

Accordingly, the Agency shall order the revocation of Registrant's registrations.

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 Certificates of Registration Nos. FZ5603952 and FZ2291451 issued to Kerri Zavota, D.V.M. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby deny any pending application of Kerri Zavota, D.V.M., to renew or modify either of these registrations, as well as any other pending application of Kerri Zavota, D.V.M., for registration in Florida. This Order is effective August 27, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on July 21, 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. 2026–15199 Filed 7–27–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Gene M. Koop, D.D.S.; Decision and Order

On November 17, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Gene M. Koop, D.D.S., of Edmond, Oklahoma (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. BK1369633, alleging that Registrant is “currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Oklahoma, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.” *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2–3.¹ “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

¹ Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated March 24, 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 19, 2025, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address, and the email was not returned as undeliverable. RFAAX 1, at 2; *see also id.*, Appendix A. On the same day, the DI mailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's provided mailing address. *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)). Therefore, due process notice requirements have been satisfied. *See 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); *Emilio Luna, M.D.*, 77 FR 4829, 4830 (2012) (same).

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 [21 CFR] 1316.67.” *Id.* at 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, on December 31, 2023, Registrant's Oklahoma dentistry license expired by its own terms. RFAAX 2, at 2. Further, on October 31, 2024, Registrant's Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drug (OBNDD) license expired by its own terms. *Id.* According to Oklahoma online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,² Registrant's OBNDD registration is inactive. OBNDD, Registrant Search, <https://obnddc.us.thenticcloud.net/webs/obnddc/register> (last visited date of signature of this Order).³ Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice dentistry nor to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma, the state in which he is registered with DEA.⁴

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 Registrant admits that he previously held a State of Oklahoma Board of Dentistry license that expired by its own terms on December 31, 2023. According to Oklahoma online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's name and state license number no longer appear in the database of registered dentists. Oklahoma Board of Dentistry, Verify A Dentist, <https://oklahoma.gov/dentistry/license-verification/verify-a-dentist.html> (last visited date of signature of this Order).

⁴ 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 Order, is not licensed to practice dentistry or to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma. 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.

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 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., *Ashley Vermillion, N.P.*, 91 FR 35270, (2026); *Henry-Norbert O. Ndekwe, M.D.*, 90 FR 15990 (2025); *Lawrence Rudolph, D.M.D.*, 89 FR 79310 (2024).⁵

Pursuant to Oklahoma’s Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Act, “[e]very person who manufactures, distributes, dispenses, prescribes, administers or uses for scientific purposes any controlled dangerous substance within or into this state . . . shall obtain a registration issued by the Director of the [OBNDD], in accordance

with rules promulgated by the Director.” Okla. Stat. tit. 63, § 2–302(A) (2026).⁶

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma because his OBNDD registration is inactive. As discussed above, a person must hold a valid OBNDD registration to dispense a controlled substance in Oklahoma, subject to limited exceptions not applicable here. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma, 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. BK1369633 issued to Gene M. Koop, D.D.S. 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 Gene M. Koop, D.D.S., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Gene M. Koop, D.D.S., for additional registration in Oklahoma. This Order is effective August 27, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on July 21, 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. 2026–15201 Filed 7–27–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[NASA Document Number: 26–042]

Name of Information Collection: Automated Technology Licensing Application System (ATLAS)

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Revision of a currently approved collection.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections.

DATES: Comments are due by August 27, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for this information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments”.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to NASA PRA Clearance Officer, Stayce Hoult, NASA Headquarters, 300 E Street SW, JC0000, Washington, DC 20546, phone 256–714–8575, or email stayce.d.hoult@nasa.gov or hq-ocio-pra-program@mail.nasa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The information submitted by the public is a license application for those companies and individuals who wish to obtain a patent license for a NASA patented technology. Information needed for the license application in ATLAS may include supporting documentation such as a certificate of incorporation, a financial statement, a business and/or commercialization plan, a project revenue/royalty spreadsheet, and a company balance sheet. At a minimum, all license applicants must submit a satisfactory plan for the development and/or marketing of an invention. The collected information is used by NASA to ensure that companies that seek to commercialize NASA technologies have a solid business plan for bringing the technology to market.

NASA is committed to effectively performing the Agency’s

⁵ 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); *Khursheed Haider, M.D.*, 90 FR 21950 (2025).

⁶ Although there are limited circumstances under which a person “may lawfully possess controlled dangerous substances” without a registration issued by the Director of the OBNDD, based on the information furnished by the Government, none are applicable here. *Id.* § 2–302(H).