

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-1762]

Importer of Controlled Substances
Application: Cambrex High Point, Inc.AGENCY: Drug Enforcement
Administration, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Cambrex High Point, Inc. has applied to be registered as an importer of basic class(es) of controlled substance(s). Refer to **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** listed below for further drug information.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants, therefore, may submit electronic comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before October 8, 2026. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application on or before October 8, 2026.

ADDRESSES: The Drug Enforcement Administration requires that all comments be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal, which provides the ability to type short comments directly into the comment field on the web page or attach a file for lengthier comments. Please go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and follow the online instructions at that site for submitting comments. Upon submission of your comment, you will receive a Comment Tracking Number. Please be aware that submitted comments are not instantaneously available for public view on <https://www.regulations.gov>. If you have received a Comment Tracking Number, your comment has been successfully submitted and there is no need to resubmit the same comment. All requests for a hearing must be sent to: (1) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: Hearing Clerk/OALJ, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152; and (2) Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: DEA Federal Register Representative/DPW, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. All requests for a hearing should also be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attn: Administrator, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on July 29, 2026, Cambrex High Point, Inc., 4180 Mendenhall Oaks Parkway, High Point, North Carolina 27265-8017, applied to be registered as an importer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substance(s):

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Poppy Straw Concentrate.	9670	II

The company plans to import the listed controlled substance for research and development purposes. No other activity for this drug code is authorized for this registration.

Approval of permit applications will occur only when the registrant's business activity is consistent with what is authorized under 21 U.S.C. 952(a)(2). Authorization will not extend to the import of Food and Drug Administration-approved or non-approved finished dosage forms for commercial sale.

Justin Wood,

Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2026-18202 Filed 9-4-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Mark Allen, D.D.S.; Rescission of Final
Agency Action and Withdrawal of
Order To Show Cause

I hereby *rescind* the Decision and Order published on August 20, 2026, at 91 FR 13986 (2026). Additionally, I *withdraw* the Order to Show Cause issued to Mark Allen, D.D.S., of Edmond, Oklahoma on November 24, 2025.

It is so ordered.

This Order is effective immediately.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on August 31, 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. 2026-18251 Filed 9-4-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Stephen Bossenberry, M.D.; Decision
and Order

On February 18, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Stephen Bossenberry, M.D., of Grand Blanc, Michigan (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. FB7239393, 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 Michigan, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 2. (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).¹

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.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2.² "A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant's/applicant's right to a hearing and an

¹ According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on July 31, 2026. The fact that a registrant allows his registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.*, 84 FR 68474, 68476-79 (2019).

² Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated May 20, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The RFAA's included Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that, after discovering that Registrant was no longer employed at his DEA registered address, on March 6, 2026, the DI traveled to the address associated with Registrant's Michigan driver's license to attempt personal service of the OSC on Registrant, but Registrant was not present at the address. RFAAX 2, at 1-2. On March 10, 2026, the DI mailed copies of the OSC to Registrant's registered address and Registrant's mailing address, as well as emailed the OSC to Registrant's registered email address. *Id.* at 2; *see also id.*, Attachment A. 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).

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 [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 20, 2025, both Registrant’s Michigan medical license and Michigan controlled substance license expired by their own terms. RFAAX 1, at 2. According to Michigan online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,³ both Registrant’s Michigan medical license and Michigan controlled substance license remain expired. State of Michigan Licensing & Regulatory Affairs Professional Licensing Search, <https://aca-prod.accela.com/MILARA/GeneralProperty/PropertyLookup.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Michigan, the state in which he is registered with DEA.⁴

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., 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).⁵

According to Michigan law, “a person who manufactures, distributes, prescribes, or dispenses a controlled substance in this state or who proposes to engage in the manufacture, distribution, prescribing, or dispensing of a controlled substance in this state shall obtain a license issued by the [Michigan Board of Pharmacy] in accordance with the rules.” Mich. Comp. Laws § 333.7303(1) (2025).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Michigan because his Michigan

controlled substance license is expired. As discussed above, an individual must hold a Michigan controlled substance license to dispense controlled substances in Michigan. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority handle controlled substances in Michigan, 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. FB7239393 issued to Stephen Bossenberry, M.D. 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 Stephen Bossenberry, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Stephen Bossenberry, M.D., for additional registration in Michigan. This Order is effective October 8, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on August 31, 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. 2026–18200 Filed 9–4–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–1766]

**Importer of Controlled Substances
Application: Fisher Clinical Services,
Inc.**

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement
Administration, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Fisher Clinical Services, Inc. has applied to be registered as an

³ 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).

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 medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Michigan. 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 Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

⁵ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the 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).