inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS [4].

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of §§ 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 9, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–23043 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N.; Decision and Order

On June 26, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N., of Holladay, Utah (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. ML5284815 CFR, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Utah, 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.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds her to be in default. RFAA, at 2.[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 [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), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 4; *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. 21 CFR 1301.43(e). According to the OSC, effective April 21, 2026, the Utah Division of Professional Licensing revoked Registrant's Utah Registered Nurse (RN) license, Registrant's Utah Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) license, and Registrant's Utah APRN controlled substance license. RFAAX 2, at 2. According to Utah online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[2] Registrant's Utah RN, APRN, and APRN controlled substance licenses are all revoked. Utah Division of Professional Licensing License Lookup & Verification System, *https://secure.utah.gov/llv/search/index.html* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice nursing, to practice as an APRN, nor to handle controlled substances in Utah, 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 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).'').[4] The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., Thomas Andr'e Endicott, D.D.S.,* 90 FR 13892 (2025); *Gerald M. Baltz, N.P.,* 87 FR 6749 (2022); *Paul E. Pilgram, M.D.,* 82 FR 11058 (2017).

According to Utah statute, ''[e]very person who . . . distributes, prescribes, dispenses, [or] administers . . . any controlled substance in Schedules I through V within [the] state . . . shall obtain a license issued by the [Division of Professional Licensing].'' Utah Code Ann. § 58–37–105(2)(a)(i) (West 2026).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Utah because Registrant's Utah APRN controlled substance license is revoked. As discussed above, an individual must

[4] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated August 18, 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 June 29, 2026, the DI, along with other DEA personnel, traveled to Registrant's registered location to personally serve Registrant, but they were unsuccessful because no one was at the facility, the lights were off, and the doors were locked. RFAAX 2, at 2. On the same day, the DI sent a copy of the OSC to Registrant via certified mail and to Registrant's registered email address. *Id.; see also id.,* Attachment C. On or about July 3, 2026, Registrant responded to the DI's email indicating her receipt of the OSC. *Id.; see also id.,* Attachment D.

[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 Order, is not licensed to practice nursing, to practice as an APRN, nor to handle controlled substances in Utah. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's findings 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.*

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

hold a Utah controlled substance license to dispense a controlled substance in Utah. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Utah, 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. ML5284815 issued to Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N. 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 Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N., for additional registration in Utah. This Order is effective December 14, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on November 3, 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. 2026–22954 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Troy R. Lehman, D.O.; Decision and Order

On January 19, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Troy R. Lehman, D.O., of Woodward, Oklahoma (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 6. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. BL7481649, alleging that Registrant lacks state authority to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma and materially falsified his registration renewal applications. *Id.* at 2–4 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1), 824(a)(3)).

On March 6, 2026, the Government submitted an RFAA to the Administrator requesting that the Agency issue a default final order revoking Registrant's registration. RFAA, at 3. After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting the analysis as set forth in detail below, the Agency finds that Registrant is in default, finds that Registrant is without state authority, and finds that Registrant materially falsified his applications. Accordingly, the Agency grants the Government's RFAA and revokes Registrant's registration.

I. Default Determination

Under 21 CFR 1301.43, a registrant entitled to a hearing who fails to file a timely hearing request ''within 30 days after the date of receipt of the [OSC] . . . shall be deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default'' unless ''good cause'' is established for the failure. 21 CFR 1301.43(a), (c)(1). In the absence of a demonstration of good cause, a registrant who fails to timely file an answer also is ''deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default.'' 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(2). Unless excused, a default constitutes ''an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].'' 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

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. RFAAX 1, at 5 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2.[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). Because Registrant is in default and has not moved to excuse the default, the Agency finds that Registrant has admitted to the factual allegations in the OSC. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(1), (e), (f)(1).

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), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 3; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

II. Lack of State Authority

A. 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, the Oklahoma State Board of Osteopathic Examiners (Board) suspended Registrant from the practice of osteopathic medicine in Oklahoma on September 18, 2025. In addition, Registrant's Oklahoma osteopathic medical license expired by its own terms on June 30, 2026. RFAAX 1, at 3. Further, on October 31, 2025, Registrant's Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drug (OBNDD) license expired by its own terms. 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.thentiacloud.net/webs/obnddc/register* (last visited date of signature of this Order).[3] Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine nor to handle controlled substances in Oklahoma, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated March 6, 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 January 21, 2026, the DI and other DEA personnel traveled to Registrant's registered address and personally served the OSC on Registrant. RFAAX 2, at 1.

[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 osteopathic medical license that expired by its own terms on June 30, 2026. Registrant also admits that on September 18, 2025, he was issued a Joint Final Order from the Board, suspending him from the practice of osteopathic medicine in the state of Oklahoma. According to Oklahoma online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's state osteopathic license is expired (Status: ''Cancelled''). Oklahoma State Board of Osteopathic Examiners, Physician Search, *https://osboe.portalus.thentiacloud.net/webs/portal/register* (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 medicine in Indiana. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for

Continued