investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondents, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against such respondent.

Issued: May 28, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14201 Filed 6–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–827 (Preliminary)]

Nitrile Rubber From Korea

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of antidumping investigation and scheduling of a preliminary phase investigation.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of an investigation and commencement of preliminary phase antidumping investigation No. 731–TA–827 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) (the Act) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Korea of acrylonitrile-butadiene rubber (nitrile rubber), provided for in subheading 4002.59.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless the Department of Commerce extends the time for initiation pursuant to section 732(c)(1)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(1)(B)), the Commission must reach a preliminary determination in antidumping investigations in 45 days, or in this case by July 12, 1999. The Commission's views are due at the Department of Commerce within five business days thereafter, or by July 19, 1999.

For further information concerning the conduct of this investigation and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 27, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Seiger (202–205–3183), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This investigation is being instituted in response to a petition filed on May 27, 1999, by Zeon Chemicals, L.P., Louisville, KY, and Uniroyal Chemical Company, Inc., Middlebury, CT.

Participation in the Investigation and Public Service List

Persons (other than petitioners) wishing to participate in the investigation as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in sections 201.11 and 207.10 of the Commission's rules, not later than seven days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Industrial users and (if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level) representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to this investigation upon the expiration of the period for filing entries of appearance.

Limited Disclosure of Business Proprietary Information (BPI) Under an Administrative Protective Order (APO) and BPI Service List

Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI gathered in this investigation available to authorized applicants representing interested parties (as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)) who are parties to the investigation under the APO issued in the investigation, provided that the application is made not later than seven days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Conference

The Commission's Director of Operations has scheduled a conference in connection with this investigation for 9:30 a.m. on June 17, 1999, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC. Parties wishing to participate in the conference should contact Jonathan Seiger (202–205–3183) not later than June 15, 1999, to arrange for their appearance. Parties in support of the imposition of antidumping duties in this investigation and parties in opposition to the imposition of such duties will each be collectively allocated one hour within which to make an oral presentation at the conference. A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the conference.

Written Submissions

As provided in sections 201.8 and 207.15 of the Commission's rules, any person may submit to the Commission on or before June 22, 1999, a written brief containing information and arguments pertinent to the subject matter of the investigation. Parties may file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the conference no later than three days before the conference. If briefs or written testimony contain BPI, they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the investigation must be served on all other parties to the investigation (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: This investigation is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: May 28, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14202 Filed 6–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 98–10]

Lawrence C. Hill, M.D.; Conditional Grant of Restricted Registration

On January 2, 1998, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Lawrence C. Hill, M.D. (Respondent) of Monroe, Louisiana, notifying him if an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should deny his pending application for registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that his registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated January 30, 1998, Respondent, through counsel, filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Monroe, Louisiana on May 6 and 7, 1998, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, both parties submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument.

On October 30, 1998, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision, recommending that Respondent's application for registration be granted. Neither party filed exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's recommended decision, and on December 2, 1998, Judge Bittner transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator.

The Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator adopts the Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of he Administrative Law Judge, except as specifically noted below. His adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent graduated from medical school in 1976 and entered private practice as a general practitioner in 1977. In 1976, Respondent was issued DEA Certificate of Registration AH7179725, which he allowed to expire on October 31, 1980. According to Respondent, he moved office locations without advising DEA of his new address, and as a result he did not receive the renewal application for his registration.

In July 1987, Respondent called DEA's New Orleans Field Division and requested that he be issued DEA order forms to enable him to purchase Schedule II controlled substances. Respondent was informed that his DEA registration had expired and that he would need to apply for and receive a new registration before he could again handle controlled substances. On July 16, 1987, Respondent executed an application for a new DEA registration. on that same day a DEA investigator visited Respondent at his office and reiterated that his previous DEA registration had expired and that he could no handle controlled substances until he received a new DEA registration. On July 20, 1987, Respondent contacted the investigator's supervisor to verify what he had been told. Respondent was again advised that he could not handle controlled substances until he received a new DEA registration.

On August 13, 1987, the investigator visited the pharmacy located across the street from Respondent's office. The investigator discovered that Respondent had issued 44 controlled substance prescriptions since July 17, 1987, when she had advised him that he was not authorized to handle controlled substances. A subsequent review of another pharmacy's records revealed that Respondent issued an addition 54 controlled substance prescriptions between July 17 and August 13, 1987.

The investigator questioned Respondent about these prescriptions. Respondent indicated that another physician had agreed to ''cover'' his prescriptions. Respondent was again advised that he could not handle controlled substances until he received a new DEA registration. After the investigator left his office, Respondent telephoned DEA's New Orleans Field Division to confirm that he was not permitted to handle controlled substances.

On August 21, 1987, the owner of the pharmacy located cross the street from Respondent's office called the DEA investigator and informed her that a friend of his had recently visited Respondent and was given a medication bottle filled with Lorcet, a Schedule III controlled substance, and Valium, a Schedule IV controlled substance, in exchange for $5.00. During a subsequent interview, the individual confirmed this information and also indicated that Respondent had dispensed Vicodin, a Schedule III controlled substance, to the individual's wife on August 27, 1987.

As a result of this information, the DEA investigator contacted several pharmaceutical companies to determine whether Respondent had ordered any controlled substances since July 16, 1987. One company indicated that on September 16, 1987, Respondent had requested 100 dosage units of Lorcet and 100 dosage units of Lorcet Plus misrepresenting that his expired DEA registration AH7179725 would expire on October 31, 1987. A second company advised that since July 17, 1987, Respondent had requested and received controlled substances such as Valium, Dalmane and Limbitrol, all Schedule IV controlled substances. Finally, the records of a third company showed that Respondent used his expired DEA registration on July 28, 1987 to request 100 dosage units of Vicodin.

Based upon this information, several undercover visits were made to Respondent's office in an attempt to determine whether Respondent would prescribe, dispense or administer controlled substances to the undercover officers. No controlled substances were obtained by the undercover officers.

On December 9, 1987, a search warrant was executed at Respondent's office and investigators found, among other things, a small amount of controlled substances. Respondent told the investigators that he did not realize that there were still controlled substances in his office and that he thought that he had disposed of all of them. During execution of the warrant, records of patients who had received controlled substances from Respondent were seized. These records were then turned over to the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners (Medical Board) for its review.

In November 1988, Respondent withdrew his pending application for registration with DEA after he received