

phase of these investigations beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 6, 2017, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building. Requests to appear at the hearing should be filed in writing with the Secretary to the Commission on or before December 1, 2017. A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the hearing. All parties and nonparties desiring to appear at the hearing and make oral presentations should participate in a prehearing conference to be held on December 4, 2017, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, if deemed necessary. Oral testimony and written materials to be submitted at the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), and 207.24 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 business days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written submissions.—Each party who is an interested party shall submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.23 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is November 29, 2017. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.25 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is December 12, 2017. 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 December 12, 2017. On December 29, 2017, 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 January 3, 2018, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.30 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on E-Filing*, available on the Commission's Web site at [https://](https://www.usitc.gov)

www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to section 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 sections 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 section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 29, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-21428 Filed 10-4-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-865-867 (Third Review)]

Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Italy, Malaysia, and the Philippines; Scheduling of Expedited Five-Year Reviews

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of expedited reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Italy, Malaysia, and the Philippines would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

DATES: September 5, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amanda Lawrence (202-205-3185), 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On September 5, 2017, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (82 FR 25324, June 1, 2017) of the subject five-year reviews was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate for all reviews. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting full reviews.¹ Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct expedited reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)).

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

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the reviews will be placed in the nonpublic record on November 2, 2017, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for these reviews. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the reviews and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,² and any party other than an interested party to the reviews may file written comments with the Secretary on what determinations the Commission should reach in the

¹ A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

² The Commission has found the responses submitted on behalf of Core Pipe Products, Inc., Shaw Alloying Piping Products, LLC, and Taylor Forge Stainless to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (see 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

reviews. Comments are due on or before November 17, 2017 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year reviews nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the reviews by November 17, 2017. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its reviews, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (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 with respect to filing were revised effective July 25, 2014. See 79 FR 35920 (June 25, 2014), and the revised Commission Handbook on E-filing, available from the Commission's Web site at https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (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.

Determination.—The Commission has determined these reviews are extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 29, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-21429 Filed 10-4-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Warren B. Dailey, M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 7, 2017, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order

to Show Cause to Warren B. Dailey, M.D. (Registrant), of Houston, Texas. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3) and (5), on two grounds: (1) That he does not have authority to handle controlled substances in Texas, the State in which he is registered with the Agency; and (2) he has been excluded from participation in a program pursuant to section 1320a-7(a) of Title 42. GX 2 (Order to Show Cause), at 1.

With respect to the Agency's jurisdiction, the Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant is registered as a practitioner in schedules II through V, under Certificate of Registration No. AD9639038, at the registered address of 2305 Southmore, Houston, Texas. *Id.* The Order alleged that Registrant's registration expires by its terms on June 30, 2018. *Id.*

As to the substantive grounds for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order specifically alleged that “[o]n October 12, 2016, the Texas Medical Board issued an Order of Suspension by Operation of Law, suspending [Registrant's] Texas Medical License . . . based on [his] felony conviction on March 30, 2016 . . . for health care fraud.” *Id.* The Show Cause Order then alleged that Registrant is “currently without authority to practice medicine or handle controlled substances in the State of Texas, the [S]tate in which he registered with” the Agency, thus subjecting his registration to revocation. *Id.* at (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3); other citations omitted).

The Show Cause Order also alleged that on December 30, 2016, the Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS IG), issued a letter to Registrant “excluding [him] from participation in all Federal health care programs based on [his] felony conviction on March 30, 2016, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas for health care fraud.” *Id.* at 2. The Show Cause Order further alleged that “[t]he exclusion was effective twenty days from the date of the letter and is for a minimum period of twenty years.” *Id.* The Show Cause Order then asserted that Registrant's “DEA registration is also subject to revocation based on [his] exclusion from participation in a program pursuant to section 1320a-7(a) of Title 42.” *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(5)).

The Show Cause Order notified Registrant of his right to request a hearing on the allegations, or to submit a written statement in lieu of a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence for failing to elect

either option. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The Order also notified Registrant of his right to submit a corrective action plan under 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C). *Id.* at 3.

On February 7, 2017, the Show Cause Order was mailed to Registrant, via first class mail, addressed to him at his registered address at 2305 Southmore, Houston, Texas. GX 5. Affidavit of Service by DEA Analyst, Office of Chief Counsel. Also, on February 21, 2016, a Diversion Investigator (DI) with the Houston Division Office emailed the Show Cause Order to an attorney, who represented Registrant in the state board proceeding, who accepted service on his behalf. GX 4. In his email, the attorney represented that he was “accepting service upon” Registrant. *Id.* (copy of email between DI and attorney accepting service on Registrant.)

On April 6, 2017 the Government forwarded a Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA) and an evidentiary record to my Office. On review, I found the Government's attempts at service insufficient. As for the Government's attempt to serve Registrant by mail addressed to his registered address, I found this inadequate because it clearly knew that Registrant had been convicted of multiple federal felony offenses more than a year earlier and was likely incarcerated in a United States Penitentiary. See *Robinson v. Hanrahan*, 409 U.S. 38, 40 (1972) (“[T]he State knew that appellant was not at the address to which the notice was mailed . . . since he was at that very time confined in . . . jail. Under these circumstances, it cannot be said that the State made any effort to provide notice which was ‘reasonably calculated’ to apprise appellant of the pendency of the . . . proceedings.”); see also *Jones v. Flowers*, 547 U.S. 220, 230 (2006) (citing with approval *Robinson* and noting that its cases “require[] the government to consider unique information about an intended recipient regardless of whether a statutory scheme is reasonably calculated to provided notice in the ordinary case”).

I also found the Government's service on the attorney insufficient. In holding so, I explained that the CSA states that “[b]efore taking action pursuant to [21 U.S.C. 824(a)] . . . the Attorney General shall serve upon the . . . registrant an order to show cause why registration should not be . . . revoked[] or suspended.” 21 U.S.C. 824(c) (emphasis added). While I explained that the Agency has found that service on an attorney may satisfy the CSA's requirement that a Show Cause Order be “serve[d] upon the . . . registrant,” I noted that the Agency has made clear