Clara, California. 71 FR 7995 (Feb. 15, 2006). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain incremental dental positioning adjustment appliances by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,685,469; 6,450,807 (''the '807 patent''); 6,394,801; 6,398,548; 6,722,880; 6,629,840; 6,699,037; 6,318,994; 6,729,876; 6,602,070; 6,471,511; and 6,227,850. The complaint also alleged violation of section 337 by reason of misappropriation of trade secrets. The complaint and notice of investigation named OrthoClear, Inc., of San Francisco, California; OrthoClear Holdings, Inc., of Tortola, British Virgin Islands; and OrthoClear Pakistan Pvt, Ltd., of Lahore, Pakistan as respondents.

On July 10, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID terminating the investigation with respect to the '807 patent. On July 20, 2006, the Commission determined not to review this ID.

On October 13, 2006, complainant Align Technology, Inc. and respondents OrthoClear, Inc.; OrthoClear Holdings, Inc.; and OrthoClear Pakistan Pvt., Ltd. filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a consent order. On October 25, 2006, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion. On October 27, 2006, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 32), granting the joint motion. No petitions for review have been filed. The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission Rules 210.21, 210.42(h), 19 CFR 210.21, 210.42(h).

Issued: November 13, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6–19489 Filed 11–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–873–875, 877–880, and 882 (Review)]

Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar From Belarus, China, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, and Ukraine

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Commission determination to conduct full five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on steel concrete reinforcing bar from Belarus, China, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, and Ukraine.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on steel concrete reinforcing bar from Belarus, China, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, and Ukraine would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date. 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 through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 6, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202–205–3193), 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*). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 6, 2006, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act. The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (71 FR 43523, August 1, 2006) was inadequate. The Commission also found that the respondent interested party group responses with respect to Belarus, Latvia, Moldova, and Ukraine were adequate and the respondent interested party group responses with respect to China, Indonesia, Korea, and Poland were inadequate. The Commission found that other circumstances warranted conducting full reviews of the antidumping duty orders concerning steel concrete reinforcing bar from Belarus, China, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, and Ukraine. 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.

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

Issued: November 13, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6–19475 Filed 11–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(i), the Attorney General shall, prior to issuing a registration under this Section to a bulk manufacturer of a controlled substance in schedule I or II and prior to issuing a regulation under 21 U.S.C. 952(a) (2) (B) authorizing the importation of such a substance, provide manufacturers holding registrations for the bulk manufacture of the substance an opportunity for a hearing.

Therefore, in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on September 14, 2006, Kenco VPI, Division of Kenco Group Inc., 350 Corporate Place, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37419, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as an importer of Nabilone (7379), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to import the listed controlled substance for distribution to its customers.

Any manufacturer who is presently, or is applying to be, registered with DEA to manufacture such basic class of controlled substance may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 and in such form as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such written comments or objections being sent via regular mail should be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/ODL; or any being sent via express mail should be sent to DEA Headquarters, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/ODL, 2401 Jefferson-Davis Highway, Alexandria, Virginia 22301; and must be filed no later than December 18, 2006.

This procedure is to be conducted simultaneously with and independent of the procedures described in 21 CFR 1301.34(b), (c), (d), (e) and (f). As noted in a previous notice published in the **Federal Register** on September 23, 1975, (40 FR 43745–46), all applicants for registration to import a basic class of any controlled substance listed in schedule I or II are, and will continue to be required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1301.34(b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: November 8, 2006.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–19446 Filed 11–16–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 03–12]

Daniel Koller, D.V.M., Denial of Application; Introduction and Procedural History

On November 22, 2002, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Daniel Koller, D.V.M. (Respondent) of San Diego, California, and Portland, Oregon. The Show Cause Order proposed to revoke Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration, BK 5633525, as a veterinary practitioner, which was issued to him at his San Diego address, and to deny his pending application for a registration as a veterinary practitioner at the proposed registered location of 3150 NE 82nd Avenue, Portland, Oregon. As grounds for the action, the Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. *See* 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4).

In pertinent part, the Show Cause Order alleged that on December 5, 2001, Respondent submitted an application for a registration as a veterinary practitioner at 3150 NE 82nd Avenue, Portland, Oregon, and that on the application, Respondent had indicated that the State of California had revoked his state license in 1978 for non-drug related conduct but had re-instated his license in 1982. *See* Show Cause Order at 2. The Show Cause Order alleged that on February 13, 2002, DEA Diversion Investigators (DIs) interviewed Respondent at his proposed registered location. *See id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent told the DIs that he had started over 30 veterinary clinics under the name ''Companion Pet Clinic'' in Oregon, Arizona, Washington and Idaho, and that Respondent obtains a DEA registration for the particular clinic and operates the clinic until he finds a veterinarian to purchase the practice. *See id.* The Show Cause Order also alleged that Respondent ''retain[s] a financial interest in each new clinic.'' *Id.*

The Show Cause Order further alleged that during the interview, Respondent told the DIs that he maintained a law practice in San Diego, California, and that he anticipated hiring temporary veterinarians at the Portland location during the periods in which he returned to San Diego, and that the temporary veterinarians and clinic support staff would have access to the safe in which the controlled substances were stored. *See id.* at 3. The Show Cause Order alleged ''that by affording such access, [Respondent] would not be providing effective controls and procedures against diversion.'' *Id.*

The Show Cause Order alleged that during the on-site inspection, the DIs observed that a partial bottle of Pentobarbital euthanasia solution, a Schedule II controlled substance, was stored in a safe. *See id.* at 3. The Show Cause Order further alleged that Respondent had a bottle of Ketamine, a Schedule III controlled substance, in his laboratory coat pocket. *See id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent told the DIs that he had brought the Ketamine from his registered location in San Diego, and that he had borrowed the Pentobarbital from the Companion Pet Clinic in Forest Grove, Oregon. *See id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that these acts ''constitute[] a violation of 21 CFR 1301.12, which requires each separate location to be registered.'' *Id.* at 3.

The Show Cause Order next alleged that Respondent had told the DIs that the California Veterinary Board was going to place him in a diversion program because Respondent had self-administered Telazol, a Schedule III controlled substance which is used as a veterinary anesthetic. *See id.* The Show Cause Order further alleged that Respondent explained that he had taken this drug because he had undergone knee replacement surgery and had trouble sleeping. *See id.* The Show Cause Order also alleged that Respondent failed to disclose to the DIs that on December 20, 2001, the California Veterinary Board had ordered the interim suspension of his license as a result of his Telazol abuse and that the order remained in effect on the date of the interview. *See id.*

The Show Cause Order alleged that on October 27, 2001, San Diego police officers and paramedics responded to a 911 call placed by Respondent's daughter which reported that Respondent's wife had suddenly lost consciousness and that Respondent was lying on a bed in a semi-conscious state. *See id.* The Show Cause Order alleged that upon arrival at Respondent's residence, paramedics found that Respondent's wife had fresh puncture wounds with blood oozing from her left arm and that Respondent had fresh puncture wounds with blood oozing from his right arm. *See id.* The Show Cause Order also alleged that the paramedics found a hypodermic needle with fresh blood on it lying near Respondent. *See id.* The Show Cause Order further alleged that Respondent was under the influence of a controlled substance, that Respondent was arrested, and that during a search incident to the arrest, police found a 5 ml. vial of Telazol, a Schedule III controlled substance, in his right front pants pocket, and that the vial's top had been punctured. *See id.*

The Show Cause Order next alleged that the police obtained a warrant and conducted a search of Respondent's residence. *See id.* at 5. The Show Cause Order alleged that during the search, the police did not find any controlled substance dispensing logs, purchasing records, or inventory reports in Respondent's residence, even though federal law requires controlled substance records to be maintained at the registered location. *See id.* at 6. The Show Cause Order also alleged that the police found a variety of controlled substances during the search most of which were not secured in a safe. *See id.* at 5.

The Show Cause Order next alleged that in January 2000, Dr. Parminder Nagra, a friend and business associate of Respondent (who owned a Companion