

conducted before the expiration date pursuant to Section 204(f) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714(f) (1988), the Secretary determines that the withdrawal shall be extended.

Dated: April 30, 1996.

Bob Armstrong,

*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 96-12322 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JB-P

[OR-957-00-1420-00: G6-0146]

### Filing of Plats of Survey: Oregon/ Washington

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, DOI.

ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The plats of survey of the following described lands are scheduled to be officially filed in the Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon, thirty (30) calendar days from the date of this publication.

Willamette Meridian

#### Oregon

T. 18 S., R. 1 W., accepted April 30, 1996

T. 40 S., R. 2 W., accepted March 6, 1996

T. 19 S., R. 6 W., accepted April 30, 1996

T. 28 S., R. 9 W., accepted April 23, 1996

T. 30 S., R. 13 W., accepted April 15, 1996

T. 31 S., R. 15 W., accepted April 15, 1996

#### Washington

T. 6 N., R. 15 E., accepted April 30, 1996

T. 23 N., R. 9 W., accepted March 6, 1996

If protests against a survey, as shown on any of the above plat(s), are received prior to the date of official filing, the filing will be stayed pending consideration of the protest(s). A plat will not be officially filed until the day after all protests have been dismissed and become final or appeals from the dismissal affirmed.

The plat(s) will be placed in the open files of the Oregon State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1515 S.W. 5th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97201, and will be available to the public as a matter of information only. Copies of the plat(s) may be obtained from the above office upon required payment. A person or party who wishes to protest against a survey must file with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Portland, Oregon, a notice that they wish to protest prior to the proposed official filing date given above. A statement of reasons for a protest may be filed with the notice of protest to the State Director, or the statement of reasons must be filed with the State Director within thirty (30) days after the proposed official filing date.

The above-listed plats represent dependent resurveys, survey and subdivision.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bureau of Land Management, (1515 S.W. 5th Avenue) P.O. Box 2965, Portland, Oregon 97208.

Dated: May 6, 1996.

Robert D. DeViney, Jr.,

*Chief, Branch of Realty and Records Services.*

[FR Doc. 96-12317 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-33-M

### National Park Service

#### Royal Production Company, Big Thicket National Preserve, Hardin County, Texas; Availability of Plan of Operations and Environmental Assessment Drilling an Exploratory Oil Well

Notice is hereby given in accordance with Section 9.52(b) of Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, Subpart B, that the National Park Service has received from Royal Production Company a Plan of Operations to drill an exploratory oil well in Big Thicket National Preserve, located within Hardin County, Texas.

The Plan of Operations and Environmental Assessment are available for public review and comment for a period of 30 days from the publication date of this notice. The documents can be viewed during normal business hours at the Office of the Superintendent, Big Thicket National Preserve, 3785 Milam Street, Beaumont, Texas. Copies can be requested from the Superintendent, Big Thicket National Preserve, 3785 Milam, Beaumont, TX 77701.

Dated: April 30, 1996.

Richard R. Peterson,

*Superintendent, Big Thicket National Preserve.*

[FR Doc. 96-12162 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

#### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Water Act

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a consent decree in *United States of America v. Ritschard Brothers, Inc. Carmelo Ritschard, and Donald Ritschard*, No. 3:96-CV-310AS (N.D. Ind.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana on May 9, 1996.

The proposed consent decree concerns alleged violations of the Clean

Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311, as a result of the discharge of fill material onto portions of property located in St. Joseph County, Indiana, which are alleged to constitute "waters of the United States." The consent decree requires Ritschard Brothers, Inc., Carmelo Ritschard, and Donald Ritschard to (1) refrain from further discharges at the wetland; (2) perform partial restoration at the wetland; (3) monitor the fill material for three years, to ensure that no hazardous substances are leaching into the wetland; (4) place a conservation easement on the portion of the wetland and surrounding uplands which the Ritschard own; (5) pay a portion of the purchase price of a 120-acre farmland parcel, and perform all necessary design and construction necessary to create a mitigation wetland; and (6) pay a penalty of \$20,000 to the United States Treasury.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to the proposed consent decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Attention: Daniel R. Dertke, 10th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Room 7215—Main Building, Washington, D.C. 20530 and should refer to *United States v. Ritschard Brothers, Inc.*, DJ Reference No. 90-5-1-6-555.

The consent decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court, Room 102, Robert A. Grant Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, 204 South Main Street, South Bend, Indiana, 46601.

Letitia J. Grishaw,

*Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 96-12324 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Petrotechnical Open Software Corporation

Notice is hereby given that, on April 22, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Petrotechnical Open Software Corporation ("POSC") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its

membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the following additional parties have become new non-voting members of POSC: Information Dimensions (France), Puteaux, FRANCE; Codd and Date Ltd., Chesham, Bucks, UNITED KINGDOM; Pt. ELNUSA Geosains, Jakarta, INDONESIA.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of POSC.

On January 14, 1991, POSC filed its original notifications pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 7, 1991, (56 FR 5021).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 24, 1996. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 3, 1996, (61 FR 14817).

Constance K. Robinson,

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 96-12323 Filed 5-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

## Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 94-59]

### Robert M. Golden, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On May 25, 1994, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Robert M. Golden, M.D., (Respondent) of Roswell, Georgia, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his Certification of Registration, AG6243125, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for the reason that his continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

On July 18, 1994, the Respondent, through counsel, filed a timely request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Atlanta, Georgia, on April 4-6, 1995, before Administrative Law Judge Paul A. Tenney. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence, and after the hearing, counsel for both sides submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On

August 4, 1995, Judge Tenney issued his Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Ruling, recommending that the Respondent's registration be suspended for one year, and after the one-year period of suspension, that the registration be limited to prescribing Schedules IV and V controlled substances only, "perhaps in an institutional setting." Both parties filed exceptions to his decision, and on September 13, 1995, the record of these proceedings and Judge Tenney's opinion were transmitted to the Deputy Administrator. On February 26, 1996, the Respondent filed with the Deputy Administrator a Motion to Reopen Evidence. By letter dated February 27, 1996, the Deputy Administrator afforded the Government an opportunity to respond to the Respondent's motion, and on March 27, 1996, the Government filed a response to the motion.

The Deputy Administrator has fully considered the record, to include the Respondent's Motion to Reopen, in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 C.F.R. 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 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, with specifically noted exceptions, and 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 on September 6, 1990, the Respondent was issued a DEA Certificate of Registration, number AG6243125, authorizing him to handle controlled substances in Schedules IV and V as a practitioner. This registration was due to expire on September 30, 1993, and on August 17, 1993, the Respondent filed an application to renew his registration. In block 2b of that application, the Respondent wrote that in 1986 his Georgia license had been acted upon concerning his handling of Schedules II and III controlled substances, but that he was "currently off probation."

Further investigation disclosed that disciplinary action was taken against the Respondent by the Georgia State Board of Medical Examiners (Board) pursuant to a Consent Order dated April 1, 1987. Although the order noted that "[t]his agreement is not an admission of wrongdoing for any purpose other than resolving the matters pending before the Board," and noted that the "Respondent waives any further findings of fact," the matters resolved included, among other things, allegations of recordkeeping violations, the prescribing or dispensing

of controlled substances while not acting in the usual course of professional practice, and the prescribing or ordering of controlled substances for an illegitimate medical purpose. As a result of the consent order, the Respondent's medical license was placed on probation for a period totalling four years, with terms and conditions of probation to include: (1) That the Respondent would not prescribe, administer, or dispense, in the course of his office practice, any Schedule II, IIN, III, or IIIN controlled substances; (2) that the Respondent would personally maintain a daily log of all Schedule IV controlled substances prescribed, administered, or dispensed in his office for at least one year; (3) that the Respondent participate in a program of continuing education with at least 100 hours focusing on drug abuse and/or pharmacology; (4) that the Respondent abide by all State and Federal laws relating to drugs with the Respondent's license subject to revocation; and (5) that the Respondent pay a fine of \$5,000.00.

Before Judge Tenney, the Respondent testified that his state probation ended in 1990 or 1991, but that he had never requested reinstatement of his authorization to handle Schedule II or III controlled substances. No evidence to the contrary was presented by the Government. Therefore, the Deputy Administrator finds that the Respondent is currently authorized by the State of Georgia to handle only controlled substances in Schedules IV and V.

A Special Agent (Agent) for the DEA testified before Judge Tenney concerning an undercover operation he conducted involving the Respondent in 1985. Specifically, the Agent described three visits he made to the Respondent's office between April 9, 1985, and May 7, 1985. The parties do not dispute that the Respondent refused to prescribe Percodan for the Agent during the first visit. However, during the second visit the Respondent prescribed Halcion 0.5 mg, and during the third visit the Respondent prescribed Valium, 10 mg, with one refill. Both Halcion and Valium are Schedule IV controlled substances. The Government asserted that the Respondent issued these prescriptions to the Agent without a legitimate medical purpose.

In the Fall of 1992, a Roswell Police Department Detective contacted a DEA Division Investigator (Investigator) and requested assistance in investigating the Respondent's prescribing activities. The Investigator testified before Judge Tenney that he was asked to interview a cooperating individual (CI), and he participated in a telephone conversation