response time should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Office, Washington DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395–7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile at (202) 514–1590.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

1. Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

1. *Type of Information Collection:* New Collection.

2. *Title of the Form/Collection:* Collection of laboratory analysis data on drug samples tested by non-Federal (state and local government) crime laboratories also known as National Forensic Laboratory Information System (NFLIS);

3. *Agency form number:* None; Applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

4. *Affected public who will be asked to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State and local crime laboratories. *Other:* None.

DEA is required under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) (21 U.S.C. 811(b)) to gather data relevant to a determination of the actual or relative abuse potential of drugs. Existing Federal drug abuse data bases do not provide the type or quality of information necessary to accomplish this task in a timely and efficient manner. Non-Federal crime laboratories conduct chemical analyses on a significantly larger number of illicit drug samples than DEA's seven laboratories. The non-Federal analyzed drug data is an untapped resource which would give DEA a very comprehensive representation of drug trafficking in the U.S. This data has the highest degree of validity because it is verified by chemical analysis. Participating laboratories and other government agencies will be permitted to access part of the data base.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 330 respondents at 12 times per year at 8 hours per response.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 31,680 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 10, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–15678 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Extension of Existing Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; annual reporting requirement for manufacturers of listed chemicals.

Office of Management and Budget approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 31, 1997, and allowed for a 60 day comment period. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments until July 16, 1997. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Office, Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395–7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to (202) 514–1590.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

1. Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of the information collection:

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

2. *Title of the Form/Collection:* Annual Reporting Requirement for Manufacturers of Listed Chemicals.

3. *Agency form number:* None, if any, and the applicable component of the *Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Business or other for-profit. Other: None. Section 310(b) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 830(b)) was amended by Public Law 103–200 (The Domestic Chemical

Diversion Control Act of 1993 (DCDCA)) to add a requirement that ''A regulated person that manufactures a listed chemical shall report annually to the Attorney General, in such form and manner and containing such specific data as the Attorney General shall prescribe by regulation, information concerning listed chemicals manufactured by the person.''

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 100 respondents at 1 response per year at 4 hours per response.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 400 annual burden hours.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: July 11, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–15720 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S. Revocation of Registration

On June 25, 1996, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S., of California, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AA2387721, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), and deny any pending applications for registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California.

The Order to Show Cause was not served on Dr. Alhanati until sometime in December 1996. By letter dated December 21, 1996, Dr. Alhanati responded to the Order to Show Cause. In his response, Dr. Alhanati did not request a hearing, but instead set forth his position on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that Dr. Alhanati has waived his right to a hearing, hereby enters his final order without a hearing and based upon the investigative file and Dr. Alhanati's letter dated December 21, 1996, pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 (c) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that by a decision dated April 17, 1994, the Board of Dental Examiners for the State of California revoked Dr. Alhanati's license to practice medicine based upon a finding that he committed a lewd act upon a child. The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that in light of the fact that Dr. Alhanati is not currently licensed to practice dentistry in the State of California, it is reasonable to infer that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in that state.

The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See *Romeo J. Perez, M.D.,* 62 FR 16,193 (1997); *Demetris A. Green, M.D.,* 61 FR 60,728 (1996); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.,* 58 FR 51,104 (1993).

Here it is clear that Dr. Alhanati is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California. Therefore, Dr. Alhanati is not entitled to a DEA registration in that state.

In his letter dated December 21, 1996, Dr. Alhanati admitted that he was not currently authorized to practice dentistry in California, but stated that he was licensed ''in the state of Illinois, among other states.'' He further contended that ''to revoke my DEA Certificate of Registration might forever preclude me from prescribing analgesics requisite following treatment of my patients following surgery.'' Dr. Alhanati argued that his state license was erroneously revoked because he ''was non-culpable of the allegation,'' and that the reason that it was revoked was non-drug related. Finally, Dr. Alhanati indicated that he was seeking relicensure with the State of California.

The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that the fact that Dr. Alhanati is licensed to practice dentistry in states other than California is irrelevant since he is not authorized to practice in the state where he is registered with DEA and he has not sought to modify his current registration to another state. The Acting Deputy Administrator notes that revocation of Dr. Alhanati's DEA Certificate of Registration will not forever preclude him from prescribing controlled substances. Dr. Alhanati is certainly free to apply for a new DEA registration in a state where he is authorized to practice dentistry and handle controlled substances or to reapply for a DEA registration in California, if he is relicensed in that state. The fact that Dr. Alhanati is seeking relicensure in California is not persuasive. There is no evidence in the record that he has been granted a new license to practice dentistry in California, and therefore the Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that Dr. Alhanati is not currently authorized to practice or handle controlled substances in that state, Finally, Dr. Alhanati's arguments that his state revocation was erroneous and not drug-related are immaterial. No matter what the basis was for the state action, the fact remains that he is not currently authorized to practice and handle controlled substances in California.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration AA2387721, previously issued to Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S., be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending applications for the renewal of such registration, be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective July 16, 1997.

Dated: June 9, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–15640 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95–43]

Dennis Robert Howard, M.D. Grant of Restricted Registration

On May 24, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Dennis Robert Howard, M.D., (Respondent) of Macon, Georgia, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his applications for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated June 21, 1995, Respondent, through counsel, timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Atlanta, Georgia on April 23 and 24, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties