

Victoria Wassmer, 202-395-5871, Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20530.

Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

1. Evaluate whether the 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 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.

Additionally, 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. Additional comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile at 202-514-1590.

Overview of this information collection:

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

2. *Title of the Form/Collection:* National Crime Victimization Survey.

3. *Agency form number and applicable components:*

Forms: NCVS-1; NCVS-1A; NCVS-1A(SP); NCVS-2; NCVS-2(SP); NCVS-7; NCVS-110; NCVS-500; NCVS-541; NCVS-545; NCVS-548; NCVS-551; NCVS-554; NCVS-554(SP); NCVS-572(L); KOR/SP/CHIN(T)/CHIN(m)/VIET; NCVS-573(L); NCVS593(I); and NCVS-594(L). Component: Victimization Statistics Branch, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked to respond:* Primary: US households and individuals age 12 or older.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 111, 100 respondents at 1.95 hours per interview.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 217,000 hours annual burden.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: July 3, 1997.

**Robert B. Briggs,**

*Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 97-17957 Filed 7-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Velsicol Chemical Corporation*, No. 4:49-CV-258-HLM, was lodged on June 17, 1997 with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Under the consent decree the United States is settling claims against Defendant Velsicol Chemical Corporation under Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9607, in connection with the Shaver's Farm Site in northern Georgia. Pursuant to the Consent Decree Velsicol will reimburse the Superfund \$6,280,560.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Velsicol Chemical Corporation*, DOJ Ref. #90-11-2-886. The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, Richard Russell Bldg., Rm. 1800, 75 Spring Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30335; the Region IV Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$5.25 (25 cents per page

reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

**Joel M. Gross,**

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environmental and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 97-17924 Filed 7-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Anne D. DeBlanco, M.D.; Denial of Application

On January 29, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Anne D. DeBlanco, M.D., of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, notifying her of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny her application, dated May 26, 1995, for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that her registration would be inconsistent with the public interest, as that term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged that, "(Dr. DeBlanco) submitted a DEA application for registration, dated May 25, 1995, in which (she) materially falsified a response by indicating 'no' to a question which asked in part 'whether (she) had ever had a State professional license or controlled substance registration revoked, suspended, denied, restricted, or placed on probation.'" (Dr. DeBlanco) knew that on May 10, 1995, the State of Florida Board of Medicine had placed (her) state medical license on probation for a period of three years, and that the State of Ohio had revoked (her) license to practice medicine in that state on May 9, 1990." The order also notified Dr. DeBlanco that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, her hearing right would be deemed waived.

The DEA received a signed receipt indicating that the order was received on February 10, 1997. No request for a hearing or any other reply was received by the DEA from Dr. DeBlanco or anyone purporting to represent her in this matter. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that (1) 30 days have passed since the receipt of the Order to Show Cause, and (2) no request for a hearing having been received, concludes that Dr. DeBlanco is deemed to have waived her hearing right. After considering the relevant material from the investigative file in this matter, the Acting Deputy Administrator now enters his final order

without a hearing pursuant to 21 C.F.R. 1301.43(d) and (3) and 1301.46.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that on or about September 18, 1989, Dr. DeBlanco was found guilty in the Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, Ohio of one count of Medicaid fraud, one count of grand theft, and ten counts of forgery as a result of allegations that Dr. DeBlanco inappropriately billed Medicaid for services which she did not provide. Thereafter, on May 11, 1990, the State Medical Board of Ohio (Ohio Board) revoked Dr. DeBlanco's license to practice medicine and surgery. Subsequently, in a Final Order dated May 10, 1995, the State of Florida, Board of Medicine, (Florida Board) placed Dr. DeBlanco's medical license on probation for three years subject to various terms and conditions. This action was based upon convictions, the action of the Ohio Board, and her failure to report the action of the Ohio Board to the Florida Board.

On May 26, 1995, Dr. DeBlanco submitted an application for a DEA Certificate of Registration. Dr. DeBlanco answered "no" to the question which asked, "Has the applicant ever been convicted of a crime in connection with controlled substances under State or Federal law, or ever surrendered or had a Federal controlled substance registration revoked, suspended, restricted or denied, or ever had a State professional license or controlled substance registration revoked, suspended, denied, restricted or placed on probation?" A DEA investigator contacted Dr. DeBlanco to inquire about her negative response to the question on the application. By letter dated August 17, 1995, Dr. DeBlanco indicated that she "did not adequately understand the question." Dr. DeBlanco stated that:

I have never been convicted of a crime concerning controlled substances or had a DEA problem. I lost my Ohio license because of a billing error. Case is no appeal, possibly will be over-turned at a scheduled hearing September 29, 1995. Have had Florida license since 1977 with never a problem. Never been a question about my medical care. My license is unrestricted on probation due to 1989 Ohio problem. \* \* \*

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 823(f), the Deputy Administrator may deny an application for a DEA Certificate of Registration if he determines that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, the following factors are considered:

(1) The recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board or professional disciplinary authority.

(2) The applicant's experience in dispensing, or conducting research with respect to controlled substances.

(3) The applicant's conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of controlled substances.

(4) Compliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances.

(5) Such other conduct which may threaten the public health and safety.

These factors are to be considered in the disjunctive; the Deputy Administrator may rely on any one or combination of factors and may give each factor the weight he deems appropriate in determining whether a registration should be revoked or an application for registration be denied. See Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D., Docket No. 88-42, 54 FR 16422 (1989).

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that there is no evidence before him that Dr. DeBlanco has improperly dispensed controlled substances or that she has been convicted of an offense relating to controlled substances. However, it is undisputed that the Ohio Board revoked her Ohio medical license and the Florida Board placed her Florida medical license on probation for three years. In her August 1995 letter to DEA, Dr. DeBlanco alleged that the Ohio Board's action was on appeal and could be overturned following a scheduled hearing in September 1995, however, Dr. DeBlanco did not respond to the Order to Show Cause and therefore did not present any evidence that the Ohio Board's action has been overturned. Consequently, based upon the evidence before him, the Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that Dr. DeBlanco's Ohio medical license remains revoked.

Regarding factors four and five, the Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Dr. DeBlanco violated 21 U.S.C. 843(a)(4) by indicating on her application for registration that she had never had a State professional license or controlled substance registration revoked, suspended, denied, restricted or placed on probation, when in fact Ohio had revoked her medical license in 1990, and Florida had placed her license on probation for three years just weeks before she submitted her application for registration with DEA. Dr. DeBlanco did not respond to the Order to Show Cause and therefore did not offer any evidence regarding the falsification. In her August 1995 letter to DEA, Dr. DeBlanco indicated that she did not adequately understand the question. However, the Acting Deputy Administrator finds that the question is clearly worded and therefore concludes

that Dr. DeBlanco falsified her application for registration. It has been held in previous cases that, "(s)ince DEA must rely on the truthfulness of information supplied by applicants in registering them to handle controlled substances, falsification can not be tolerated." Bobby Watts, M.D., 58 FR 46995 (1993); see also, Leonel Tano, M.D., 62 FR 22968 (1997).

The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that based upon the action taken against her medical licenses in Ohio and Florida, her material falsification of her application for registration, and the lack of any mitigating evidence offered in response to the Order to Show Cause, Dr. DeBlanco's application must be denied at this time.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application, submitted by Anne D. Dr. DeBlanco, M.D., on May 26, 1995, for a DEA Certificate of Registration, be, and it hereby is denied. This order is effective August 8, 1997.

Dated: June 30, 1997.

**James S. Milford,**

*Acting Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97-17784 Filed 7-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Paul W. Teegardin, D.V.M.; Denial of Application

On February 25, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Paul W. Teegardin, D.V.M., of Ashville, Ohio, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application, dated December 6, 1995, for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that his registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged that:

"(1) (Dr. Teegardin's) last DEA registration, AT6745648, expired in November 1997. On two occasions in 1990-91, (he) prescribed for (himself) and received diazepam injectable, a Schedule IV controlled substance, and Darvocet, a Schedule IV controlled substance. These prescriptions were issued not in the course of usual professional practice and not for a