Teresa Wilderness boundary within the northwest quarter of section 10, Township 6 South, Range 21 East, accepted July 8, 2014, and officially filed July 10, 2014, for Group 1132, Arizona.

This plat was prepared at the request of the Bureau of Land Management.

The plat representing the survey of the subdivision of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 8, Township 7 South, Range 27 East, accepted July 8, 2014, and officially filed July 10, 2014, for Group 1119, Arizona.

This plat was prepared at the request of the Bureau of Land Management.

A person or party who wishes to protest against any of these surveys must file a written protest with the Arizona State Director, Bureau of Land Management, stating that they wish to protest.

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 protest is filed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: These plats will be available for inspection in the Arizona State Office, Bureau of Land Management, One North Central Avenue, Suite 800, Phoenix, Arizona 85004–4427. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

Gerald T. Davis,

Chief Cadastral Surveyor of Arizona.

[FR Doc. 2014–24997 Filed 10–20–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–32–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Certain Windshield Wipers and Components Thereof, DN 3036;* the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS,[1] and will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at USITC.[2] The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS.[3]Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Valeo North America, Inc. and Delmex de Juarez S. de R.L. de C.V. on October 15, 2014. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 windshield wipers and components thereof. The complaint names as respondents Trico Products Corporation of Rochester Hills, MI; Trico Products of Brownsville, TX; and Trico Componentes SA de CV of Mexico. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number (''Docket No. 3036'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures[4]). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202–205–2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential

[1] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

[2] United States International Trade Commission (USITC): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

[3] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

[4] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf.*

treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.[5]

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 16, 2014.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014–24972 Filed 10–20–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 13–16]

Michael A. White, M.D.; Decision and Order

On April 16, 2014, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Gail A. Randall issued the attached Recommended Decision (R.D.).[1] Respondent filed Exceptions to the Recommended Decision. Having reviewed the entire record including Respondent's Exceptions, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction except as explained below.[2] A discussion of Respondent's Exceptions follows.

Respondent's Exceptions

In his Exceptions, Respondent raises five different contentions. Notably, however, Respondent does not challenge any of the ALJ's factual findings (including her findings that were based on the testimony of the Government's Expert) regarding his prescribing of phentermine to the sixteen patients at issue in this proceeding. *See generally* Exceptions, at 1–4. Nor does he challenge the ALJ's legal conclusion ''that Respondent failed to establish a bona-fide doctor-patient relationship before prescribing [p]hentermine to the sixteen patients at issue here, thus violating 21 CFR 1306.04(a).'' R.D. at 33; *see also* Exceptions, at 1–4.

The ALJ also made extensive findings based on the results of a January 19, 2012 hearing conducted by the Mississippi State Board of Medical Licensure regarding Respondent's prescribing of phentermine to five other persons. GX 5. Following the hearing, at which Respondent was represented by counsel, the Board found him guilty of violating various provisions of both state law and the Board's rules.

More specifically, with respect to each of the five persons, the Board found that Respondent failed to obtain a thorough history or complete a thorough physical examination prior to initiating treatment utilizing a Schedule IV controlled substance.[3] *Id.* at 49 (citing Miss. Code Ann. § 73–25–29(13); 25 Miss. Code R. § 501(2)). The Board further found that Respondent had violated its rule prohibiting the continued prescribing of controlled substances classified as amphetamine like anorectics and/or central nervous system stimulants to a patient who had failed to lose weight after taking the controlled substances over a period of thirty days. *Id.* (citing Miss. Code Ann. § 73–25–29(13)).

Most significantly, with respect to each of the five patients at issue in the proceeding, the Board found Respondent ''guilty of dispensing drugs having addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability otherwise than in the course of legitimate professional practice.'' *Id.* at 16 (citing Miss. Code Ann. § 73–25–29(3)). This finding is equivalent to a finding that Respondent violated 21 CFR 1306.04(a), which requires that a controlled-substance prescription ''be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his professional practice.''

Here again, Respondent did not challenge the ALJ's findings of fact and conclusions of law which were based on the Board's findings. Indeed, nowhere in his Exceptions does he dispute the ALJ's legal conclusions that he violated the Controlled Substance Act's prescription requirement with respect to some twenty-one patients.

Instead, he argues that the denial of his application is unwarranted because there is no evidence that any person he prescribed to has been injured or died as a result of his unlawful prescribing of controlled substances. Exceptions, at 1–2. The short answer to Respondent's contention is that proving injury is not an element of an allegation that a physician violated 21 CFR 1306.04(a). Rather, proof of such a violation is established by showing that in issuing the prescription, the physician acted outside of the usual course of professional practice and lacked a legitimate medical purpose, and such proof establishes that a physician knowingly or intentionally diverted a controlled substance.

Respondent also argues that the ALJ's findings and recommendation are erroneous because he was found not guilty in a criminal proceeding ''after the exact evidence was presented and the same witness testimony[ ] that was presented'' at the DEA hearing. Exceptions, at 2. Putting aside whether the exact same evidence was presented at both his criminal trial and the DEA proceeding (the latter appearing to include evidence of his misconduct in prescribing to far more patients than were at issue in the former), Respondent ignores that the State Board also found him guilty of dispensing controlled substances other than in the course of legitimate professional practice (*i.e.,* without a legitimate medical purpose). *See* GX 5, at 50.

As for his related argument that ''[t]he irony is overwhelming that the public who he could potentially harm did not buy the DEA's assertions while sitting in the jury box,'' Exceptions, at 2–3; Respondent ignores that because of the greater consequences that attach upon a criminal conviction, a higher standard of proof applies in a criminal trial than in an administrative proceeding. Indeed, given that Respondent does not challenge any of the ALJ's findings with respect to whether he violated the CSA's prescription requirement and diverted controlled substances, there is more than ample evidence to support the conclusion that he poses a potential danger to the public. *See Gonzales* v. *Oregon,* 546 U.S. 243, 274 (2006) (''the prescription requirement . . . ensures patients use controlled substances under the supervision of a doctor so as to prevent addiction and recreational abuse. As a corollary, [it] also bars doctors from peddling to patients who

[5] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

[1] All citations to the Recommended Decision are to the slip opinion as issued by the ALJ.

[2] I decline to publish the ALJ's discussion of the substantial evidence standard. It suffices to say that in reviewing the factual findings of a recommended decision, this Agency adheres to the principles set forth in *Universal Camera Corp.* v. *NLRB,* 340 U.S. 474, 496 (1951).

[3] The Board also found that he had ''initiated treatment utilizing a Schedule IV controlled substance without having performed a review of the patient's prior medical and weight-loss program records to determine that the patient had made a substantial good-faith effort to lose weight in a treatment program utilizing a regimen of weight reduction based on caloric restriction, nutritional counseling, behavior modification and exercise, without the utilization of controlled substances, and that said treatment had been ineffective, all in violation of Miss. Code Ann. § 73–25–29(13).'' GX 5, at 49 (citing 25 Miss. Code R. § 501(1)).