

States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on October 2, 2023 (88 FR 67809) and determined on January 5, 2024 that it would conduct an expedited review (89 FR 3427, January 18, 2024).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on April 1, 2024. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5501 (April 2024), entitled Xanthan Gum from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–1203 (Second Review).

By order of the Commission. Issued: April 1, 2024.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2024–07214 Filed 4–4–24; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

BILLING CODE 7020-02-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 *Certain Cameras, Camera Systems, and Accessories Used Therewith, DN 3736;* the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

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 *https://edis.usitc.gov*. For help accessing EDIS, please email *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov*.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at *https://www.usitc.gov*. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov*. 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 § 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of GoPro, Inc. on March 29, 2024. 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 cameras, camera systems, and accessories used therewith. The complaint names as respondents: Arashi Vision Inc. d/b/a Insta360 of China; and Arashi Vision (U.S.) LLC d/b/a Insta360 of Irvine, CA. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a general exclusion order or, in the alternative, limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders, and impose a bond upon respondent alleged infringing articles during the 60-day Presidential review period pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(j).

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or § 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 on the public interest 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. Any written submissions on other issues must also be filed by no later than the close of business, eight calendar days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Complainant may file replies to any written submissions no later than three calendar days after the date on which any initial submissions were due, notwithstanding § 201.14(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. No other submissions will be accepted, unless requested by the Commission. Any submissions and replies filed in response to this Notice are limited to five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above. Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 3736") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures ¹).

Please note the Secretary's Office will accept only electronic filings during this time. Filings must be made through the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, https:// edis.usitc.gov). No in-person paperbased filings or paper copies of any electronic filings will be accepted until further notice. Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary at EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential 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 information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for

¹Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_ filing_procedures.pdf.

purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel,² solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.³

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 §§ 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: April 1, 2024.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2024–07215 Filed 4–4–24; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 23-64]

Traesa A. Brown, M.D.; Decision and Order

On August 31, 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to Traesa A. Brown, M.D. (Respondent) of Florence, South Carolina. OSC, at 1, 5. The OSC/ ISO informed Respondent of the immediate suspension of her DEA Certificate of Registration (registration or COR), Control No. BB9937624, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(d), alleging that Respondent's continued registration constitutes " 'an imminent danger to the public health or safety.' '' Id. at 1 (quoting 21 U.S.C. 824(d)). The OSC/ ISO also proposed the revocation of Respondent's registration, alleging that Respondent's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest and alleging that Respondent has no state authority to handle controlled substances. Id. (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), 824(a)(3), 824(a)(4)).

On September 20, 2023, Respondent requested a hearing. On October 13, 2023, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition only pertaining to the allegation that Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances.¹ See Government's Notice of Filing of Evidence and Motion for Summary Disposition (Motion for Summary Disposition), dated October 13, 2023.² Respondent did not respond to the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition. On October 23, 2023, Administrative Law Judge Paul E. Soeffing (the ALJ) granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and recommended the revocation of Respondent's registration, finding that because Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances in South Carolina, the state in which she is registered with DEA, "there is no other fact of consequence for this tribunal to decide in order to determine whether or not she is entitled to hold a COR." Order Granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, and Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD), at 6. Respondent did not file exceptions to the RD.

Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction as found in the RD and summarizes and expands upon portions thereof herein.

Findings of Fact

The Government asserts that on October 1, 2022, Respondent's South Carolina controlled substance registration expired. RD, at 3–4.³ Further, the Government asserts that on June 30, 2023, Respondent's South

² The Government originally filed a Motion for Summary Disposition on October 12, 2023, and therein asserted that Respondent had failed to timely file an Answer to the allegations in the OSC/ ISO. RD, at 2 n.4; Motion for Summary Disposition, dated October 12, 2023, at 3–4. Later on October 12, 2023, the Government was informed that Respondent had filed an Answer on October 10, 2023, and was provided with a copy of Respondent's Answer. RD, at 2 n.4. On October 13, 2023, the Government filed its amended Motion for Summary Disposition, referenced in this Decision, with revisions based on its receipt of the copy of Respondent's Answer. *Id.; see also* Motion for Summary Disposition, dated October 13, 2023.

³ See also Motion for Summary Disposition, dated October 13, 2023, Exhibit (GX) 1; Motion for Summary Disposition, dated October 13, 2023, at 4– 5. Carolina medical license expired. RD, at $4.^4$

According to South Carolina online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Respondent's South Carolina controlled substance registration is expired.⁵ SC DHEC Bureau of Drug Control, Controlled Substances Registration Verification, https://.dhec.sc.gov//Licensing/Home/ Verify (last visited date of signature of this Order). Further, Respondent's South Carolina medical license is listed as "lapsed." South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners, Licensee Lookup, https://verify.llronline.com/LicLookup/ Med/Med.aspx (last visited date of signature of this Order).

Accordingly, the Agency finds that Respondent is not currently licensed to engage in the practice of medicine nor to handle controlled substances in South Carolina, the state in which she is registered with the DEA.

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under section 823 of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) "upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances." With respect to a practitioner, the DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D., 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), pet. for rev. denied, 481

⁵ Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency "may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding-even in the final decision.' United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), "[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary." Accordingly, Respondent may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

² All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

³Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

¹ This suggests that the Government has dropped the public interest allegation included in the OSC/ ISO; as such, the Agency will only consider the lack of state authority allegation from the OSC/ISO.

⁴ See also Motion for Summary Disposition, dated October 13, 2023, at 4. As noted by the ALJ, the Government did not submit documentary evidence regarding the status of Respondent's South Carolina medical license as they had for Respondent's South Carolina controlled substance registration, *see supra* n.3. RD, at 4 n.8.