Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607(a), for the recovery of costs incurred by the United States in connection with the Imperial Oil Co., Inc./Champion Chemical Site (''Imperial Site''), located at Orchard Place in Marlboro Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey, and at the Burnt Fly Bog Superfund Site (''Burnt Fly Bog Site''), located on Tyler Lane in Marlboro Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey. The Consent Decree requires 10 generators of hazardous substance to pay $222,953, which will be deposited in equal shares of $111,476.50 into two special accounts to pay for response activities at the Sites.

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, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20044–7611, and should refer to *United States and State of New Jersey* v. *Dominick Manzo, et al.,* DOJ Ref. #90–11–2–488A.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey, 402 East State Street, Room 430, Trenton, New Jersey, and the Region II Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 290 Broadway, New York, New York 10007–1866 (contact Assistant Regional Counsel Kedari Reddy). A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC. 20044–7611 or by faxing a request to Tonia Fleetwood, fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–1547. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $8.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs) for the Consent Decree, payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Ronald Gluck,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 02–26507 Filed 10–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Department Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, and with section 122(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(d), notice is hereby given that a proposed amendment to a partial consent decree in *United States* v. *Niagara Frontier Transportation Auth.*, Case No. 96–CV–0219C(Sc) (W.D.N.Y.) was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of New York on October 2, 2002. This proposed amendment to a consent decree will resolve contribution claims against the United States pursuant to section 113 of CERCLA for payment of response costs incurred at or in connection with the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the Bern Metal Superfund Site and the Universal Iron and Metal Superfund Site in Buffalo, New York.

The proposed amendment to the consent decree requires the United States to pay $75,000 towards the total response costs.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed amendment to a consent decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Please address comments to Eileen T. McDonough, Environmental Defense Section, U.S. Department of Justice, Post Office Box 23986, L'Enfant Plaza Station, Washington, DC 20026–3986, and refer to this case name and civil action number.

The proposed amendment to the consent decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Western District of New York. In addition, the proposed amendment to the consent decree may be viewed on the World Wide Web at *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/enrd-home.html.*

Scott Schachter,

Environmental Defense Section.

[FR Doc. 02–26510 Filed 10–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States* v. *Remi Bourdeau,* Civil Action No. 1:02:CV:250 (D. Vt.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Vermont on October 1, 2002. This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States of America against Remi Bourdeau, pursuant to section 301 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311(a), to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendant for causing fill and/or dredged material to be discharged into waters of the United States at a site located in Sheldon, Vermont in Franklin County.

The proposed Consent Decree requires Remi Bourdeau to pay a $15,000 civil penalty, complete restoration work in the wetland, and implement a monitoring plan to periodically assess the success of the restoration work. In addition, the consent decree prohibits the defendant from discharging any pollutant into waters of the United States, unless such discharge complies with the provisions of the Clean Water Act and its implementing regulations.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Please address comments to Joseph Perella, Assistant U.S. Attorney, P.O. Box 570, Burlington, VT 05402–0570 and refer to this case name and civil action number.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Vermont at 11 Elmwood Ave., Burlington, Vermont. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be viewed on the World Wide Web at *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/enrd-home.html.*

Joseph Perella,

Assistant United States Attorney, United States Attorney's Office, Burlington, Vermont.

[FR Doc. 02–26509 Filed 10–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to § 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on April 26, 2002, AccuStandard, Inc., 125 Market Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06513, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475)	I
N,N-Dimethylamphetamine (1480)	I
Fenethylline (1503)	I
Mecloqualone (2572)	I
Alpha-Ethyltryptamine (7249)	I

Drug	Schedule
3,4,5-Trimethoxyamphetamine (7390).	I
2,5-Dimethoxy-4-ethylamphetamine (7399).	I
5-Methoxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (7401).	I
Diethyltryptamine (7434)	I
Dimethyltryptamine (7435)	I
Psilocybin (7437)	I
Psilocyn (7438)	I
N-Ethyl-1-phenylcyclohexylamine (7455).	I
1-(1-Phenylcyclohexyl)pyrrolidine (PCPY) (7458).	I
1-[1-(2-Thieynyl) cyclohexyl]pyrrolidine TCPY (7473).	I
N-Ethyl-3-piperidyl benzilate (7482).	I
N-Methyl-3-piperidyl benzilate (7484).	I
Acetyldihydrocodeine (9051)	I
Benzylmorphine (9052)	I
Desomorphine (9055)	I
Codeine methylbromide (9070)	I
Difenoxin (9168)	I
Hydromorphinol (9301)	I
Methyldihydromorphine (9304)	I
Morphine methylbromide (9305)	I
Morphine methylsulfonate (9306)	I
Nicomorphine (9312)	I
Drotebanol (9335)	I
Allylprodine (9602)	I
Alphamethadol (9605)	I
Betaprodine (9611)	I
Clonitazene (9612)	I
Dextromoramide (9613)	I
Diampromide (9615)	I
Diethylthiambutene (9616)	I
Dimenoxadol (9617)	I
Dimepheptadol (9618)	I
Dimethylthiambutene (9619)	I
Dioxaphetyl butyrate (9621)	I
Dipipanone (9622)	I
Ethylmethylthiambutene (9623)	I
Furethidine (9626)	I
Hydromorphinol (9627)	I
Ketobemidone (9628)	I
Morpheridine (9632)	I
Noracymethadol (9633)	I
Normethadone (9635)	I
Norpipanone (9636)	I
Phenadoxnone (9637)	I
Phenampromide (9638)	I
Phenoperidine (9641)	I
Piritramide (9642)	I
Proheptazine (9643)	I
Properidine (9644)	I
Propiram (9649)	I
1-Methyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine (9661).	I
1-(Phenylethyl)-4-phenyl-4-acetoxypiperidine (9663).	I
Tilidine (9750)	I
Para-Fluorofentanyl (9812)	I
3-Methylfentanyl (9813)	I
Alpha-methylfentanyl (9814)	I
Acetyl-alpha-methylfentanyl (9815).	I
Beta-hydroxyfentanyl (9830)	I
Beta-hydroxy-3-methylfentanyl (9831).	I
Alpha-Methylthiofentanyl (9832)	I
3-Methylthiofentanyl (9833)	I
Thiofentanyl (9835)	I
Nabilone (7379)	II
1-Phenylcylohexylamine (7460)	II
Phenylacetone (8501)	II
1-Piperidinocyclohexanecarbonitrile (8603).	II
Isomethadone (9226)	II
Metopon (9260)	II
Piminodine (9730)	II
Racemorphan (9733)	II
Bezitramide (9800)	II

The firm plans to manufacture small quantities of the listed controlled substances to make reference standards.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than (60 days from publication).

Dated: August 28, 2002.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–26607 Filed 10–17–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Douglas L. Geiger, M.D.; Denial of Application

On September 24, 2001, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Douglas L. Geiger, M.D. (Dr. Geiger), proposing to deny his pending application for DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, and deny any pending modifications of such application pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f). As a basis for the denial of his pending application, the Order to Show Cause alleged that Dr. Geiger is not currently authorized to handled controlled substances in the State of Georgia. 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3). The order also notified Dr. Geiger that should no request for a hearing be filed within 30 days, his hearing right would be deemed waived.

The Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to Dr. Geiger at a location in Riverdale, Georgia. A second copy of the Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to Dr. Geiger at a location in College Park, Georgia. DEA received a signed receipt indicating that the Order to Show Cause was received on behalf of Dr. Geiger at that location. Subsequently, and at Dr. Geiger's request, a copy of the Order to Show Cause was sent to him by facsimile on October 9, 2001. DEA received a printed report indicating that the show cause order had been successfully transmitted to the number provided by Dr. Geiger. DEA has not received a request for hearing or any other reply from Dr. Geiger or anyone purporting to represent him in this matter.

Therefore, the 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. Geiger is deemed to have waived his hearing right. After considering material from the investigative file in this matter, the Deputy Administrator now enters his final order without a hearing pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(d) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Deputy Administrator finds that Dr. Geiger was issued a temporary medical license #0142 on October 6, 1994. That license was extended until December 8, 1994, and subsequently extended on separate occasions until its expiration on October 5, 1995. A second temporary medical license was issued to Dr. Geiger on December 21, 1998, and on February 4, 1999, that license also expired. According to a August 6, 2001 letter contained within the investigative file from the Executive Director of the Composite State Board of Medical Examiners, Dr. Geiger has never been issued a permanent license to practice medicine in the State of Georgia.

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 business. See 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See Carla Johnson, M.D., 66 FR 52939 (2001); Graham Travers Schuler, M.D., 65 FR 50570 (2000); Demetris A. Green, M.D., 61 FR 60,728 (1996).

DEA has also consistently held that a DEA registration may not be maintained if the applicant or registrant lacks state authority to dispense controlled substances, even if such lack of state authorization was the result of the expiration of his/her state registration without further action by the state. See e.g., Mark L. Beck, D.D.S., 64 FR 40899