DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (''NEMA'')

Notice is hereby given that, on November 14, 1997, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (''NEMA'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are Acuson Corporation, Mountain View, CA; ALI Technologies, Inc., Richmond, British Columbia; Aloka, Tokyo, Japan; Hewlett-Packard Co., Palo Alao, CA; and Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, NY. The parties to the venture, manufacturers and vendors of devices that record on or read from various media the images drawn from multi-model medical imaging devices (e.g., ultrasound devices, CAT scanners and the like), intend to cooperate in the cross-testing of their reading and production equipment in order to implement the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) Standard. The DICOM Standard is a set of rules that will allow a medical image produced on one vendor's machine to be displayed on a workstation from another vendor. The purpose of the cross-testing is to ensure the compatibility of equipment so as to facilitate the exchange of medical images between instruments, computers and hospitals.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–26180 Filed 9–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Petroleum E&P Research Cooperative (''Cooperative'')

Notice is hereby given that, on March 27, 1998, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Petroleum E&P Research Cooperative (''Cooperative'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its project status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

The Cooperative intends to undertake the following research projects: (1) Intelligent Well Completions—Phase I. This project details only the Phase I of what is now envisioned as a multi-phase project for Intelligent Well Completions and addresses the need to identify the gaps in current technology and define the technology needs. (2) Integrated Analysis of ''Next Generation'' Compact Separation Technology concepts. This project is designed to identify and to quantify the comparative advantages associated with implementing state-of-the-art compact separation technology components into integrated designs for the 'next generation' E&P facilities. Differential cost, size and weight considerations will be quantified. (3) Cavity Like Completions in Weak Sands. This project seeks to identify where/when/how deliberate sand flowback/surging/jetting can lead to significant productivity/injectivity increases, and stabilize a well against sand production.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Petroleum E&P Research Cooperative (''Cooperative'') intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 16, 1997, Petroleum E&P Research Cooperative (''Cooperative'') filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 13, 1997 (62 FR 6801).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 22, 1997. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 28, 1997 (62 FR 63389).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–26179 Filed 9–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Southwest Research Institute (''SWRI'') Ford Focus: Catalytic Converter Design Validation Test Project

Notice is hereby given that, on June 25, 1998, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Southwest Research Institute (''SWRI'') Ford Focus: Catalytic Converter Design Validation Test Project has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, MI; Ford Motor Company, Ltd., Laindon Basildon Essex, England; Arvin Exhaust, Columbus, IN; Corning, Inc., Troy, MI; Tenneco Automotive, Grass Lake, MI; AP Parts, Toledo, OH; 3M, St. Paul, MN; and Visteon, Dearborn, MN. The nature and objectives of the venture are to establish a foundation of real on-vehicle data and a database of catalytic converter operating environments from several current-technology Ford vehicles so that an appropriate design validation test for catalytic converters can be developed for current and future vehicles.

Membership in this program is limited to those companies listed herein and is closed. SWRI intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in the planned activities.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–26177 Filed 9–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Specialty Metals Processing Corporation

Notice is hereby given that, on February 17, 1998, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative

Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Specialty Metals Processing Corporation has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, GE Aircraft Engines, Cincinnati, OH; Dynamet, Washington, PA; Allied Signal Engines, Phoenix, AZ; United Technologies Corporation—Pratt & Whitney Division, East Hartford, CT; Schultz Steel Company, South Gate, CA; and Titanium Metals Corporation, Henderson, NV have been added as parties to this venture. Also, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation, Brackenridge, PA has been dropped as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Specialty Metals Processing Corporation intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On August 7, 1990, Specialty Metals Processing Corporation filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 17, 1990 (55 FR 38173).

The last notification was filed with the Department on October 30, 1995. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 10, 1996 (61 FR 15972).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–26176 Filed 9–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 97–9]

John J. Cienki, M.D.; Revocation of Registration and Continuation of Registration With Restrictions

On January 28, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to John J. Cienki, M.D. (Respondent) of Colorado and Florida, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificates of Registration BC1616929 and AC2221187, and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registrations, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), 824(a)(1) and (a)(4).

By letter dated February 22, 1997, Respondent, through counsel, filed a timely request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Miami, Florida on September 24 and 25, 1997, before Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, counsel for both parties submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On March 18, 1998, Judge Randall issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, recommending in effect that Respondent's DEA registration issued to him in Colorado be revoked and that his Florida DEA registration be continued with restrictions. On April 20, 1998, the Government filed Exceptions to the Opinion and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and on April 30, 1998, Judge Randall transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Acting Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, in full, the Opinion and Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge. His adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent is board certified in emergency medicine and toxicology. In the mid-1980's, Respondent was fulfilling a service commitment in rural Florida when he began abusing controlled substances. According to Respondent, he abused opiates such as ''Demerol, Talwin, whatever I could get my hands on.'' His abuse occurred over a period of a few months and stopped temporarily when he moved to Miami, Florida in 1985. By 1988, his drug use had escalated to a point where he sought and received 28 days of in-patient treatment for his addiction. Thereafter, he signed up with the Physicians' Recovery Network (PRN) to monitor him for five years.

After completing his drug treatment in 1988, Respondent worked in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania until sometime in 1991. During that time, Respondent entered into a Physicians' Health Program contract and remained involved with the program until he left Pennsylvania.

In 1991 Respondent moved to Mississippi and applied for a Mississippi Medical license. On the application, he answered ''yes'' to the question that asked whether he had a history of drug or alcohol abuse. As a result of his response, Respondent agreed to submit to certain conditions for licensure in a Consent Agreement including that the would submit to random, unannounced and witnessed urine and/or blood screens; that he would not administer, dispense or prescribe drugs to himself; that he would not treat himself or family members; and that he would comply with Federal and state laws governing the practice of medicine. Respondent testified that he believed that the Consent Agreement was the result of a non-disciplinary procedure and in fact the records form the Mississippi Board specifically state that the Consent Agreement was non-disciplinary. Respondent further testified that he did not believe that this medical license was restricted as a result of the Consent Agreement and the license itself did not indicate that it was restricted. Respondent remained in Mississippi until November 1993 when he moved to Denver, Colorado to do a toxicology fellowship.

On October 1, 1993, Respondent submitted a renewal application for DEA Certificate of Registration AC2221187, issued to him in Florida. Respondent answered ''No'' to the question on the application (hereinafter referred to as the liability 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?''

On January 12, 1995, Respondent submitted a renewal application for DEA Certificate of Registration BC1616929, issued to him in Pennsylvania, along with a request, which was subsequently granted, to transfer the registration to a Colorado address. Respondent answered ''No'' to the liability question on this application.

In June of 1994, Respondent relapsed and abused the non-controlled substance Stadol until March 5, 1995. Stadol has a potential for abuse due to its opiate-like effects and as a result, DEA has published a proposed rule