

sufficient, and whether the decree may positively harm third parties. See *United States v. Microsoft*, 56 F. 3d 1448 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

In conducting this inquiry, "the Court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process."<sup>2</sup> Rather,

absent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should \* \* \* carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances.

*United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc.*, 1977-1 Trade Cas. ¶ 61,508 at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977).

Accordingly, with respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not "engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public." *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988), quoting *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 1083 (1981); see also *Microsoft*, 56 F. 3d 1448 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Precedent requires that

[t]he balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is "within the reaches of the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is "within the reaches of the public interest." More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.

*Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (citations omitted) (emphasis added).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> 119 Cong. Rec. 24598 (1973); see also *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 715 (D. Mass. 1975). A "public interest" determination can be made properly on the basis of the Competitive Impact Statement and Response to Comments filed pursuant to the Tunney Act. Although the Tunney Act authorizes the use of additional procedures, 15 U.S.C. 16(f), those procedures are discretionary. A court need not invoke any of them unless it believes that the comments have raised significant issues and that further proceedings would aid the court in resolving those issues. See H.R. 93-1463, 93d Cong. 2d Sess. 8-9, reprinted i (1974) U.S.C.C.A.N. 6535, 6538.

<sup>3</sup> See also *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d at 463; *United States v. National Broadcasting Co.*, 449 F. Supp. 1127, 1143 (C.D. Cal. 1978); *Gillette*, 406 F. Supp. at 716; *United States v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 719 F.2d 558, 565 (2d Cir. 1983).

The proposed Final Judgment, therefore, should not be reviewed under a standard of whether it is certain to eliminate every anticompetitive effect of a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of free competition in the future. Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. "[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is 'within the reaches of public interest.'" *United States v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982) (citations omitted), aff'd sub nom. *Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983), quoting *Gillette*, 406 F. Supp. at 716<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, the Court's role under the Tunney Act is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its complaint, and the Act does not authorize the Court to "construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case." *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459. Since "[t]he court's authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government's exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place," it follows that the court "is only authorized to review the decree itself," and not to "effectively redraft the complaint" to inquire into other matters that the United States might have, but did not, pursue. *Id.* at 1459-60.

#### VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the Tunney Act that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: September 13, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

For Plaintiff United States of America:

Michael P. Harmonis,

*Pennsylvania Bar No. 17994, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202) 307-6357. Facsimile: (202) 307-2784.*

#### Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of September, 2002, I have caused a copy of the foregoing United State's Competitive Impact Statement to be served by first class mail, postage

<sup>4</sup> See also *United States v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (w.D. Ky. 1985).

prepaid, and by facsimile on counsel for defendants in this matter:

David James Smith,  
*Vice President, Secretary & General Counsel, Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, 4666 Faries Parkway, Decatur, IL 62526. Telephone: (217) 424-6183. Facsimile: (217) 424-6196. Counsel for Defendant Archer-Danbiels-Midland.*

Joseph Bennett,  
*Secretary and General Counsel, Minnesota Corn Processors, LLC, 901 North Highway 59, Marshall, MN 56258. Telephone: (507) 537-2674. Facsimile: (507) 537-2641. Counsel for Defendant Minnesota Corn Processors, LLC.*

Michael P. Harmonis,  
*Pennsylvania State Bar No. 17994, Attorney, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 325 Seventh St., NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20530. Telephone: (202) 307-6357. Facsimile: (202) 307-2784.*

#### Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of September, 2002, I have caused a copy of the foregoing United State's Competitive Impact Statement to be served by first class mail, postage prepaid, and by facsimile on counsel for defendants in this matter:

David James Smith,  
*Vice President, Secretary & General Counsel, Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, 4666 Faries Parkway, Decatur, IL 62526. Telephone: (217) 424-6183. Facsimile: (217) 424-6196. Counsel for Defendant Archer-Daniels-Midland.*

Joseph Bennett,  
*Secretary and General Counsel, Minnesota Corn Processors, LLC, 901 North Highway 59, Marshall, MN 56258. Telephone: (507) 537-2674. Facsimile: (507) 537-2641. Counsel for Defendant Minnesota Corn Processors, LLC.*

Michael P. Harmonis,  
*Pennsylvania State Bar No. 17994, Attorney, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 325 Seventh St., NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20530. Telephone: (202) 307-6357. Facsimile: (202) 307-2784.*

[FR Doc. 02-28333 Filed 11-6-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Importation of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to Section 1008 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 958(i)), the Attorney General shall, prior to issuing a registration under this Section to a bulk manufacturer of a controlled substance in Schedule I or II and prior to issuing a regulation under Section

1002(a) authorizing the importation of such a substance, provide manufacturers holding registrations for the bulk manufacture of the substance an opportunity for a hearing.

Therefore, in accordance with Section 1301.34 of Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that on May 13, 2002, Chattem Chemicals, Inc., 3801 St. Elmo Avenue, Building 18, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37409, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as an importer of methamphetamine (1105), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule II.

The firm plans to import the listed controlled substance to bulk manufacture controlled substance.

Any manufacturer holding, or applying for, registration as a bulk manufacturer of this basic class of controlled substance may file written comments on or objections to the application described above and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.43 in such form as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments, objections, or requests for a hearing may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administration, 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 (30 days from publication).

This procedure is to be conducted simultaneously with and independent of the procedures described in 21 CFR 1301.34(b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). As noted in a previous notice at 40 FR 43745-46 (September 23, 1975), all applicants for registration to import basic class of any controlled substance in Schedule I or II are and will continue to be required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1301.34(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: October 25, 2002.

**Laura M. Nagel,**

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

[FR Doc. 02-28312 Filed 11-6-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-09-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

**Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on May 21, 2002, Aldrich Chemical Company Inc., dba Isotec, 3858 Benner Road, Miamisburg, Ohio 45342-4304, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Cathinone (1235) .....	I
Methcathinone (1237) .....	I
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475) .....	I
N,N-Dimethylamphetamine (1480) .....	I
Aminorex (1585) .....	I
Gamma hydroxybutyric acid (2010) .....	I
Methaqualone (2565) .....	I
Lysergic acid dethylamide (7315) .....	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370) .....	I
Mescaline (7381) .....	I
2,5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396) .....	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400) .....	I
3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404) .....	I
3,4-Methylenedioxy-methamphetamine (7405) .....	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411) .....	I
Psilocybin (7437) .....	I
Psilocyn (7438) .....	I
N-Ethyl-1-phenylcyclohexylamine (7455) .....	I
Dihydromorphine (9145) .....	I
Normorphine (9313) .....	I
Acetylmethadol (9601) .....	I
Alphacetylmethadol Except Levo-Alphacetylmethadol (9603) .....	I
Normethadone (9635) .....	I
3-Methylfentanyl (9813) .....	I
Amphetamine (1100) .....	II
Methamphetamine (1105) .....	II
Methylphenidate (1724) .....	II
Amobarbital (2125) .....	II
Pentobarbital (2270) .....	II
Secobarbital (2315) .....	II
1-Phenylcyclohexylamine (7460) .....	II
Phencyclidine (7471) .....	II
Phenylacetone (8501) .....	II
1-Piperidinocyclohexane-carbonitrile (8603) .....	II
Codeine (9050) .....	II
Dihydrocodeine (9120) .....	II
Oxycodone (9143) .....	II
Hydromorphone (9150) .....	II
Benzoylcegonine (9180) .....	II
Ethylmorphine (9190) .....	II
Hydrocodone (9193) .....	II
Isomethadone (9226) .....	II
Meperidine (9230) .....	II
Meperidine intermediate-A (9232) .....	II
Meperidine intermediate-B (9233) .....	II
Methadone (9250) .....	II
Methadone intermediate (9254) .....	II

Drug	Schedule
Dextropropoxyphene, bulk (non-dosage forms) (9273) ..	II
Levo-Alphacetylmethadol (9648) ..	II
Oxymorphone (9652) .....	II
Fentanyl (9801) .....	II

The firm plans to manufacture small quantities of the listed controlled substances to produce standards for analytical laboratories.

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 January 6, 2003.

Dated: October 25, 2002.

**Laura M. Nagel,**

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

[FR Doc. 02-28314 Filed 11-6-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-09-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

**Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on May 28, 2002, Abbott Laboratories, DBA Knoll Pharmaceutical Company, 30 North Jefferson Road, Whippany, New Jersey, 07981, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Dihydromorphine (9145) .....	I
Hydromorphone (9150) .....	II

The firm plans to produce bulk product and finished dosage units for distribution to its customers.

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.