



**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Drug Enforcement Administration**

**Yogesh Patel, M.D.;
Decision and Order**

On June 7, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Yogesh Patel, M.D., of Grand Junction, Colorado (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s Certificate of Registration No. FP8684931, alleging that Registrant’s registration should be revoked because Registrant is “currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Colorado, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.” *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.¹ “A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant’s/applicant’s right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].” 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, “[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 C.F.R.] § 1316.67.” *Id.* § 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant’s default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(d), (e), (f)(1), 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

FINDINGS OF FACT

¹ Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated August 1, 2024, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the included Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on July 1, 2024, Registrant was personally served a copy of the OSC at a residence located in Illinois. RFAAX 2, at 1-2. Registrant also signed a DEA Form 12 acknowledging receipt of the OSC on this date. *Id.* at 2; RFAAX 3.

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant’s default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, effective on or about January 22, 2024, Registrant entered into a Non-Disciplinary Interim Cessation of Practice Agreement with the Colorado Medical Board that indefinitely prohibited him from “performing any act requiring a license issued by the Colorado Medical Board.” RFAAX 1, at 1. According to Colorado online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant’s Colorado medical license is under an “Active – Restricted” status and Registrant is not permitted to practice medicine.² Colorado Division of Professions and Occupations License Search, <https://apps2.colorado.gov/dora/licensing/lookup/licenselookup.aspx> (last visited date of signature of this Order).

Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Colorado, the state in which he is registered with DEA.

DISCUSSION

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 “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, 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. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) (“The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances ‘if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled

² 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, Registrant 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 e-mail to the other party and to the DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.’ ... The very definition of a ‘practitioner’ eligible to prescribe includes physicians ‘licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices’ to dispense controlled substances. § 802(21).”). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 Fed. Reg. 71,371, 71,372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 Fed. Reg. 27,616, 27,617 (1978).³

According to Colorado statute, “dispense” means “to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user, patient, or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, administering, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.” Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18-18-102(9) (2024). Further, a “practitioner” means a “physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by this state, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, administer, or to use in teaching or chemical analysis, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research.” *Id.* § 18-18-102(29).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado. As discussed above, a physician must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in Colorado. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Colorado and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Colorado, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant’s DEA registration be revoked.

³ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). First, Congress defined the term “practitioner” to mean “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 Fed. Reg. at 71,371-72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 Fed. Reg. 39,130, 39,131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 Fed. Reg. 51,104, 51,105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 Fed. Reg. 11,919, 11,920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 Fed. Reg. at 27,617.

ORDER

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. FP8684931, issued to Yogesh Patel, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Yogesh Patel, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Yogesh Patel, M.D., for additional registration in Colorado. This Order is effective **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]**.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on February 10, 2025, by Acting Administrator Derek Maltz. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the Federal Register.

Heather Achbach,
Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2025-02629 Filed: 2/13/2025 8:45 am; Publication Date: 2/14/2025]