

[REDACTED]

From: Autor, Deborah
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 8:10 AM
To: Silverman, Steven
Subject: RE: Local anesthetics

I agree with [REDACTED] that one version of the footnote is better than the other. But, seriously, this is a warning letter not a brief. GC has completely lost sight of the point that WLs are intended to quickly get word to violators that they need to come into compliance. Instead, GC is more concerned about perfecting documents that quickly become irrelevant.

-----Original Message-----

From: Silverman, Steven
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 8:01 AM
To: Anderson, Kathleen R; Nasr, Samia
Cc: [REDACTED]; Levy, Michael; Autor, Deborah
Subject: Fw: Local anesthetics

Am I right that today's plan is to confirm delivery of the WLs, get the letter redacted and posted, and then issue the press release? Thanks.
Steve Silverman, Assistant Director, CDER Office of Compliance, sent from my Blackberry

----- Original Message -----

From: Nasr, Samia
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Silverman, Steven; Levy, Michael; Anderson, Kathleen R
Sent: Tue Dec 05 06:14:50 2006
Subject: RE: Local anesthetics

[REDACTED]

I'll let everyone know about using version # 1. As far as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] it is late to do anything, and I think we just have to move on.

Thanks for checking this for us

Samia

Samia M. Nasr, R.Ph., M.S.
Team Leader
Compounding Team
Division of New Drugs and Labeling Compliance HFD-317
Office of Compliance
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, FDA
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 6:40 PM
To: Nasr, Samia
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Local anesthetics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 5:40 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Local anesthetics

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2006 2:09 PM

To: Nasr, Samia

Cc: Anderson, Kathleen R; Silverman, Steven; Levy, Michael; [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Local anesthetics

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]