

DEA Order Against Louisiana-Based Company Clarifications

1. Administrator Milgram, you recently issued an order against a Louisiana-based company, Morris & Dickson, seeking to strip it of its registration to distribute controlled substances. Prior to your issuance of the order, the matter had been pending for approximately 4 years. Please describe the remediation measures taken by Morris & Dickson during the approximately 4 year period while the matter was pending with the DEA.
2. Since Morris & Dickson has updated its compliance systems, have any DEA audits of the company found violations?
3. During that time, DEA staff was negotiating a settlement with Morris & Dickson, correct?
4. My office has learned that days before the DEA issued the order seeking to strip Morris & Dickson of its registration to distribute controlled substances, the Associated Press (AP) reached out to the DEA regarding the status of the case against Morris & Dickson. The AP article was unflattering about the fact that the DEA had taken no action on Morris & Dickson for four years. How heavily did that AP article weigh in your decision to strip Morris & Dickson of its registration to distribute controlled substances, which was rendered just days after the article ran?
5. Before you decided to issue the order, did you familiarize yourself with the role Morris & Dickson played during emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic and hurricanes?
6. Prior to issuing the order, did you consider the negative impacts to healthcare systems in the communities Morris & Dickson serves if it went out of business?
7. Does the fact that a federal court has now placed an indefinite hold on the order to strip Morris & Dickson’s registration give you cause to consider whether your course of action was indeed the right course of action?