Issued: March 29, 2021.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.
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INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1092 (Second Review)]

Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From China
Determination

On the basis of the record ¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission ("Commission") determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on August 3, 2020 (85 FR 46719) and determined on November 6, 2020 that it would conduct an expedited review (86 FR 10597, February 22, 2021).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on March 30, 2021. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5176 (March 2021), entitled Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–1092 (Second Review).

By order of the Commission.
Issued: March 30, 2021.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.
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INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1014 and 1016 (Third Review)]

Polyvinyl Alcohol From China and Japan; Determinations

On the basis of the record ² developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission ("Commission") determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on polyvinyl alcohol from China and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on April 1, 2020 (85 FR 18271) and determined on July 6, 2020 that it would conduct full reviews (85 FR 42005, July 13, 2020). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission’s reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register on September 22, 2020 (85 FR 59545). Subsequently, the Commission cancelled its previously scheduled hearing following a request on behalf of domestic producers (86 FR 8034, February 3, 2021).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on March 29, 2021. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5173 (March 2021), entitled Polyvinyl Alcohol from China and Japan: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1014 and 1016 (Third Review).

By order of the Commission.
Issued: March 29, 2021.

Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.
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¹ The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 30, 2021, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 of the ‘322 patent; claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 15, 16, 19, and 20 of the ‘567 patent; claims 1–3, and 16–18 of the ‘983 patent; claims 1, 5–7, 9, 13–15, and 17 of the ‘550 patent and claims 1, 2, 5, 7–10, and 13–15 of the ‘488 patent; and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is “smart thermostat products, which defines the scope of the accused products or category of accused products, systems, systems, smart HVAC systems, smart HVAC control systems, and components thereof”;

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: EcoFactor, Inc., 441 California Avenue, Number 2, Palo Alto, CA 94301.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

ecobee Ltd., 25 Dockside Dr., Suite 600, Toronto, ON M5A 0B5, Canada
ecobee, Inc., 25 Dockside Dr., Suite 600, Toronto, ON M5A 0B5, Canada
Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, California 94043
Carrier Global Corporation, 13995 Pasteur Boulevard, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida 33418
Emerson Electric Co., 8000 W Florissant Ave., P.O. Box 4100, St. Louis, Missouri 63166
Honeywell International Inc., 300 South Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC 28202
Resideo Technologies, Inc., 901 E 6th Street, Austin, Texas 78702
Johnson Controls International, PLC, One Albert Quay, Cork, Ireland, T12 X8N6
Siemens Industry, Inc., 1000 Deerfield Pkwy., Buffalo Grove, IL 60089
Siemens AG, Werner-von-Siemens-Str, 1, 80333 Munich, Germany

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

The Office of Unfair Import Investigations will not participate as a party in this investigation.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainant of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the alleged claims in the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.
Issued: March 30, 2021.
Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Drug Enforcement Administration
[Docket No. 20–34]

Brenton D. Goodman, M.D.; Decision and Order

On August 19, 2020, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause (hereinafter, OSC) to Brenton D. Goodman, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent) of Lafayette, Indiana, OSC at 1. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent’s Certificate of Registration No. FG7707409. It alleged that Respondent is without “authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Indiana, the state in which [Respondent is] registered with the DEA.” OSC, at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that Respondent’s Indiana medical license and Indiana controlled substances registration had both expired, leaving Respondent without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Indiana. Id.

The OSC notified Respondent of the right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement, while waiving the right to a hearing, the procedures for electing each option, and the consequences for failing to elect either option. Id. (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The OSC also notified Respondent of the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan. OSC, at 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

By letter dated September 22, 2020, Respondent timely requested a hearing.1 Hearing Request, at 1. According to the Hearing Request, Respondent denied that his Indiana medical license was expired and claimed that his Indiana controlled substance registration was in the administrative process of being renewed. Id. He further requested that the hearing be delayed “to afford Registrant a reasonable opportunity to be heard before the Indiana Board of Pharmacy” regarding the renewal of his Indiana controlled substance registration. Id.
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