

to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at (202) 205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pathenia Proctor, The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2560.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Authority:* The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2025).

*Scope of Investigation:* Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on September 25, 2025, *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 1–59 of the '579 patent; claims 1–29 of the '598 patent; claims 1–23 of the '810 patent; and claims 1–31 of the '541 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 “televvisions with smart features and functionality”;

(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:* Cerence Operating Company, 25 Burlington Mall Road, Suite 416, Burlington, Massachusetts 01803.

(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: Sony Group Corporation, 1–7–1 Konan Minato-ku, Tokyo 108–0075 Japan  
Sony Corporation of America, 25 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10010  
Sony Electronics Inc., 16535 Via Esprillo, San Diego, California 92127

TCL Industries Holdings Co., Ltd., 22nd Floor, TCL Technical Tower, Huifeng 3 Road, Zhongkai Development Zone, Huizhou, Guangdong, China 516006

TCL Technology Group Corporation, TCL Technology Building, No. 17 Huifeng Third Road, Zhongkai High-Tech Development Zone, Huizhou, Guangdong, China 516001

TCL Electronics Holdings Limited, 5th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

Manufacturas Avanzadas, S.A. de C.V., Blvd. Independencia No. 2151, Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, 32580, Mexico  
Shenzhen TCL New Technology Co., Ltd., 9th Floor, TCL Electronics Holdings Limited Building, TCL International E City, No. 1001 Zhongshan Park Road, Nanshan, China 518067

T.C.L. Industries Holdings (H.K.) Limited, 8th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

TCL King Electrical Appliances (Huizhou) Company Limited, No. 78, Huifeng 4 Road, Zhongkai Development Zone, Huizhou, China 516006

TCL Optoelectronics Technology (Huizhou) Co., Ltd., No. 78, Huifeng 4 Road, Zhongkai Development Zone, Huizhou, China 516006

TCL Overseas Marketing Limited, 5th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

TCL Smart Device (Vietnam) Company Limited, No. 26 VSIP II–A, Street 32, Vietnam Singapore Industrial Park II–A Tan Binh Commune, Bac Tan Uyen District, Binh Duong Province, 75000, Vietnam

TTE Corporation, 7th Floor, Building 22E, 22 Science Park East Avenue, Hong Kong Science Park, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong  
TTE Technology, Inc. (d/b/a TCL North, America), 1860 Compton Avenue, Corona, California 92881

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

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

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), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission 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 allegations of 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: September 25, 2025.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2025–18951 Filed 9–29–25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–777 and 731–TA–1762–1763 (Preliminary)]**

### High Purity Dissolving Pulp From Brazil and Norway; Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of high purity dissolving pulp (“HPDP”) from Brazil and Norway, provided for in subheading 4702.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”) and imports of the subject merchandise from Brazil that are alleged to be subsidized by the government of Brazil.<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> 90 FR 43168 and 43174 (September 8, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Commissioner David S. Johanson determines that there is a reasonable indication that an industry

## Commencement of Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in § 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Commerce") of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under §§ 703(b) or 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in those investigations under §§ 705(a) or 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Any other party may file an entry of appearance for the final phase of the investigations after publication of the final phase notice of scheduling. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations. As provided in section 207.20 of the Commission's rules, the Director of the Office of Investigations will circulate draft questionnaires for the final phase of the investigations to parties to the investigations, placing copies on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, <https://edis.usitc.gov>), for comment.

### Background

On August 12, 2025, Rayonier Advanced Materials, Inc., Jacksonville, Florida and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO Washington, DC filed petitions with the Commission and Commerce, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of subsidized imports of HPDP from Brazil and LTFV imports of HPDP from Brazil and Norway. Accordingly, effective August 12, 2025, the Commission instituted

countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-777 and antidumping duty investigation Nos. 731-TA-1762-1763 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference 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** of August 15, 2025 (90 FR 39419). The Commission conducted its conference on September 2, 2025. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to §§ 703(a) and 733(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on September 26, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5680 (October 2025), entitled *High Purity Dissolving Pulp from Brazil and Norway: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-777 and 731-TA-1762-1763 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 26, 2025.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2025-19027 Filed 9-29-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Jody Adams, N.P.; Decision and Order

On June 21, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Jody Adams, N.P., of Ridgeland, Mississippi (Respondent). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 5. The OSC proposed the denial of Respondent's application for DEA registration, Control No. W24008696M, alleging that Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1)). More specifically, the OSC alleged that Respondent illegally issued three prescriptions for controlled substances without a DEA Registration. *Id.* at 3. The OSC alleged that the issuance of these prescriptions violated both state and federal law.<sup>1</sup> *Id.* (citing 21

U.S.C. 822; 21 CFR 1301.11; 30 Miss. Code R. 2840-1.5).

On January 15, 2025, the Government submitted an RFAA requesting that the Agency issue a default final order denying Respondent's application for registration. RFAA, at 4.<sup>2</sup> After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting the analysis as set forth in more detail below, the Agency grants the Government's request for final agency action and denies Respondent's application for registration.

### I. Default Determination

Under 21 CFR 1301.43, a registrant entitled to a hearing who fails to file a timely hearing request "within 30 days after the date of receipt of the [OSC] . . . shall be deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default" unless "good cause" is established for the failure. 21 CFR 1301.43(a) & (c)(1). In the absence of a demonstration of good cause, a registrant who fails to timely file an answer also is "deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default." 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(2). Unless excused, a default is deemed to constitute "an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC]." 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Here, the OSC notified Respondent that should she request a hearing and file an answer and then fail to appear at the designated hearing, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. RFAAX 2, at 3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Respondent timely filed a request for a hearing and an answer; however, on September 10, 2024, Respondent withdrew her hearing request. RFAA, at 2.<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, the Administrative Law Judge issued an order terminating the proceeding. *Id.*

Consistent with the intent and purpose of the default provisions, the Agency has determined that a voluntary withdrawal of a hearing request demonstrates a respondent's desire to no longer defend his/her case and contest the allegations of the OSC. *See* 21 CFR 1301.43(c); *see also Default Provisions for Hearing Proceedings Relating to the Revocation, Suspension, or Denial of a Registration*, 87 FR 68036,

<sup>2</sup> The RFAA states that "the Administrator is authorized to render the Agency's final order without . . . making a finding of fact." RFAA, at 4 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), and 1301.46). However, 21 CFR 1316.67 requires that the Administrator's final order "set forth the final rule and the findings of fact and conclusions of law upon which the rule is based." *See JYA LLC d/b/a Webb's Square Pharmacy*, 90 FR 31244, 31246 n.7 (2025).

<sup>3</sup> As Respondent filed a request for a hearing, the Agency finds that the Government's service of the OSC was adequate.

<sup>1</sup> The Agency need not adjudicate the criminal violations alleged in the instant OSC. *Ruan v. United States*, 597 U.S. 450 (2022) (decided in the context of criminal proceedings).