

and determined on August 4, 2025, that it would conduct expedited reviews (90 FR 45245, September 19, 2025).²

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 December 16, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5691 (December 2025), entitled *Quartz Surface Products from India and Turkey: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-624-625 and 731-TA-1450-1451 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 16, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025-23303 Filed 12-17-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-779 and 731-TA-1765-1766 (Preliminary)]

Chromium Trioxide From India and Turkey; Revised Schedule for the Subject Proceeding

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

DATES: December 12, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel Schwartz (202-205-2398), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this proceeding may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 2, 2025, the Commission published a notice of institution of these investigations, and on November 19, 2025, published a revised scheduling notice. The Commission is revising the

current schedule as follows: the Commission views will be transmitted to Commerce on January 7, 2026.

For further information concerning this proceeding, see the Commission's notice cited above and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 207).

Authority: This proceeding is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 15, 2025.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025-23247 Filed 12-17-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1435]

Certain Electrolyte Containing Beverages and Labeling and Packaging Thereof (II); Notice of a Commission Determination To Review in Part an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination of Violation; Request for Written Submissions on the Issue Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission ("Commission") has determined to review in part an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 18) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting a motion for summary determination of violation. The Commission requests written submissions from the parties on the issue under review and from the parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding, under the schedule set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward S. Jou, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3316. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS)

at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on February 3, 2025, based upon a complaint, as supplemented (the "Complaint"), filed on behalf of CAB Enterprises, Inc. of Houston, Texas; Sueros y Bebidas Rehidratantes, S.A. de C.V. of Guadalajara, Mexico; Brazos River Ventures LLC of Albany, New York; and Electrolit Manufacturing USA Inc. of Albany, New York (collectively, "Complainants"). 90 FR 8811-12 (Feb. 3, 2025). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("section 337") based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain electrolyte containing beverages and labeling and packaging thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,222,726; U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,833,885; U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,717,350; and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,717,232. *Id.* The Complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. *Id.* at 8811.

The Commission's notice of investigation named eight respondents: Empacadora Torres Mora, S. de R.L. de C.V. of Monterrey, Mexico; Version Exportaciones, S.R.L. de C.V. of Tijuana, Mexico; Mabel Distribuciones, S.A. de C.V. of Matamoros, Mexico; Salfe International Trade, S. de R.L. de C.V. ("Salfe") of Garza Garcia, Mexico; Exportadora de Abarrotes del Pacifico, S.A. de C.V. ("Pacifico") of Torreon, Mexico; Centro de Distribucion de Carbon Allende, S.A. de C.V. of Allende, Mexico; Wenceslao Colunga Ruiz ("Ruiz") of Camargo, Mexico; and Distribuidora de Productos Heres, S.A. de C.V. ("Heres") of Allende, Mexico. *Id.* at 8812. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") is also a party to this investigation. *Id.*

The investigation was terminated with respect to respondents Ruiz and Heres based on withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 7 (Mar. 11, 2025),

²Due to the lapse in appropriations and ensuing cessation of Commission operations, the Commission tolled its schedule for this proceeding. The schedule was revised in a subsequent notice published in the *Federal Register* on November 28, 2025 (90 FR 54744).

unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (Apr. 9, 2025).

On April 18, 2025, the ALJ issued an order requiring the remaining respondents in the investigation to show cause why they should not be found in default. Order No. 9 (Apr. 18, 2025). Respondent Pacifico filed an answer to the Complaint on May 1, 2025, and the investigation was subsequently terminated with respect to Pacifico based on a consent order. Order No. 10 (May 23, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (June 17, 2025). The investigation was also terminated with respect to respondent Salfe based on a consent order. Order No. 12 (June 25, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (July 14, 2025). The remaining four respondents did not file any response to the complaint and notice of investigation or to the order to show cause for failure to do so.

On July 21, 2025, Complainants filed a motion for summary determination of violation, and on July 22, 2025, Complainants filed a motion for leave for acceptance of a corrected motion for summary determination, which was granted pursuant to Order No. 15 (July 22, 2025). On August 4, 2025, OUII filed a response in support of Complainants' motion.

On September 10, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the motion for summary determination, which included a recommended determination on remedy and bonding. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the ID, the pleadings, and the parties' briefing on summary determination, the Commission has determined to review the ID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the ID's findings with respect to the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. The Commission has determined not to review the other findings in the ID.

In connection with its review, the Commission requests responses to the following question:

Question 1: On or before the date of the complaint, explain how and to what extent the investments relating to the Texas manufacturing facility were with respect to the protected domestic industry articles as required under section 337(a)(2). Please provide citation to any evidence in the record that would support this. If such investments were not exclusively with respect to the protected domestic industry articles, explain how the asserted domestic investments for the facility can be allocated with respect to the protected domestic industry articles.

The parties are requested to brief their positions with reference to the applicable law and the existing evidentiary record.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the statute authorizes issuance of, *inter alia*, (1) an exclusion order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States; and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7-10 (Dec. 1994).

In connection with its remedy determination, the Commission requests responses to the following question:

Question 2: Identify evidence or allegations that the foreign defaulting respondents maintain commercially significant inventories and/or engage in significant commercial operations in the United States.

The parties are requested to brief their positions with reference to the applicable law and the existing evidentiary record.

The statute requires the Commission to consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The public interest factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and cease and desist orders would have on: (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve, disapprove, or take no action on the Commission's determination. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005).

During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: Parties are requested to file written responses to the briefing questions above. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding.

In their initial submission, Complainants are also requested to identify the remedy sought and Complainants and OUII are requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainants are further requested to provide the HTSUS subheadings under which the accused products are imported, and to supply the identification information for all known importers of the products at issue in this investigation. All initial written submissions, from the parties and/or third parties/interested government agencies, and proposed remedial orders from the parties must be filed no later than close of business on January 5, 2026. All reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on January 12, 2026. Opening submissions from the parties are limited to 20 pages. Reply submissions shall be limited to 10 pages. No further submissions on any of these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above pursuant to 19 CFR 210.4(f). Submissions should refer to the investigation number (Inv. No. 337-TA-1435) in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary, (202) 205-2000.

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment by marking each document with a header indicating that the document contains confidential information. This marking will be

deemed to satisfy the request procedure set forth in Rules 201.6(b) and 210.5(e)(2) (19 CFR 201.6(b) & 210.5(e)(2)). Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. Any non-party wishing to submit comments containing confidential information must serve those comments on the parties to the investigation pursuant to the applicable Administrative Protective Order. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed with the Commission and served on any parties to the investigation within two business days of any confidential filing. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on December 15, 2025.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 15, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–23176 Filed 12–17–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States et al. v. Constellation Energy Corporation et al.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act,

15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America et al. v. Constellation Energy Corporation et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:25–cv–04235–ABJ. On December 5, 2025, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Constellation Energy Corporation's proposed acquisition of Calpine Corporation would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires Constellation to divest the Calpine electric generating facilities listed below.

In the area operated by the Electric Reliability Council of Texas:

- Jack A. Fusco Energy Center, located southwest of the city of Houston, Texas; and
- Calpine's minority ownership interest in the Gregory Energy Center, located northeast of the city of Corpus Christi, Texas.

In the area operated by PJM Interconnection, LLC:

- Bethlehem Energy Center, located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania;
- Edge Moor Energy Center, located in Wilmington, Delaware;
- Hay Road Energy Center, located in Wilmington, Delaware; and
- York Energy Center (York 1 and York 2), located southeast of the city of York, Pennsylvania.

A Competitive Impact Statement filed by the United States on December 12, 2025, describes the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, the industry, and the remedies available to private litigants who may have been injured by the alleged violation.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the Antitrust Division's website, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be submitted in English and directed to Patricia Cororan, Acting Chief, Transportation, Energy & Agriculture

Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530 (email address: ATR.Public-Comments-Tunney-Act-MB@usdoj.gov).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 5th Street NW, Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20001, and STATE OF TEXAS, Office of the Texas Attorney General, Antitrust Division, P.O. Box 12548, Austin, TX 78711, Plaintiffs, v. CONSTELLATION ENERGY CORPORATION, 1310 Point Street, Baltimore, MD 21231, CALPINE CORPORATION, 717 Texas Avenue, Suite 1000, Houston, TX 77001, and CPN CS HOLDCO CORP., 717 Texas Avenue, Suite 1000, Houston, TX 77001, Defendants.

Case No.: 1:25–cv–04235–ABJ
COMPLAINT

Constellation Energy Corporation (“Constellation”) seeks to buy one of its largest rivals, Calpine Corporation (“Calpine”), in a proposed acquisition that would create the largest wholesale power generator in the United States with a formidable array of assets. The combination of those assets would risk affording Constellation the opportunity to profitably raise the price of electricity for millions of citizens and businesses in Texas and parts of the mid-Atlantic, likely resulting in increased energy costs of more than \$100 million per year. The United States and the State of Texas bring this suit to preserve competition.

I. Introduction

1. Electricity is an essential resource to people and companies across the country.

Whether storing food in refrigerators, keeping the lights on in workplaces, watching a football game, or powering lifesaving support systems in hospitals, Americans depend on electricity for almost every facet of their daily lives. Demand for electricity is increasing rapidly, as the population grows and innovative technologies like cloud computing and artificial intelligence rely ever more on energy-intensive data centers. In Texas, the highest level of electricity consumption (so-called “peak load”) handled by its largest electrical grid is expected to increase by 72% from 2024 to 2030. In the multistate power grid that includes the mid-Atlantic, summer peak load is expected to increase by 3.1% per year over the next decade. Despite this rapidly increasing demand, it is challenging to