

the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 27, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-01812 Filed 1-29-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-626 and 731-TA-1452 (Review)]

Certain Collated Steel Staples From China; Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ 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 countervailing and antidumping duty orders on certain collated steel staples 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 these reviews on June 2, 2025 (90 FR 23364) and determined on September 5, 2025, that it would conduct expedited reviews (90 FR 58308, December 16, 2025).

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 January 27, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5698 (January 2026), entitled *Certain Collated Steel Staples from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-626 and 731-TA-1452 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 27, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-01840 Filed 1-29-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1232 (Enforcement II)]

Certain Chocolate Milk Powder and Packaging Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination of Violation of the General Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Request for Briefing on the Recommended Remedy for Violation of the Cease and Desist Orders

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission ("Commission") has determined not to review an enforcement initial determination ("EID") (Order No. 9) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting a motion for summary determination of violation of the General Exclusion Order ("GEO") and Cease and Desist Orders ("CDOs"). The Commission requests written submissions from the parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons on the recommended remedy for violation of the CDOs, under the schedule set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Panyin Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. 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 the original investigation on December 1, 2020, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Meenaxi Enterprise Inc. ("Meenaxi") of Edison, New Jersey. 85 FR 77237-38 (Dec. 1, 2020). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation into the United States,

the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain chocolate milk powder and packaging thereof by reason of infringement of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,206,026 ("the '026 mark"). The Commission's notice of investigation named several respondents, including but not limited to Bharat Bazar Inc. of Union City, California ("Bharat Bazaar"); Coconut Hill Inc. d/b/a Coconut Hill of Sunnyvale, California ("Coconut Hill"); Organic Food d/b/a Namaste Plaza Indian Super Market ("Organic Food") of Fremont, California; and New India Bazar Inc. d/b/a New India Bazar of San Jose, California ("New India"). *Id.* at 77237. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") was also a party to the investigation. *Id.*

In the underlying investigation, all respondents were found in default. *See* Order No. 6 (Feb. 10, 2021), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (Mar. 2, 2021); Order No. 23 (May 19, 2022), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (Jun. 14, 2022). On May 24, 2021, Meenaxi moved for summary determination of violation of section 337 by the respondents found in default by Order No. 6 and requested a GEO. On December 1, 2021, the former chief administrative law judge granted the motion as an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 15), but noted discrepancies with respect to respondent Organic Food, calling into question whether that respondent was ever properly served with the complaint and notice of investigation and with the CALJ's order to show cause why the respondents should not be found in default, Order No. 5 (Jan. 13, 2021). *See* Order No. 15 at 1, n.1. No petitions for review of the ID were filed. The Commission determined *sua sponte* to review Order No. 15 and ordered reconsideration of Order No. 6 as to Organic Food and/or any other respondents who may not have been properly served with documents in the underlying investigation. *See* Comm'n Notice at 3 (Jan. 18, 2022). The Commission remanded the investigation to an ALJ for further proceedings. *Id.*

On remand, the current chief administrative law judge ("CALJ") issued Order No. 18, granting Meenaxi's unopposed motion for leave to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to (i) substitute Organic Food with proposed respondent Organic Ingredients Inc. d/b/a Namaste Plaza Indian Super Market ("Organic Ingredients") of San Diego, California; (ii) correct the address of respondent New India; (iii) correct the address of respondent Bharat Bazar; and (iv) supplement the complaint with Exhibits

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