Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on May 27, 2025 (90 FR 22323).[3] The public hearing in connection with these reviews, originally scheduled for October 7, 2025, was cancelled.[4]

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 28, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5694 (January 2026), entitled *Acetone from Belgium, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, and Spain: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1435–1436 and 1438–1440 (Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 28, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–01951 Filed 1–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1483]

Certain Medical Imaging Devices; Notice of Institution of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on December 29, 2025, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on behalf of MolecuLight Inc. of Canada and MolecuLight Corp. of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Supplements to the complaint were filed on January 12, 14, and 20, 2026. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of 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 medical imaging devices by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,438,356 (''the '356 patent''). The complaint, as supplemented, further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by the applicable Federal Statute. The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.* For help accessing EDIS, please email *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.* Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained 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 at *https://www.usitc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pathenia M. 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 January 28, 2026, *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 20–25, 27, 28, 30, and 31 of the '356 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 ''medical imaging devices for the identification, diagnosis, and treatment of wounds'';

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(l), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties or other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. l337(d)(l), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(4) 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 complainants are:

MolecuLight Inc., 425 University Avenue, Suite 700, Toronto, ON, M5G 1T6, Canada

MolecuLight Corp., 2403 Sidney Street, Suite 286, Pittsburgh, PA 15203

(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:

Kent Imaging Inc., 1210 8 St. SW, Calgary, AB T2R 1A9, Canada

Adiuvo Diagnostics Pvt. Ltd., Unit 18 and 19, Golden Jubilee Biopark, 4th Main Road, 2nd Cross Street, SIPCOT IT Park, Siruseri, Chennai 603103, India

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

(5) 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

[3] Due 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 21, 2025 (90 FR 52695).

[4] 90 FR 52695 (November 21, 2025).

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: January 28, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–01968 Filed 1–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1411]

Certain Photodynamic Therapy Systems, Components Thereof, and Pharmaceutical Products Used in Combination With the Same; Notice of a Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Request for Written Submissions 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 a final initial determination (''FID'') of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ''), finding a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The Commission requests written submissions 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: B. Rashmi Borah, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2518. 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 August 1, 2024, based on a complaint filed by Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc. (''Complainant'') of Princeton, New Jersey. 89 FR 62790 (Aug. 1, 2024). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based on the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain photodynamic therapy systems, components thereof, and pharmaceutical products used in combination with the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of the U.S. Patent Nos. 11,446,512 (''the '512 patent'') and 11,697,028 (collectively, ''the Asserted Patents''). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists or is in the process of being established. *Id.* The notice of investigation names four respondents: (1) Biofrontera Inc. of Woburn, Massachusetts; (2) Biofrontera Pharma GmbH of Leverkusen, Germany; (3) Biofrontera Bioscience GmbH of Leverkusen, Germany; and (4) Biofrontera AG of Leverkusen, Germany (collectively, ''Respondents''). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to this investigation. *Id.*

On November 20, 2024, the Commission amended the complaint and notice of investigation to add infringement allegations as to claims 17 and 18 of the '512 patent. Order No. 8 (Oct. 22, 2024), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Nov. 20, 2024).

On June 25, 2025, the ALJ issued Order No. 23 granting, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.18 (19 CFR 210.18), Complainant's motion for summary determination that it has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement.

On July 25, 2025, the Commission determined to review Order No. 23. Comm'n Notice at 2 (July 25, 2025).

On September 30, 2025, the ALJ issued the FID, finding a violation of section 337. The FID finds that: (1) claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 17–18, and 20 of the '512 patent and claims 1, 2, 4, 16, 17, and 19–21 of the '028 patent, are directly infringed; (2) claims 8, 17, and 18 of the '512 patent are indirectly infringed via inducement; (3) none of the claims asserted for infringement and/or domestic industry are invalid under 35 U.S.C. 103 and/or 112, ¶ 1; and (4) Complainant has satisfied the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement for both Asserted Patents by practicing claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 19, and 20 of the '512 patent and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 16–18, and 21 of the '028 patent. The FID also includes the ALJ's recommended determination (''RD'') on remedy, the public interest, and bonding, should the Commission find a violation of section 337. Specifically, the RD recommends entry of a limited exclusion order against Respondents' infringing products, entry of a cease and desist orders against Respondents, and a bond of zero percent for any importations of infringing products during the period of Presidential review.

On November 17, 2025, Complainant filed a petition for review seeking review of the following findings: (1) that the preamble of each asserted claim is limiting and (2) the RD's recommendation to set a bond of zero percent for any importations of infringing products during the period of Presidential review. On the same day, Respondents filed a petition for review seeking review of the following findings: (1) that the claim terms ''nested hinges'' and ''higher intensity proximate'' are not indefinite; (2) that the asserted claims are not invalid under 35 U.S.C. 103 for obviousness, or under § 112 ¶ 1 for lack of written description; (3) that certain claims are either directly or indirectly infringed; and (4) that certain declarations from *inter partes* review proceedings are admissible. On November 24, 2025, Complainant and Respondents filed their respective petition responses.

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the FID, and the parties' submissions, the Commission has determined to review the FID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review: (1) the construction of the claim term ''nested hinges'' and (2) whether the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid under 35 U.S.C. 103 for obviousness. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the FID. Order No. 23 remains under Commission review. Comm'n Notice at 2 (July 25, 2025). The Commission will consider the reviewed issues identified above as well as any issues concerning Order No. 23 and the RD in connection with the final disposition of this Investigation.

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