

notice in the **Federal Register** on August 26, 2025 (90 FR 41595).<sup>3</sup> The public hearing in connection with the investigations, scheduled for January 21, 2026, was cancelled.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to §§ 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on March 9, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5709 (March 2026), entitled *Polypropylene Corrugated Boxes from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-757 and 731-TA-1737 (Final)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 9, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026-04762 Filed 3-10-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1444]

### Certain Nasal Devices and Components Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination To Reconsider an Earlier Decision; Issue a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (“Commission”) has determined to reconsider in part its prior affirmation of an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 27) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”). The Commission has also determined to issue: (1) a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) barring entry of certain nasal devices and components thereof by or on behalf of the defaulting respondents; and (2) cease and desist orders (“CDOs”) against each of the defaulting respondents. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronald A. Traud, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International

Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3427. 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](mailto: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 March 26, 2025, based on a complaint filed by Aardvark Medical Inc. of Denton, Texas. 90 FR 13781-82 (Mar. 26, 2025). The complaint, as later amended and supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain nasal devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 1-5, 7-14, and 16-19 of U.S. Patent No. 9,750,856 (“the ‘856 patent”); claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14-17, 21-24, 27, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 11,318,234 (“the ‘234 patent”); claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 16-18, 21-22, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 11,883,009 (“the ‘009 patent”); claims 1-7, 10-14, and 17-21 of U.S. Patent No. 11,883,010 (“the ‘010 patent”); and claims 13-21 and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 11,889,995 (“the ‘995 patent”) (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents: (1) Xiamenximier Electronic Commerce Co., Ltd (d/b/a Cenny) of Fujian, China (“Cenny”); (2) Xia Men Deng Jia E-Commerce Co., Ltd. (d/b/a Ronfnea) of Fujian, China (“Ronfnea”); (3) Chongqing Moffy Innovation Technology Co., Ltd. of Chongqing City, China (“Moffy”); (4) Guangdong XINRUNTAO Technology Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen, China (“Xinruntao”); and (5) Shenzhen Jun&Liang Media Tech Limited of Shenzhen, China (“Jun&Liang,” and together with the aforementioned respondents, “Defaulting Respondents”), as well as RhinoSystems of Brooklyn, Ohio; and Spa Sciences LP of Port St. Lucie, Florida. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in the investigation. *Id.*

On June 17, 2025, the Commission determined not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 9) granting Complainant’s motion for leave to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation to substitute and correct the appropriate entity from named respondent “Spa Sciences LP” to “Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences.” Order No. 9 (May 22, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (June 17, 2025).

The following respondents have been terminated from the investigation: RhinoSystems and Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences. Order No. 14 (July 14, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Aug. 6, 2025); Order No. 28 (Dec. 4, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Dec. 22, 2025).

The Commission previously found Defaulting Respondents to be in default. Order No. 27 (Sept. 22, 2025), *reviewed in part and aff’d by* Comm’n Notice (Dec. 4, 2025) (affirming the ALJ’s finding of Cenny, Ronfnea, Moffy, and Jun&Liang in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1) (19 CFR 210.16(a)(1)) for failing to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation; and modifying the ALJ’s finding that Xinruntao was in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1) with a finding that Xinruntao was in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(2) (19 CFR 210.16(a)(2)) for failing to cooperate with discovery).

The Commission hereby reconsiders its decision affirming Order No. 27 as to Xinruntao. *See* Commission Rule 210.47 (19 CFR 210.47). Xinruntao’s answer to the complaint and notice of investigation was untimely, and Xinruntao failed to show cause justifying its late response (*see* Order No. 2 (Mar. 24, 2025) (ALJ’s Ground Rules)) or otherwise respond to the ALJ’s order instructing it to show good cause why it should not be found in default (*see* Order No. 25 (Sept. 8, 2025)). In reconsideration, the Commission now finds Xinruntao to be in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1). An unexcused, untimely response to the complaint and notice of investigation is insufficient to avoid a finding of default under the Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1), and accordingly, a finding of default under that rule is appropriate. In sum, all remaining respondents have been found in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1).

On January 15, 2026, the Commission issued a notice asking the parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest,

<sup>3</sup> 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 subsequent notices published in the **Federal Register** on November 26, 2025 (90 FR 54369) and December 18, 2025 (90 FR 59202).

<sup>4</sup> 91 FR 2800 (January 22, 2026).

and bonding. 91 FR 2367 (Jan. 20, 2026) (“the Remedy Notice”).

On January 29, 2026, Complainant filed a submission to the Remedy Notice. No other responses were received.

When the conditions in section 337(g)(1)(A)–(E) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)(A)–(E)) have been satisfied, section 337(g)(1) and Commission Rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)) direct the Commission, upon request, to issue a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both against a respondent found in default, based on the allegations regarding a violation of section 337 in the complaint, which are presumed to be true, unless after consideration of the public interest factors in section 337(g)(1), it finds that such relief should not issue.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including Complainant’s submission in response to the Remedy Notice, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)), that the appropriate remedy in this investigation is: (1) an LEO prohibiting the unlicensed entry of certain nasal devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of claims 1–5, 7–14, and 16–19 of the ’856 patent; claims 1–4, 6, 8–12, 14–17, 21–24, 27, and 28 of the ’234 patent; claims 1–3, 6–8, 10–12, 16–18, 21–22, and 28 of the ’009 patent; claims 1–7, 10–14, and 17–21 of the ’010 patent; and claims 13–21 and 26 of the ’995 patent by Defaulting Respondents and (2) CDOs directed to Defaulting Respondents. The Commission has determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsection 337(g)(1) do not preclude the issuance of the LEO and CDOs. The Commission has further determined that the bond during the period of Presidential review pursuant to section 337(j) (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)) shall be in the amount of one hundred percent (100%) of the entered value of the imported articles that are subject to the LEO.

The investigation is hereby terminated.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on March 9, 2026.

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: March 9, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026–04769 Filed 3–10–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

**[Investigation No. 337–TA–883 (Rescission)]**

### **Certain Opaque Polymers; Notice of Institution of Rescission Proceeding; Rescission of Remedial Orders; Termination of Rescission Proceeding**

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (“Commission”) has determined to institute a rescission proceeding and rescind a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) directed to Organik Kimya San. ve Tic. A.Ş of Istanbul, Turkey; Organik Kimya Netherlands B.V. of Rotterdam-Botlek, Netherlands; and Organik Kimya US, Inc. of Burlington, Massachusetts (collectively, “Organik Kimya”) and a cease and desist order directed to Organik Kimya US, Inc (collectively, “the remedial orders”). The remedial orders are rescinded, and the rescission proceeding is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Ronald A. Traud, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3427. 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](mailto: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 underlying investigation on June 21, 2013, based on a complaint filed by the Dow Chemical Company of Midland, Michigan, and by Rohm and Haas Company and Rohm and Haas Chemicals LLC, both of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (collectively, “Dow”). 78 FR 37571 (June 21, 2013). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff

Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337) (“section 337”), by reason of the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain opaque polymers that infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,020,435, 6,252,004 7,435,783, and 7,803,878. *Id.* The notice of investigation named Organik Kimya as the respondent. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations did not participate in the investigation. *Id.* The complaint and notice of investigation were later amended to add allegations of misappropriation of trade secrets. *See* 78 FR 71643 (Nov. 29, 2013). The Commission later terminated the investigation as to the four asserted patents. *See* Order No. 11 (Nov. 21, 2013), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Dec. 13, 2013); Order No. 29 (Nov. 3, 2014), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Dec. 1, 2014).

On April 17, 2015, the Commission found Organik Kimya in default as a sanction for discovery abuse pursuant to section 337(h) (19 U.S.C. 1337(h)) and Commission Rules 210.16 and 210.33 (19 CFR 210.16 & 210.33). *See* 80 FR 22548–49 (Apr. 22, 2015). The Commission thereby determined that Organic Kimya violated section 337 based on the misappropriation of trade secrets and issued the remedial orders. *See id.*

On February 9, 2026, Dow and Organic Kimya filed a joint petition requesting that the Commission rescind the remedial orders based on a settlement reached between the parties. The petition includes a copy of the settlement agreement and the required statement that there are “no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied between the parties concerning the subject matter of the investigation.” The petition asserts that rescission is warranted based on changed conditions of fact and law stemming from the parties’ settlement agreement that fully resolves the dispute between them concerning the subject matter of the underlying investigation. On February 10, 2026, the parties filed a redacted version of the petition and settlement agreement, and on February 20, 2026, the parties filed a revised redacted version. The Commission received no responses to the petition.

Having reviewed the petition, the Commission finds that the conditions which led to the issuance of the remedial orders no longer exist, and therefore, that granting the petition to rescind is warranted under section 337(k) (19 U.S.C. 1337(k)) and Commission Rule 210.76(a) (19 CFR 210.76(a)). Consistent with an order