

address, phone number, email address, or other personally identifiable information included in your comment—may be made publicly available at any time. Even if BOEM withholds your personally identifiable information in the context of this NOI, your comment is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552). Your information will only be withheld if a determination is made that one of the FOIA exemptions to disclosure applies. Such a determination will be made in accordance with the Department's FOIA implementing regulations (43 CFR part 2) and applicable laws.

In order for BOEM to consider withholding from disclosure your personally identifiable information, you must identify, in a cover letter, any information contained in the submittal of your comments that, if released, would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of your personal privacy. You must also briefly describe any possible harmful consequences of the disclosure of information, such as embarrassment, injury, or other harm. Note that BOEM will make available for public inspection, in their entirety, all comments submitted by organizations and businesses, or by individuals identifying themselves as representatives of organizations or businesses.

Authority: This NOI is published pursuant to DOI's regulations (43 CFR part 46) implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*).

Matthew Giacona,

Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

[FR Doc. 2026-05319 Filed 3-17-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4340-98-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

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

Certain Chocolate Milk Powder and Packaging Thereof; Issuance of Civil Penalties and Termination of Enforcement 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 impose civil penalties for violating the Commission's cease and desist orders ("CDOs") issued on

November 18, 2024 against each of the following four defaulting enforcement respondents as follows: \$1.8 million for eighteen (18) days of violation assessed to Organic Ingredients Inc. d/b/a Namaste Plaza Indian Super Market ("Organic Ingredients") of San Diego, California; \$1.6 million for sixteen (16) days of violation assessed to New India Bazar Inc. d/b/a New India Bazar ("New India") of San Jose, California; \$200,000 for two (2) days of violation assessed to Bharat Bazar Inc. ("Bharat Bazar") of Union City, California; and \$1.7 million for seventeen (17) days of violation assessed to Coconut Hill Inc. d/b/a Coconut Hill ("Coconut Hill") of Sunnyvale, California. The enforcement proceeding is terminated.

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; Coconut Hill; New India; and Organic Food d/b/a Namaste Plaza Indian Super Market ("Organic Food") of Fremont, California. *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 general exclusion order ("GEO"). On December 1, 2021, the former chief administrative law judge ("CALJ") 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 former 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 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; (ii) correct the address of respondent New India; (iii) correct the address of respondent Bharat Bazar; and (iv) supplement the complaint with Exhibits 9-a, 9-b, and 9-c, concerning Organic Food and/or Organic Ingredients. Order No. 18 at 1-5 (Mar. 11, 2022), *unreviewed* by Comm'n Notice (Apr. 12, 2022); *see also* 87 FR 22940-41 (Apr. 18, 2022). Meenaxi also demonstrated that Bharat Bazar actually had been served with all of the documents in the investigation (prior to remand) despite incorrectly spelling Bharat Bazar's address as being on "Niled Road" instead of "Niles Road." *See* Order No. 18 at 4.

The CALJ conducted remand proceedings as to Organic Ingredients and New India to respond to the amended complaint and notice of investigation, and then ordered them to respond to an order to show cause why they should not be found in default. *See* Order No. 19 (Mar. 11, 2022); Order No. 21 at 2-3 (May 3, 2022). On May 19, 2022, the CALJ issued an ID finding Organic Ingredients and New India in default. Order No. 23 (May 19, 2022), *unreviewed* by Comm'n Notice (June 14, 2022). Accordingly, the Commission

found all respondents in default (collectively with the respondents previously found in default, the “Defaulting Respondents”).

Subsequently, on June 15, 2022, following the remand determination of default, Meenaxi again moved for summary determination of violation by the Defaulting Respondents and requested a GEO. On July 6, 2022, OUII filed a response supporting the motion.

On August 3, 2022, the CALJ issued a remand ID (“RID”) (Order No. 27), granting the second motion for summary determination and finding a violation of section 337 with respect to the ‘026 mark. The RID found that all Defaulting Respondents met the importation requirement and that Meenaxi satisfied the domestic industry requirement. *See* 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)–(3). No party petitioned for review of the ID.

On September 19, 2022, the Commission determined not to review the RID. *See* 87 FR 58130–32 (Sept. 23, 2022). On November 15, 2022, the Commission issued a final determination finding a violation, issuing a GEO prohibiting the unlicensed importation of chocolate milk powder and packaging thereof that infringe the ‘026 mark, and terminating the investigation. *See* 87 FR 70864–66 (Nov. 21, 2022). The GEO prohibits the unlicensed importation of “chocolate milk powder in consumer-sized container with the Bournvita label.” *Id.* That same day, the Commission issued an opinion explaining the basis for its final determination.

On November 9, 2023, the Commission determined to institute an enforcement proceeding (“Enforcement I”) under Commission Rule 210.75 to investigate alleged violations of the GEO by four respondents: (1) Organic Ingredients; (2) New India; (3) Bharat Bazar; and (4) Coconut Hill (collectively the “Enforcement Respondents”). *See* 88 FR 78786–87 (Nov. 16, 2023); 89 FR 15220 (Mar. 1, 2024). OUII was also named as a party. *Id.*

On January 10, 2024, the presiding ALJ issued an order directing the Enforcement Respondents to show cause why they should not be found in default and why judgment should not be rendered against them for failing to respond to the enforcement complaint and notice of investigation. *See* Enforcement I, Order No. 6 (Jan. 10, 2024). Enforcement I, Order No. 6, directed the Enforcement Respondents to make any showing of good cause by no later than February 2, 2024. *Id.* at 3. No party responded to Order No. 6. *See* Enforcement I, Order No. 8 at 1 (Feb. 13, 2024).

On March 14, 2024, the Commission determined that the four Enforcement Respondents were in default. *See* Order No. 8 (Feb. 13, 2024), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Mar. 14, 2024). On March 15, 2024, Meenaxi filed a motion requesting summary determination of violation of the GEO and the issuance of CDOs against the four Enforcement Respondents. *See* Enforcement I, Initial Determination (“EID–1”) at 5.

On August 16, 2024, the ALJ granted Meenaxi’s motion and recommended issuance of CDOs. *See* Enforcement I, Order No. 9 (Aug. 16, 2024). On November 18, 2024, the Commission issued a final determination finding that all four Enforcement Respondents had violated the GEO and issued CDOs against each of the four Enforcement Respondents. 89 FR 92,722–723 (Nov. 22, 2024).

On February 24, 2025, Meenaxi filed a complaint requesting that the Commission institute a second enforcement proceeding to investigate alleged violations of the GEO and CDOs by the same four Enforcement Respondents: (1) Organic Ingredients; (2) New India; (3) Bharat Bazar; and (4) Coconut Hill Inc. *See* EID at 5. On March 26, 2025, the Commission determined to institute an enforcement proceeding under Commission Rule 210.75 to investigate alleged violations of the GEO and CDOs by the four Enforcement Respondents. *See* 90 FR 14,381–382 (Apr. 1, 2025). OUII is also named as a party. *Id.* Meenaxi filed proof that the notice and enforcement complaint were served on each of the four Enforcement Respondents. *See* July 29, 2025 Letter from Anil Gandhi to Secretary Barton, EDIS Doc. ID 857933.

On May 9, 2025, the ALJ issued an order directing the Enforcement Respondents to show cause why they should not be found in default and why judgment should not be rendered against them for failing to respond to the second enforcement complaint and notice of investigation. Enforcement II, Order No. 5 (May 9, 2025). Order No. 5 directed the Enforcement Respondents to make any showing of good cause by no later than June 13, 2025. *Id.* at 3. No party responded to Order No. 5, the show-cause order. Meenaxi filed proof that Order No. 5 was served on each of the four Enforcement Respondents. *See* May 19, 2025 Letter from Anil Gandhi to Secretary Barton, EDIS Doc. ID 851448, 851447. On July 15, 2025, the Commission determined that the four Enforcement Respondents were in default. Order No. 6 (June 16, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (July 15, 2025). Meenaxi filed proof that Order No. 6 was served on each of the four

Enforcement Respondents. *See* July 29, 2025 Letter from Anil Gandhi to Secretary Barton, EDIS Doc. ID 857933.

On July 10, 2025, Meenaxi filed a motion for summary determination of violation of the GEO and CDOs by the four Enforcement Respondents and requested issuance of civil penalties against the four Enforcement Respondents. *See* EID at 6. Meenaxi argued that the Enforcement Respondents have violated the Commission’s GEO and CDOs by continuing to import, sell for importation, advertise, market, distribute, offer to sell, and sell the “Bournvita” products that infringe the ‘026 mark. EID at 18.

On December 15, 2025, the presiding ALJ issued the subject EID (Order No. 9), granting Meenaxi’s motion and recommending issuance of the requested civil penalties. The ALJ concluded that the un rebutted evidence demonstrates that the Enforcement Respondents have imported and/or sold after importation chocolate milk powder products bearing the “Bournvita” label in violation of the GEO and CDOs. The ALJ recommended that the Commission issue civil penalties against the four defaulting enforcement respondents. No party filed a petition seeking review of EID.

On January 27, 2026, the Commission determined not to review the EID and requested briefing on the recommended remedy. 81 FR 4108–110 (Jan. 30, 2026).

Having examined the record in this enforcement proceeding, including the EID/RD and the parties’ submissions, the Commission has determined to impose a penalty of \$100,000, the maximum available in this investigation, for each day that each of the four defaulting Enforcement Respondents violated the respective CDOs. The resulting penalties are as follows: \$1.8 million for eighteen (18) days of violation assessed to Organic Ingredients; \$1.6 million for sixteen (16) days of violation assessed to New India; \$200,000 for two (2) days of violation assessed to Bharat Bazar; and \$1.7 million for seventeen (17) days of violation assessed to Coconut Hill. The enforcement proceeding is hereby terminated.

The Commission’s vote on this determination took place on March 16, 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 16, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-05310 Filed 3-17-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA-2009-0025]

UL LLC: Application for Expansion of Recognition

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this notice, OSHA announces the application of UL LLC, for expansion of the scope of recognition as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL) and presents the agency's preliminary finding to grant the application.

DATES: Submit comments, information, and documents in response to this notice, or requests for an extension of time to make a submission, on or before April 2, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted as follows:

Electronically: You may submit comments, including attachments, electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency's name and the docket number for this rulemaking (Docket No. OSHA-2009-0025). All comments, including any personal information you provide, are placed in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Therefore, OSHA cautions commenters about submitting information they do not want made available to the public, or submitting materials that contain personal information (either about themselves or others), such as Social Security numbers and birthdates.

Submission of comments: You may submit comments and attachments, identified by Docket No. OSHA-2009-0025, electronically at www.regulations.gov, which is the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Follow the online instructions for making electronic submissions. The Federal e-Rulemaking Portal at www.regulations.gov is the only way to submit comments on this Notice.

Docket: To read or download comments or other material in the

docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Documents in the docket (including this **Federal Register** notice) are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index; however, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through the website. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection through the OSHA Docket Office. Contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693-2350 (TTY (877) 889-5627) for assistance in locating docket submissions.

Extension of comment period: Submit requests for an extension of the comment period on or before April 2, 2026 to the Office of Technical Programs and Coordination Activities, Directorate of Technical Support and Emergency Management, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room N-3653, Washington, DC 20210, or by fax to (202) 693-1644.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Information regarding this notice is available from the following sources:

Press inquiries: Contact Mr. Frank Meilinger, Director, OSHA Office of Communications, U.S. Department of Labor, telephone: (202) 693-1999; email: meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.

General and technical information: Contact Mr. Kevin Robinson, Director, Office of Technical Programs and Coordination Activities, Directorate of Technical Support and Emergency Management, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, phone: (202) 693-1911 or email: robinson.kevin@dol.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Notice of the Application for Expansion

OSHA is providing notice that UL LLC (UL), is applying for an expansion of current recognition as a NRTL. UL requests the addition of one test site to the NRTL scope of recognition.

OSHA recognition of a NRTL signifies that the organization meets the requirements specified in 29 CFR 1910.7. Recognition is an acknowledgment that the organization can perform independent safety testing and certification of the specific products covered within the scope of recognition. Each NRTL's scope of recognition includes (1) the type of products the NRTL may test, with each type specified by the applicable test standard and (2) the recognized site(s) that has/have the technical capability to perform the product-testing and product-

certification activities for test standards within the NRTL's scope. Recognition is not a delegation or grant of government authority; however, recognition enables employers to use products approved by the NRTL to meet OSHA standards that require product testing and certification.

The agency processes applications by a NRTL for initial recognition, as well as for an expansion or renewal of recognition, following requirements in Appendix A to 29 CFR 1910.7. This appendix requires that the agency publish two notices in the **Federal Register** in processing an application. In the first notice, OSHA announces the application and provides the preliminary finding. In the second notice, the agency provides the final decision on the application. These notices set forth the NRTL's scope of recognition or modifications of that scope. OSHA maintains an informational web page for each NRTL, including UL, which details that NRTL's scope of recognition. These pages are available from the OSHA website at <http://www.osha.gov/dts/otpca/nrtl/index.html>.

UL currently has fifty-seven facilities (site) recognized by OSHA for product testing and certification, with the headquarters located at: UL LLC, 333 Pfungsten Road, Northbrook, Illinois 60062. A complete list of UL sites recognized by OSHA is available at <https://www.osha.gov/dts/otpca/nrtl/ul.html>.

II. General Background on the Application

UL submitted an application, dated October 30, 2023 (OSHA-2009-0025-0079), to expand recognition as a NRTL to include one additional test site located at: Certification Entity for Renewable Energies (CERE), S.L., C/ Monturiol, 15. Getafe, Madrid, 28906, Spain. OSHA staff performed a review of UL's testing facilities at CERE Madrid on June 17-18, 2025, in which assessors found some nonconformances with the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.7. UL has addressed these issues sufficiently, and OSHA staff has preliminarily determined that OSHA should grant the application.

III. Preliminary Finding on the Application

UL submitted an acceptable application for expansion of its scope of recognition. OSHA's review of the application file and pertinent documentation preliminarily indicates that UL can meet the requirements prescribed by 29 CFR 1910.7 for expanding its recognition to include the additional test site at CERE Madrid.