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, telephone (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 9, 2024, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint filed by JBS Hair of Atlanta, Georgia. 89 FR 73123–24 (Sept. 9, 2024). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''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 pre-stretched synthetic braiding hair and packaging therefor by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 10,786,026; 10,945,478 (''the '478 patent''); and 10,980,301 (''the '301 patent''). *Id.* The complaint also alleged that a domestic industry exists. The notice of investigation, as amended, named numerous respondents, including Vivace. *Id.; see also* 91 FR 35267 (June 10, 2026). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') was also named as a party in the investigation. *Id.*

On February 24, 2025, the Commission found Vivace to be in default. Order No. 31 (Feb. 4, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Feb. 24, 2025). On September 29, 2025, the Commission issued a limited exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders (collectively, ''the remedial orders'') against certain defaulting respondents, including Vivace, pursuant to section 337(g)(1), 19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1). 90 FR 47821–23 (Oct. 2, 2025).

On December 18, 2025, JBS Hair filed an enforcement complaint against Vivace requesting that the Commission institute an enforcement proceeding under Commission Rule 210.75 (19 CFR 210.75) to investigate alleged violations by Vivace of the Commission's remedial orders.

On January 22, 2026, the Commission instituted an enforcement proceeding under Commission Rule 210.75 against Vivace. 91 FR 2799–800 (Jan. 22, 2026).

On June 8, 2026, the Commission amended the complaint and notice of investigation to correct the name of Vivace from ''Vivace, Inc. d/b/a Dae Do Inc.'' to ''Dae Do Inc. d/b/a Vivace.'' *See* Order No. 51 (May 7, 2026), *unreviewed by* 91 FR 35267 (June 10, 2026).

On June 9, 2026, JBS Hair filed an unopposed motion to terminate the enforcement proceeding pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1) (19 CFR 210.21(a)(1)) based on withdrawal of the enforcement complaint against Vivace. On June 16, 2026, OUII filed a response in support of the motion.

On June 18, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 53) granting the unopposed motion. The ID finds that ''JBS Hair has complied with the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21(a).'' ID at 1–2. In particular, the motion was filed before the issuance of the enforcement initial determination. *Id.* In addition, the motion states that ''there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties concerning the subject matter of this investigation.'' *Id.* at 1. Furthermore, the ID finds ''no extraordinary circumstances exist that would prevent the requested termination.'' *Id.* at 2. No petition for review of the subject ID was filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The Commission's vote for this determination took place on July 8, 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: July 8, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–13993 Filed 7–9–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1426]

Certain Crafting Machines and Components Thereof; Notice of the Commission's Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a General Exclusion Order, Limited Exclusion Orders, and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has found a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in this investigation and has issued a general exclusion order (''GEO'') prohibiting the importation of certain crafting machines and components thereof that infringe U.S. Patent No. D893,563 (''the D563 patent''), a limited exclusion order (''LEO'') directed to defaulting respondent LiPing Zhan (''Konduone'') with respect U.S. Patent No. 11,905,646 (''the '646 patent''), an LEO directed to defaulting respondents Bozhou Wanxingyu Technology Co. Ltd., Bozhou Zhongdaxiang Technology Co., Ltd., and Shanghai Sishun E-Commerce Co., Ltd. (collectively, the ''Vevor Respondents'') with respect to U.S. Patent No. D1,029,090 (''the D090 patent''), and cease and desist orders (''CDO'') directed to Konduone and the Vevor Respondents.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Chen, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2392. 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 December 11, 2024, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Cricut, Inc. (''Cricut'') of South Jordan, Utah. 89 FR 99,905–06 (Dec. 11, 2024). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain crafting machines and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of the '646 patent, the D563 patent, the D090 patent, U.S. Patent No. 11,208,758 (''the '758 patent''), U.S. Patent No. D910,724 (''the D724 patent''), and U.S. Patent No. D926,237 (''the D237 patent''). *Id.* The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by the applicable Federal statute. The Commission's notice of investigation named eight (8) respondents: Bozhou Wanxingyu Technology Co. Ltd. of Bozhou, China; Bozhou Zhongdaxiang Technology Co., Ltd. of Bozhou, China; Shanghai Sishun E-Commerce Co., Ltd. of Shanghai, China; LiPing Zhan of Jingzhou, China;

Hunan Sijiu Technology, Co. Ltd. of Changsha, China; Hunan Sijiu Electronic Technology Co., Ltd. (''HSET'') of Changsha, China; Guangdong Rongtu Technology Co., Ltd. of Foshan City, China; and SainStore Technology Co., Ltd. (''SainStore'') of Dongguan City, China. *Id.* at 99,905–06. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') was also named as a party. *Id.* at 99,906.

On January 31, 2025, the Commission partially terminated the investigation as to SainStore based on a consent order stipulation and issued a consent order against SainStore. Order No. 5 (Jan. 8, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Jan. 31, 2025).

On April 3, 2025, Respondent HSET was terminated from this investigation, HK Sijiu International Share Co., Ltd. of Hong Kong, China, was added to this investigation as a new respondent, and U.S. Design Patent No. D877,214 (''the D214 patent'') was also added to this investigation. Order No. 10 (Mar. 6, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Apr. 3, 2025), 90 FR 15,161–62 (Apr. 8, 2025). The target date was extended to May 13, 2026.

On April 4, 2025, claims 19 and 20 of the 758 patent were terminated from the investigation based on withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 11 (Mar. 17, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Apr. 4, 2025).

The Vevor Respondents and Konduone were found in default pursuant to 19 CFR 210.16. Order No. 17 (May 7, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 28, 2025). Accordingly, Respondents HK Sijiu International Share Co., Ltd., Hunan Sijiu Technology, Co. Ltd., and Guangdong Rongtu Technology Co., Ltd. (collectively, ''HTVRONT'') were the only remaining active respondents during the investigation.

On May 27, 2025, the Commission partially terminated the investigation as to the D090 patent based on a consent order stipulation and issued a consent order against HTVRONT as to that patent. Order No. 16 (Apr. 30, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 27, 2025).

On August 5, 2025, the Commission determined not to review an ID (Order No. 21), extending the target date to August 13, 2026, at the request of the parties. Order No. 21 (July 8, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Aug. 5, 2025).

On August 27, 2025, the Chief Administrative Law Judge (''ALJ'') shortened the target date to March 11, 2026, after the parties agreed that the remainder of the investigation could be adjudicated through motion practice. Order No. 22 (Aug. 27, 2025).

On September 4, 2025, Cricut filed a motion for summary determination as to violation and remedy. Mot. No. 1426–017. In its motion, Cricut requested an LEO and a CDO against Konduone for alleged violations based on infringement of the '646 patent and the D563 patent. Cricut also requested an LEO and a CDO against the Vevor Respondents for alleged violations based on infringement of the D090 patent. Cricut further requested GEOs to remedy alleged violations based on infringement of the D563, the D724, and the D237 patents but later withdrew its requests for GEOs as to the D724 and the D237 patents. Order No. 26 (Jan. 14, 2026). Cricut's motion did not address the '758 or the D214 patents or request any remedy as to those patents.

Also, on September 4, 2025, HTVRONT moved to partially terminate this investigation as to the products HTVRONT was discontinuing—the Square Heat Press, Reduced Square Heat Press, Mini Heat Press, Mini3 Heat Press, and Hat Heat Press (the ''Old HTVRONT Products'')—based upon a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. Motion No. 1426–014. HTVRONT's motion to partially terminate the investigation as to the Old HTVRONT Products was granted on January 20, 2026 and the Commission issued a second consent order against HTVRONT. Order No. 27 (Jan. 20, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (February 17, 2026). HTVRONT also moved for summary determination of non-infringement of its redesigned products. Mot. No. 1426–016.

On December 4, 2025, the Commission determined not to review Order No. 24, extending the target date to May 21, 2026, due to a lapse in government appropriations from October 1, 2025 through November 12, 2025. Order No. 24 (Nov. 17, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Dec. 4, 2025).

On January 21, 2026, the Chief ALJ issued a combined final initial determination (''ID'') and recommended determination (''RD''), finding a violation of section 337 by Konduone as to the D563 patent and claims 8–12 of the '646 patent and by the Vevor Respondents as to the D090 patent. The final ID also found HTVRONT's redesigned products were ripe for adjudication and the redesigned products are entitled to summary determination of non-infringement. The final ID further found no violation of section 337 as to the '758 or D214 patents because Cricut did not present any evidence or argument as to those patents. Furthermore, the final ID determined that Cricut's contentions in its summary determination motion that the Old HTVRONT Products infringe the D724 and D237 patents was moot in view of the consent order stipulation in Order No. 27. No petitions for review of the final ID were filed.

No petitions for review were filed, which means each party has abandoned all issues decided adversely to that party. *See* 19 CFR 210.43(b)(4).

On March 23, 2026, the Commission determined to extend the deadline for determining whether to review the final ID from March 23, 2026 to April 16, 2026.

The Commission did not receive any submissions from the public on public interest issues raised by the RD. *See* 91 FR 3,542–543 (Jan. 27, 2026).

On April 14, 2026, the Commission determined on its own initiative to review the final ID's findings on the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. 91 FR 20,699–701 (Apr. 17, 2026); 19 CFR 210.44. The Commission determined not to review the remaining findings, conclusions, and supporting analysis in the final ID, including its findings that Cricut has demonstrated that the EasyPress products practice the D563 patent, that there was no violation as to the '758 and D214 patents, no violation as to HTVRONT's redesigned products, and Cricut's allegations as to the D724 and D237 patents were moot. The Commission also requested briefing on remedy, bonding, and the public interest.

On April 28, 2026, Cricut and OUII filed their respective initial submissions on remedy, bonding, and the public interest. OUII filed a response submission on May 5, 2026. No other party filed a submission before the Commission.

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the final ID and the parties' submissions, the Commission has found a violation of section 337 with respect to the D563 patent. Specifically, the Commission has determined to affirm, with modifications, the final ID's finding that Cricut has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(B).

The Commission has determined that the appropriate remedy is: (1) a GEO prohibiting the entry of crafting machines and components thereof that infringe the D563 patent under section 337(d)(2); (2) an LEO directed to defaulting respondent Konduone with respect the '646 patent under section 337(g)(1); (3) an LEO directed to defaulting Vevor Respondents with respect to the D090 patent under section 337(g)(1); and (4) CDOs against Konduone and the Vevor Respondents under section 337(g)(1). The Commission has determined that the public interest factors do not preclude issuance of the remedial orders. The Commission has determined that a bond is required during the period of Presidential review and sets the bond in the amount of one hundred percent (100%) of the imported articles. 19 U.S.C. 1337(j)(3).

The investigation is terminated. The Commission's reasoning in support of its determination is set forth more fully in its opinion. The Commission's orders and opinion were delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 7, 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: July 7, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–13926 Filed 7–9–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Frederick Tanzer, M.D.; Decision and Order

On November 24, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Frederick Tanzer, M.D., of Cincinnati, Ohio (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration, No. FT3360334, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to handle controlled substances in Ohio . . . , the state[ ] in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' [1] *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 3–4.[2] ''A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the registrant's/applicant's right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].'' 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Further, ''[i]n the event that a registrant . . . is deemed to be in default . . . DEA may then file a request for final agency action with the Administrator, along with a record to support its request. In such circumstances, the Administrator may enter a default final order pursuant to [21 CFR] 1316.67.'' *Id.* 1301.43(f)(1). Here, the Government has requested final agency action based on Registrant's default pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 1; *see also* 21 CFR 1316.67.

Findings of Fact

The Agency finds that, in light of Registrant's default, the factual allegations in the OSC are admitted. According to the OSC, on or about March 12, 2025, the Ohio Medical Board (OMB) entered an Order ratifying the February 11, 2025, surrender of Registrant's Ohio medical license. RFAAX 1, at 2. OMB's Order also indicated that Registrant's medical license was permanently revoked. *Id.* According to Ohio online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[3] the status of Registrant's Ohio medical license is ''closed'' with a sub-status of ''permanent revocation.'' *See* eLicense Ohio Professional Licensure System, License Look-Up, *https://elicense.ohio.gov/oh_verifylicense* (last visited date of signature of this Order).

Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Ohio, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 ''upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.''

With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *Gonzales* v. *Oregon,* 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006) (''The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances 'if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.' . . . The very definition of a 'practitioner' eligible to prescribe includes physicians 'licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices' to dispense controlled substances. § 802(21).''). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.,* 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.,* 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).[5]

[1] The Government's RFAA abandoned the OSC allegation that sought revocation of Registrant's DEA registration in Kansas, noting that the Kansas registration expired prior to service of the OSC. RFAA, at 1 n.1.

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated January 26, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on December 9, 2025, DI served copies of the OSC on Registrant's attorney's assistant and a sergeant at the facility where Registrant is incarcerated. RFAAX 2, at 1–2; *see* Attachments A and B (signed Forms DEA–12, Receipt for Cash or Other Items, confirming receipt of the OSC). On December 10, 2025, DEA personnel sent a copy of the OSC by email to Registrant's registered email address and received automated messages confirming delivery. RFAAX 2, at 2; *see* Attachment C, at 1, 3. On December 11, 2025, DI mailed a copy of the OSC to the ''mail to'' address associated with Registrant's registration. RFAAX 2, at 2. Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email and that DI's efforts to serve Registrant by other means were '' 'reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise [Registrant] of the pendency of the action.' '' *Jones* v. *Flowers,* 547 U.S. 220, 226 (2006) (quoting *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.,* 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)); *see also Mohammed S. Aljanaby, M.D.,* 82 FR 34552, 34552 (2017) (finding that service by email satisfies due process where the email is not returned as undeliverable and other methods have been unsuccessful).

[3] Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency ''may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.'' United States Department of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979).

[4] Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), ''[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.'' The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this Order, is not licensed to practice medicine in Ohio. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, at *dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.*

[5] This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined the term

Continued