

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

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."

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

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

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.

According to Ohio statute, “[n]o person shall knowingly obtain, possess, or use a controlled substance or a controlled substance analog,” except pursuant to a “prescription issued by a licensed health professional authorized to prescribe drugs if the prescription was issued for a legitimate medical purpose.” Ohio Rev. Code 2925.11(A), (B)(1)(d). Further, a “[l]icensed health professional authorized to prescribe drugs or ‘prescriber’ means an individual who is authorized by law to prescribe drugs or dangerous drugs or drug therapy related devices in the course of the individual’s professional practice.” *Id.* 4729.01(I). The Ohio statute further defines an authorized prescriber as “[a] physician authorized under Chapter 4731. of the Revised Code to practice medicine and surgery, osteopathic medicine and surgery, or podiatric medicine and surgery.” *Id.* 4729.01(I)(5). Additionally, Ohio law permits “[a] licensed health professional authorized to prescribe drugs, if acting in the course of professional practice, in accordance with the laws regulating the professional’s practice,” to prescribe or administer schedule II, III, IV, and V controlled substances to patients. *Id.* 3719.06(A)(1)(a)–(b).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in Ohio. As already discussed, a physician is authorized by law to prescribe or administer drugs in Ohio only when authorized to practice medicine under Ohio law. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Ohio and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Ohio, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, I will order that Registrant’s DEA registration be revoked.

“practitioner” to mean “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. FT3360334 issued to Frederick Tanzer, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Frederick Tanzer, M.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Frederick Tanzer, M.D., for additional registration in Ohio. This Order is effective August 10, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on June 22, 2026, by Administrator Terrance Cole. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Leslie Mayer,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–13988 Filed 7–9–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Timothy Genetta, D.O.; Decision and Order

On November 5, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Timothy Genetta, D.O., of Georgetown, Ohio (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s Certificate of Registration No. FG3579503, alleging that Registrant is “currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Ohio, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.” *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 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 3.¹ “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), 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 deemed admitted. According to the OSC, effective March 12, 2025, the State Medical Board of Ohio suspended Registrant’s doctor of osteopathic medicine license. RFAAX 1, at 2.

According to Ohio online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant’s Ohio osteopathic medical license status is now revoked.² eLicense Ohio Professional Licensure License Lookup, <https://elicense.ohio.gov/verifylicense> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not

¹ Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated March 3, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that shortly after the DI received a copy of the OSC, the DI attempted to locate Registrant for personal service, however, they were unsuccessful. RFAAX 2, at 2. On or about December 2, 2025, the DI emailed Registrant a copy of the OSC to three different registered email addresses and did not receive a response. *Id.*; *see also Id.* at 21. There is no evidence indicating that the emails were undeliverable. Here, the Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email and that the 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).

² 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).