and determined on April 7, 2026 that it would conduct expedited reviews (91 FR 21312, April 21, 2026).

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 June 22, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5755 (June 2026), entitled *Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products from China: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–636 and 731–TA–1470 (Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 22, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–12748 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Renewal of Generic Clearance; Comment Request

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice and comment request.

SUMMARY: Consistent with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the U.S. International Trade Commission (Commission) has submitted a proposal for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval. The proposed information collection is a three-year extension of the current generic clearance (approved by OMB under Control No. 3117–0016) under which the Commission can issue information collections for investigations and reviews that it is required to conduct under the Tariff Act of 1930, the Trade Act of 1974, and other trade remedy statutes that require or authorize the Commission to make findings or determinations. These investigations and reviews include: antidumping duty, countervailing duty, safeguards, other import competition, market disruption, interference with programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and cross-border long-haul trucking. A full list of all the investigations and reviews associated with this generic clearance and their associated statutory authorities is available in the Commission's supporting statement to this **Federal Register** notice. Any comments submitted to OMB on the proposed information collection should be specific, indicating which part of the questionnaires or study plan are objectionable, describing the issue in detail, and including specific revisions or language changes.

DATES: Comments solicited under this notice must be submitted on or before July 24, 2026.

Comments: Comments about the proposal should be provided to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs through the Information Collection Review Dashboard at *https://www.reginfo.gov.* All comments should be specific, indicating which part of the renewal request is objectionable, describing the concern in detail, and including specific suggested revisions or language changes. Provide copies of any comments that you submit to OMB to Maureen Letostak, Director, Office of Analysis and Research Services, U.S. International Trade Commission at *Maureen.Letostak@usitc.gov* and Nannette Christ, Director, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission at *Nannette.Christ@usitc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain copies of the proposed collection of information and supporting documentation from Peter Stebbins, Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission at *Peter.Stebbins@usitc.gov,* 202–205–2039, or Zachary Coughlin, Statistical and Data Services Division, U.S. International Trade Commission, at *Zachary.Coughlin@usitc.gov,* 202–205–3435. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202–205–1810. You may also obtain general information concerning the Commission by accessing its website (*http://www.usitc.gov*).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

(1) The generic clearance generally covers the collections of six types of forms, as follows: U.S. producers' questionnaire; U.S. importers' questionnaire; U.S. purchasers' questionnaire; Foreign producers'/exporters' questionnaire; Administrative Protective Order (APO) application form; and Notice of Institution (NOI) for five-year reviews.

(2) The types of items contained within actual information collections issued under this generic clearance are largely determined by statute; however, questions are modified to match the specific facts of each investigation or review. Case-specific factors such as the nature of the industry, the relevant economic and legal issues, the ability of respondents to supply the data, as well as the availability of data from secondary sources are all taken into consideration in each investigation and review.

(3) Once the data are collected from the relevant entities in an information collection under this generic clearance, Commission staff consolidates the information collected into compilations, summaries, and statistical aggregations that are then used as the basis for the Commission's determinations or recommendations in the investigation or review. Affirmative Commission determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty investigations result in the imposition of duties on imports entering the United States, as determined by the U.S. Department of Commerce, which are in addition to any normal customs duties. If the Commission makes an affirmative determination in a five-year review, the existing antidumping or countervailing duty order remains in place. The President or the U.S. Trade Representative may use the data developed in global and bilateral safeguard, market disruption, interference with U.S. Department of Agriculture program, and cross-border long-haul trucking investigations to determine the type of relief, if any, to be provided to domestic industries.

Parties' submissions of the Commission's APO application form for inclusion on the APO are the basis for determining whether those parties are granted access to business proprietary or confidential business information. The submissions made to the Commission in response to the notices of institution of five-year reviews are the basis for the Commission's determination whether to conduct a full or expedited review.

(4) Likely respondents are businesses (including foreign businesses) or farms that produce, import, purchase, or sell products under investigation. The Commission estimates that information collections issued under the requested generic clearance will impose an average annual burden of 409,250 hours on 12,935 respondents over the next three-year generic clearance period.

(5) No new record keeping burden is known to result from the proposed collection of information.

(6) Note that, in addition to the generic clearance public comment process, for every individual antidumping and countervailing duty final investigation or full five-year review, Commission questionnaires are made available to the public on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) and parties specifically subject to the Commission investigation or review are requested to comment on the case-specific

information collections prior to their issuance as part of the Commission's investigatory procedures.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 22, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–12710 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1012 (Fourth Review)]

Certain Frozen Fish Fillets From Vietnam; Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain frozen fish fillets from Vietnam would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on November 3, 2025 (90 FR 55176, December 1, 2025) [2] and determined on March 6, 2026 that it would conduct an expedited review (91 FR 19202, April 14, 2026).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on June 18, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5754 (June 2026), entitled *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets from Vietnam: Investigation No. 731–TA–1012 (Fourth Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 18, 2026.

Susan Orndoff,

Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2026–12651 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] Due to the lapse in appropriations and ensuing cessation of Commission operations, the Commission tolled its schedule for this proceeding.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Amanda Ward, N.D.; Decision and Order

On September 19, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Amanda Marie Ward, N.D., of Encinitas, CA (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. MW1889534, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of California, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).[1]

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds her to be in default. RFAA, at 2.[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.* at 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.[3] 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 April 23, 2024, Registrant surrendered her California naturopathic doctor's license. RFAAX 1, at 2. Further, according to the OSC, Registrant's California naturopathic doctor's license expired by its own terms on August 31, 2025. *Id.* at 1. According to California online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[4] Registrant's California naturopathic doctor's license has a primary status of ''Voluntary Surrender.'' California DCA License Search, *https://search.dca.ca.gov* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Registrant's California naturopathic doctor's license also has a listed expiration date of August 31, 2025. *Id.* Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice as a naturopathic doctor in California, the state in which she is registered with DEA.[5]

[1] According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on May 31, 2026. The fact that a registrant allows her registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.,* 84 FR 68474, 68476–68479 (2019).

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated February 12, 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 November 6, 2025, the DI, along with other DEA personnel, called the phone number associated with Registrant's DEA registration, as well as additional phone numbers linked to Registrant, and left multiple voicemail messages. RFAAX 2, at 1. Registrant did not answer any of the calls or respond to any of the voicemails. *Id.* On the same day, DEA personnel traveled to Registrant's registered address and observed that the location was vacant with an ''Available'' sign in the window. *Id.* at 2. On November 7, 2025, the DI, along with other DEA personnel, traveled to Registrant's residence, but observed that the house appeared vacant, was locked from the exterior, and had no vehicles in the driveway. *Id.* DEA personnel knocked on the front door of this residence, but there was no answer. *Id.* On November 10, 2025, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to the email address associated with Registrant's registration, and the email was not returned as undelivered. *Id.; see also* RFAAX 2, Attachment A. 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)). Therefore, due process notice requirements have been satisfied. *See 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); *Emilio Luna, M.D.,* 77 FR 4829, 4830 (2012) (same).

[3] The RFAA states that ''the Administrator is authorized to render the Agency's final order, without . . . making a finding of fact in this matter.'' RFAA, at 4 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(c), (f), and 1301.46). However, 21 CFR 1316.67 requires that the Administrator's final order ''set forth the final rule and the findings of fact and conclusions of law upon which the rule is based.'' *See JYA LLC d/b/a Webb's Square Pharmacy,* 90 FR 31244, 31246 n.7 (2025).

[4] 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).

[5] Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), ''[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact

Continued