

CONNECTICUT**New Haven County**

Scully, Vincent J. and Susannah K., House (Mid-Twentieth-Century Modern Residences in Connecticut 1930–1979, MPS), 68 Orchard Road, Woodbridge, MP100012233

KENTUCKY**Christian County**

Moore, Dr. Bankie Oliver and Mamie, House, 1030 East 4th Street, Hopkinsville, SG100012238

Daviess County

Alexander-Ford Farmhouse, 5785 Highway 144, Thruston, SG100012240

Fayette County

Mentelle House, 116 Lincoln Avenue, Lexington, SG100012239

Hart County

Henrytown Historic District, Bounded by US 31–W, the CSX railroad tracks, McFerran Street, S.R. 335, Peebles and Smith Streets, and Guthrie Street, Horse Cave, SG100012241

Memorial Elementary School (Historic Public Schools of Kentucky MPS), 1400 N Jackson Hwy., Hardyville, MP100012242

McLean County

J.W. Quigg Establishment, 304 Main St., Livermore, SG100012243

Shelby County

Scott's Station Interurban Power House, 3651 Shelbyville Road, Shelbyville, SG100012244

MAINE**Cumberland County**

Reed, Amos O., House, 19 High Street, Brunswick, SG100012234

Hancock County

Wilson Museum, 107 Perkins Street, Castine, SG100012235

MISSISSIPPI**Harrison County**

Greater Biloxi Subdivision, Roughly bounded by Greater Avenue, Althea Street, Southern Avenue, and Orchid Street, Biloxi, SG100012236

NEBRASKA**Fillmore County**

First Congregational United Church of Christ, 906 H St., Geneva, SG100012251

NEW HAMPSHIRE**Hillsborough County**

Kalil House, 117 Heather Street, Manchester, SG100012252

NEW YORK**Monroe County**

Wilkinson-Lent House, 270 Wilkinson Road, Perinton, SG100012250

Suffolk County

High House & Studio, 7134 Indian Neck Lane, Southold (Hamlet of Peconic), SG100012249

VIRGINIA**Richmond INDEPENDENT CITY**

Main Street Banking Historic District (Boundary Decrease), 700 E Main St., 705–711 E Main St., 801 E Main St., 830–838 E Main St., Richmond, BC100012247

WISCONSIN**Crawford County**

Blackhawk Avenue Historic District, 100–225 W Blackhawk Ave., 101–130 E Blackhawk Ave., 201–213 E Blackhawk Ave. (odd only) and 108 N Beaumont Rd., Prairie du Chien, SG100012253

WYOMING**Uinta County**

Evanston Chinatown, China Mary Road (A Avenue) and County Road (Almy Road), Evanston vicinity, SG100012237

Additional documentation has been received for the following resource(s):

VIRGINIA**Richmond INDEPENDENT CITY**

Main Street Banking Historic District (Additional Documentation), 700 E Main St., 705–711 E Main St., 801 E Main St., 830–838 E Main St., Richmond, AD05000527

(Authority: Section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60.)

Sherry A. Frear,

Chief, National Register of Historic Places/ National Historic Landmarks Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–18247 Filed 9–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1392]

Certain Oil Vaporizing Devices, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same; Notice of a Commission Determination To Review and, on Review, To Affirm a Remand Initial Determination Finding That Complainant Has Satisfied the Economic Prong of the Domestic Industry Requirement; Request for Briefing on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (“Commission”) has determined to review a remand initial determination (“RID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”),

finding that PAX Labs, Inc. (“Complainant”) satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. On review, the Commission has determined to affirm the RID’s finding that Complainant satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(A) and (B).¹ The Commission requests written submissions from the parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding, under the schedule set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: B. Rashmi Borah, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2518. 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 March 6, 2024, based on a complaint filed by Complainant. 89 FR 16025–26 (Mar. 6, 2024). The complaint, as 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 oil vaporizing devices, components thereof, and products containing the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 11,369,756 (“the ‘756 patent”); 11,766,527 (“the ‘527 patent”); 11,369,757 (“the ‘757 patent”); and 11,759,580 (“the ‘580 patent”) (together, the “Asserted Patents”). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents STIIIZY IP LLC f/k/a STIIIZY, LLC; STIIIZY, Inc. d/b/a

¹ Commissioner Johanson concurs with the Commission’s finding of a domestic industry under subsection 337(a)(3)(B) based on alternative reasoning as set forth in his separate views in this investigation, and he takes no position on Complainant’s investments under 337(a)(3)(A).

Shryne Group Inc. (collectively, “STIIIZY”); ALD Group Limited; and ALD Hong Kong Holdings (collectively, “ALD”) (together, “Respondents”) *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in the investigation. *Id.*

The Commission previously terminated the investigation as to claims 4 and 21 of the ’527 patent. Order No. 11 (July 11, 2024), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (July 30, 2024). The Commission also terminated the investigation as to claims 2, 3, 6–9, and 11–17 of the ’756 patent; claims 3–8, 10–12, 14, and 17–19 of the ’757 patent; claims 2–3, 6–9, 12–16, 19, 20, 24, 25, and 27–29 of the ’527 patent; and claims 2–5, 9, 12–15, and 19 of the ’580 patent. Order No. 20 (Sept. 6, 2024), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Oct. 7, 2024).

The ALJ held an evidentiary hearing from October 21–23, 2024.

After the hearing, the Commission terminated the investigation as to claims 2, 9, and 16 of the ’757 patent; claims 23, 26, and 30 of the ’527 patent; and claims 11, 16–18, and 20 of the ’580 patent. Order No. 32 (Nov. 8, 2024), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Dec. 10, 2024).

As of the issuance of the final initial determination (“FID”), the remaining asserted claims were: claims 1, 5, and 10 of the ’756 patent; claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 17, 18, and 22 of the ’527 patent; claims 1, 13, 15, and 20 of the ’757 patent; and claims 1, 6–8, and 10 of the ’580 patent.

On March 6, 2025, the ALJ issued the FID finding no violation of section 337. The FID finds that: the accused STIIIZY–LIII, the STIIIZY–1G(C), and the STIIIZY–ORIG–1 products infringe at least one claim of each Asserted Patent; the accused STIIIZY–AIO, the FLARE(C), and the FLARE(V) products each infringe at least one asserted claim of the ’527 and ’580 patents; the accused ROVE(C) and ROVE(V) products each infringe at least one asserted claim of the ’527 patent; the accused STIIIZY Redesigned Products and FLARE–REDESIGNS infringe at least one claim of the ’580 patent; the ROVE(C) and ROVE(V) products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’580 patent; and the accused ROVE–REDESIGNS do not infringe any asserted claim. The FID further finds that Respondents induced infringement and contributorily infringed all asserted claims, none of the asserted claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102, 103, and/or 112, ¶ 1, and Complainant has satisfied the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement for all Asserted Patents. The FID finds, however, that Complainant has not satisfied the

economic prong of the domestic industry requirement for any of the Asserted Patents. *Id.*

The FID also includes the ALJ’s recommended determination (“RD”) on remedy, the public interest, and bonding should the Commission find a violation of section 337. Specifically, the RD recommends that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order barring entry of STIIIZY’s and ALD’s products that infringe the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents. The RD also recommends issuing a cease and desist order directed to STIIIZY, but not to ALD, because ALD does not maintain significant commercial operations in the United States. The RD further recommends that the Commission set a bond of 100 percent for any importations of infringing products during the period of Presidential review.

On March 18, 2025, Complainant filed a petition seeking review of the following findings: (1) that certain accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’580 patent; (2) that certain redesigned products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’756, ’527, or ’757 patent; and (3) that Complainant has not satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. On the same day, Respondents filed a petition seeking review of the following findings: (1) that certain redesigned products infringe the asserted claims of the ’580 patent under the doctrine of equivalents; (2) that claims 1, 6, or 8 of the ’580 patent are not invalid as anticipated; and (3) that Respondents failed to meet their burden to show that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine certain prior art references. Respondents also asked the Commission to determine: (1) whether Complainant’s investments made while the Complainant was a licensee should be counted under subsections (A) or (B) of the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement; (2) whether Complainant fails to satisfy the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement because Complainant’s domestic industry expenditures are based on activities that are illegal under the Controlled Substances Act; and (3) whether Complainant demonstrated that it had a domestic industry on the date the complaint was filed. On March 26, 2025, Complainant and Respondents filed their respective petition responses.

On March 31, 2025, Professor William J. McNichol, Jr., an adjunct professor at Rutgers Law School, submitted a response to the Commission’s **Federal Register** notice seeking public interest submissions. *See* 90 FR 11851–52 (Mar.

12, 2025). On April 7, 2025, the Complainant and ALD filed their respective submissions on the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4). 19 CFR 210.52(a)(4).

On May 16, 2025, the Commission issued a notice indicating that it was reviewing the FID’s findings that: (1) certain accused products do not infringe the ’580 patent; (2) certain redesigned products infringe the ’580 patent; and (3) Complainant has not satisfied its burden as to the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. *See* Comm’n Not. at 3 (May 16, 2025). On review, the Commission determined that “the FID errs by stating as a bright-line rule that ‘pre-issuance investments [are not] cognizable under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 337(a)(3).’” *Id.* The Commission remanded the investigation and directed the ALJ to “consider whether Complainant’s alleged domestic industry investments were made with respect to the articles protected by the patent (*i.e.*, the products that the FID finds satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement), not limited by whether those investments were made post-patent issuance.” Remand Order at 4 (May 16, 2025). The other issues remain under review.

On June 9, 2025, Complainant and Respondents submitted their respective remand briefs. The ALJ did not provide for the parties to file reply briefs.

On July 18, 2025, the ALJ issued the RID finding that Complainant has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(A) and (B).

On July 30, 2025, Respondents submitted a petition for review of the RID. Respondents request review of the RID’s finding that Complainant was an exclusive licensee to the Asserted Patents before June 28, 2022, and that investments made before that date should count towards Complainant’s domestic industry. On August 6, 2025, Complainant submitted a response to Respondents’ petition for review.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the RID and the parties’ submissions, the Commission has determined to review the RID. First, the Commission has determined to supplement the following sentence on page 7 of the RID: “Nor is there a dispute that all investments toward a domestic industry were incurred while [Complainant] was an exclusive licensee to the Asserted Patents.” The Commission notes that Respondents dispute whether Complainant was an exclusive licensee to the Asserted Patents before the Asserted Patents issued. However, Respondents raised

this argument for the first time in their remand submission, and accordingly, this argument is waived. *See, e.g., Certain Fitness Devices, Streaming Components Thereof, and Systems Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1265, Comm'n Op. at 19-20 (Mar. 23, 2023) (finding arguments not made in the pre-hearing brief to be waived). Furthermore, the Commission has determined to modify the following sentence on page 14 of the RID: "The 1.0-gram pod only practices the '757 and '580 patents, so less than 100% of all DI investments are attributable to a domestic industry for these patents" to read: "The 1.0-gram pod is not alleged to practice the '757 and '580 patents, so less than 100% of all DI investments are attributable to a domestic industry for these patents."

The Commission otherwise affirms the RID's finding that Complainant has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(A) and (B), including its subsidiary finding that Complainant was an exclusive licensee when it made its domestic industry investments. The Commission finds that the RID reflects a holistic approach to the domestic industry analysis consistent with the Federal Circuit's recent holding in *Wuhan Healthgen Biotechnology Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 127 F.4th 1334, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2025); *see also Lashify, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 130 F.4th 948, 963 (Fed. Cir. 2025).

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the statute authorizes issuance of, *inter alia*, (1) an exclusion order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States; and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, *see Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7-10 (Dec. 1994).

The statute requires the Commission to consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The public interest factors the Commission will

consider include the effect that an exclusion order and cease and desist orders would have on: (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve, disapprove, or take no action on the Commission's determination. *See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005*, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding.

In its initial submission, Complainant is also requested to identify the remedy sought and to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainant is further requested to state the dates that the Asserted Patents expire, to provide the HTSUS subheadings under which the accused products are imported, and to supply the identification information for all known importers of the products at issue in this investigation. All initial written submissions, from the parties and/or third parties/interested government agencies, and proposed remedial orders from the parties must be filed no later than close of business on October 1, 2025. All reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on October 8, 2025. Opening submissions from the parties are limited to 25 pages. Reply submissions from the parties are limited to 15 pages. All submission from third parties and/or interested government agencies are limited to 10 pages. No further submissions on any of these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above pursuant to 19 CFR 210.4(f). Submissions should refer to the investigation number (Inv. No. 337-TA-1392) in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures*, https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary, (202) 205-2000.

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment by marking each document with a header indicating that the document contains confidential information. This marking will be deemed to satisfy the request procedure set forth in Rules 201.6(b) and 210.5(e)(2) (19 CFR 201.6(b) & 210.5(e)(2)). Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. Any non-party wishing to submit comments containing confidential information must serve those comments on the parties to the investigation pursuant to the applicable Administrative Protective Order. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed with the Commission and served on any parties to the investigation within two business days of any confidential filing. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on September 17, 2025.

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: September 17, 2025.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–18254 Filed 9–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–1600]

Bulk Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Application: Groff Health Inc

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Groff Health Inc has applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of basic class(es) of controlled substance(s). Refer to Supplementary Information listed below for further drug information.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class(es), and applicants, therefore, may submit electronic comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration on or before November 21, 2025. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application on or before November 21, 2025.

ADDRESSES: The Drug Enforcement Administration requires that all comments be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal, which provides the ability to type short comments directly into the comment field on the web page or attach a file for lengthier comments. Please go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and follow the online instructions at that site for submitting comments. Upon submission of your comment, you will receive a Comment Tracking Number. Please be aware that submitted comments are not instantaneously available for public view on <https://www.regulations.gov>. If you have received a Comment Tracking Number, your comment has been successfully submitted and there is no need to resubmit the same comment.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33(a), this is notice that on August 26, 2025, Groff Health Inc, 2218 South Queen Street, York, Pennsylvania 17402–4631, applied to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the following basic class(es) of controlled substance(s):

Controlled substance	Drug code	Schedule
Psilocybin	7437	I
Psilocyn	7438	I

The company plans to bulk manufacture the listed controlled substances for internal use or for sale to its customers. No other activities for these drug codes are authorized for this registration.

Justin Wood,

Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2025–18244 Filed 9–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE;P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey (JOLTS)

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting this Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)-sponsored information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA). Public comments on the ICR are invited.

DATES: The OMB will consider all written comments that the agency receives on or before October 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function.

Comments are invited on: (1) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency’s estimates of the burden and cost of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nicole Bouchet by telephone at 202–693–0213, or by email at DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey collects data on job vacancies, labor hires, and labor separations. The data can be used as demand-side indicators of labor shortages. These indicators of labor shortages at the national level greatly enhance policy makers’ understanding of imbalances between the demand and supply of labor. Presently there is no other economic indicator of labor demand with which to assess the presence of labor shortages in the U.S. labor market. The availability of unfilled jobs is an important measure of tightness of job markets, symmetrical to unemployment measures. For additional substantive information about this ICR, see the related notice published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 2025 (90 FRN 29893).

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless the OMB approves it and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid OMB Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6.

Agency: DOL–BLS.

Title of Collection: Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey (JOLTS).

OMB Control Number: 1220–0170.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profits; State, Local, or Tribal Governments; Federal Government.

Total Estimated Number of Respondents: 6,446.

Total Estimated Number of Responses: 77,352.

Total Estimated Annual Time Burden: 12,892 hours.

Total Estimated Annual Other Costs Burden: \$0.

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D))

Nicole Bouchet,

Senior Paperwork Reduction Act Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2025–18265 Filed 9–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–P