

U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-1802.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2025).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on April 27, 2026, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 5-12, and 15-19 of the '235 patent; claims 1-7, 13-18, and 20 of the '983 patent; claims 1-9 of the '425 patent; claims 1-14 of the '546 patent; claims 1-12, 14, and 16-18 of the '748 patent; and claims 1-6 of the '167 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is "certain semiconductor devices manufactured using Tower's RF, power management, BCD, logic, SiGe, and BiCMOS processes, including wafers and chips, and components thereof";

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:

GlobalFoundries U.S. Inc., 400 Stonebreak Road Extension, Malta, NY 12020

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Tower Semiconductor Ltd., Ramat Gavriel Industrial Park, 20 Shaul Amor Avenue, P.O. Box 619, Migdal Haemek, 2310502, Israel

Tower Partners Semiconductor Co., Ltd., 800 Higashiyama, Uozu-city Toyama, 937-8585, Japan

Tower Semiconductor Italy S.R.L. (Italy), Via Marco De Marchi 7, 20121 Milano (MI), Italy

Tower US Holdings, Inc., 4321 Jamboree Road, Newport Beach, California 92660

Tower Semiconductor San Antonio, Inc., 9651 Westover Hills Boulevard, San Antonio, Texas 78251

Tower NPB Holdings, Inc., 2570 N 1st Street, Suite 480, San Jose, California 95131

Tower Semiconductor Newport Beach, Inc., 4321 Jamboree Road, Newport Beach, California 92660

Newport Fab LLC, 4321 Jamboree Road, Newport Beach, California 92660

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

The Office of Unfair Import Investigations will not participate as a party in this investigation.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 28, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-08439 Filed 4-29-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1465]

Certain Semiconductor Devices, Computing Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Joint Motion To Terminate the Investigation in Its Entirety; Termination of the Investigation in Its Entirety

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 11), granting a joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement and withdrawal of the complaint. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cathy Chen, 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 19, 2025, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Adeia, Inc., Adeia Semiconductor Bonding Technologies, Inc., and Adeia Holdings Inc., all of San Jose, CA (collectively, "Adeia"). 90 FR 59,579-580 (Dec. 19, 2025). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged 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 semiconductor devices, computing products containing the same, and components thereof by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S.

Patent No. 11,978,681; U.S. Patent No. 12,199,069; U.S. Patent No. 12,322,650; and U.S. Patent No. 12,381,173. The complaint, as supplemented, 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 Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. ("AMD") of Santa Clara, CA; Lenovo (United States) Inc. of Morrisville, NC; Lenovo Group Limited of Hong Kong; Lenovo Information Products (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen, China, and Super Micro Computer, Inc. of San Jose, CA, as respondents. *Id.* at 59,580. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") was also named as a party in this investigation.

On March 11, 2026, Complainant Adeia and Respondent AMD moved to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement between Adeia and AMD. *See* Order No. 11 at 1 (Mar. 31, 2026). Additionally, Adeia moved to withdraw the complaint as to the other respondents in the investigation and limit service of the agreement. *Id.* On March 19, 2026, the ALJ issued Order No. 10, finding the motion did not comply with Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1) because the "public version of the settlement agreement was over-redacted." Order No. 10 at 1–2 (Mar. 19, 2026); *see* 19 CFR 210.21(b)(1). The ALJ directed Adeia and AMD to file an amended public version of the agreement. *Id.* at 2. OUII filed a statement in support of the motion to the extent Adeia and AMD comply with Order No. 10. On March 27, 2026, an amended public version of the agreement was filed.

On March 31, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 11), granting the joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation as to AMD based on a settlement agreement and as to the remaining respondents based on withdrawal of the complaint. The ID found the motion with the amended public version of the settlement agreement complies with the Commission Rules. Order No. 11 at 2. The ID also found that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant denying the motion and there is no evidence indicating that terminating this investigation based on the agreement would be contrary to the public interest. *Id.* at 2–3. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on April 27, 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: April 27, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–08384 Filed 4–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1046 (Fourth Review)]

Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol From China; Determination

On the basis of the record¹ 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 Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol from China 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 October 1, 2025 (90 FR 47328), and determined on February 23, 2026, that it would conduct an expedited review (91 FR 13334, March 19, 2026).²

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 April 27, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5731 (April 2026), entitled *Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–1046 (Fourth Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

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. The schedule was revised in a subsequent notice published in the **Federal Register** on December 2, 2025 (91 FR 13334).

Issued: April 27, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–08362 Filed 4–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Second Modification To Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act

On April 23, 2026, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Second Modification to Consent Decree (the "Modification") with the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota in the lawsuit entitled *United States of America v. City of Minot*, Civil Action No. 4:95–cv–141.

The lawsuit was initiated by a complaint filed by the United States on October 26, 1995, alleging that the City of Minot (the "City") was liable for the release of hazardous substances at and from the Old Minot Landfill Superfund Site in Minot, North Dakota (the "Site") under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980. The complaint was resolved by settlement through a Consent Decree that was joined by the State of North Dakota and entered by the Court on February 7, 1996 ("1996 Consent Decree"). Under the 1996 Consent Decree, the City agreed to remediate the Old Minot Landfill and impose institutional controls restricting the future use of the land.

The Modification amends the 1996 Consent Decree to allow for the City to re-purpose the Site for recreational uses such as an 18-hole disc golf course, mountain biking trails, and cross-country running trails. The Modification is made possible by an Explanation of Significant Differences issued by EPA on September 28, 2022, which amended the original Record of Decision that had required a more restrictive post-cleanup land use for the Site. The Modification also makes several technical changes to the 1996 Consent Decree.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Modification, which should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States of America v. City of Minot*, Civil Action No. 4:95–cv–141, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–1107. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice.