

FR 4630 (Feb. 2, 2026). Specifically, the Commission determined to review: (1) the construction of the claim term “nested hinges” and (2) whether the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid as obvious. *Id.* The notice also reiterates that Order No. 23 remains under review. *Id.* The Commission did not request briefing on any of the issues under review. The notice also requested submissions on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. *Id.* at 4631.

On February 11, 2026, Complainant and Respondents submitted their respective initial submissions on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. On February 18, 2026, Complainant the parties submitted their respective replies.

On February 24, 2026, Respondents submitted a letter requesting that the Commission take judicial notice of a final written decision (“FWD”) issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) finding claims 1, 2, 4–6, 16, 17, and 19–21 of the ’028 patent unpatentable as obvious. On March 5, 2026, the Commission requested additional briefing from the parties on “whether, and to what extent, the FWD should impact the Commission’s determination regarding the validity of the asserted claims of both the ’028 patent and the ’512 patent.” Comm. Not. at 3 (Mar. 5, 2026). On March 12, 2026, the parties submitted their initial responses. On March 19, 2026, the parties submitted their responsive submissions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the FID, the parties’ petitions for review and responses thereto, the parties’ submissions regarding the FWD and responses thereto, and the submissions to the Commission regarding remedy, the public interest, and bonding, the Commission has determined to find a violation of section 337 as to both Asserted Patents. As set forth in the simultaneously-issued Commission opinion, the Commission affirms the construction of the claim term “nested hinges” with modified reasoning. The Commission also affirms the FID’s findings that none of the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid as obvious, with modified and additional reasoning. Finally, the Commission affirms Order No. 23’s finding that Complainant has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(B) with modified reasoning.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief is an LEO prohibiting the unlicensed entry of infringing photodynamic therapy

systems, components thereof, and pharmaceutical products used in combination with the same that are manufactured by or on behalf of Respondents or any of their affiliated companies, parents, subsidiaries, or other related business entities, or their successors or assigns. The Commission has also determined to issue CDOs against each of Respondents. The Commission has determined to suspend the orders as to the ’028 patent in light of the FWD, pending any further action before the Board and any potential appeals.

The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsections (d)(l) and (f)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(l), (f)(1)) do not preclude issuance of the above-referenced remedial orders.

Additionally, the Commission has determined to impose a bond in the amount of zero percent (0%) of the infringing products imported during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)).

The investigation is terminated.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on May 6, 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: May 6, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–09243 Filed 5–8–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–471 and 731–TA–1170 (Final)]

Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses From Indonesia; Denial of Request To Institute a Section 751(b) Review Concerning the Commission’s Affirmative Determinations

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has declined to institute a review pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)) (the Act).

DATES: April 28, 2026

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Celia Feldpausch (202–205–2387), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this matter may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—In November 2010, the Commission determined that an industry in the United States was threatened with material injury by reason of imports of certain coated paper (“CCP”) from China and Indonesia (75 FR 70289, November 17, 2010) that had been found by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), and that had been found by Commerce to be subsidized by the governments of China and Indonesia (75 FR 59209, 75 FR 59212, 75 FR 59217, and 75 FR 59223, September 27, 2010). Effective November 17, 2010, Commerce issued antidumping and countervailing duty orders (75 FR 70201, 75 FR 70203, 75 FR 70205, and 75 FR 70206, November 17, 2010).

Following affirmative determinations in the first five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective January 6, 2017, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia (82 FR 1692, January 6, 2017). Following affirmative determinations in the second five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective June 13, 2022, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia (87 FR 35733, June 13, 2022).

On December 3, 2025, the Commission received a request to review its affirmative determinations in investigation Nos. 701–TA–471 and 731–TA–1170 (Final) pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)). The request was filed by PT. Pindo Deli Pulp and Paper Mills (“Pindo Deli”) and PT. Indah Kiat Pulp

& Paper Tbk. (“Indah Kiat”) (for purposes of this notice, collectively “Requestors”). Requestors argue that structural changes sufficient to warrant a changed circumstances review have occurred within the Indonesian industry since the Commission determined that the domestic industry was threatened with material injury by reason of subject imports from Indonesia. Requestors contend that there has been a “significant” and “permanent” reduction in the capacity to produce the subject merchandise by the industry in Indonesia, which they assert has contracted to only two producers. Requestors further contend that there has been a “marked shift away from exports toward home market sales” such that, in their view, the Indonesian industry producing the subject merchandise “is no longer export oriented.” They argue that these changes have not been the “natural and direct result” of the subject orders but rather of market factors leading to the shifting of capacity and increasing focus on home market sales.

On January 14, 2026, the Commission published a **Federal Register** notice inviting comments from the public on whether changed circumstances exist sufficient to warrant the institution of a changed circumstances review (91 FR 1557, Jan. 14, 2026). Comments in response to this notice were filed on March 4, 2026. The Commission received comments in support of the request from Requestors and comments in opposition to the request from Billerud Americas Corporation and Sappi North America, a petitioner and a successor-in-interest to petitioner NewPage Corp.¹ Requestors also submitted a separate submission in favor of instituting a changed circumstances review.

Analysis

In considering whether to institute a review investigation under section 751(b), the Commission will not institute such an investigation unless it is persuaded there is sufficient information demonstrating:

- (1) that there are significant changed circumstances from those in existence at the time of the original investigation;
- (2) that those changed circumstances are not the natural and direct result of the imposition of the antidumping duty order; and
- (3) that the changed circumstances, allegedly indicating that revocation of

the order would not be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry, warrant a full {review} investigation.²

After consideration of the request for review and the responses to the notice inviting comments, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act and Commission rule 207.45, that the information available to the Commission does not show significant changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an investigation to review the Commission’s affirmative determinations in Investigation Nos. 701–TA–471 and 731–TA–1170: Certain Coated Paper Suitable for Quality Printing Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from Indonesia.

The decision to undertake a review is “a threshold question . . . [which] may be made only when it reasonably appears that positive evidence adduced by the petitioner together with other evidence gathered by the Commission leads the ITC to believe that there are changed circumstances sufficient to warrant review.”³ A party requesting a review must “present facts, which when weighed against the other facts presented, would convince a reasonable decision-maker that a full investigation is necessary to establish whether or not changed circumstances have obviated the need for the order in its present form.”⁴

Requestors allege that CCP production in Indonesia has permanently and significantly declined since the original investigations and that the Indonesian industry is no longer export oriented. The statute calls upon the Commission to “determine whether revocation of the order or finding is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury.”⁵ Requestors have failed to present evidence indicating that the alleged changes to the capacity and export orientation of Indonesian CCP producers are significant changed circumstances to warrant a review. First, with respect to an alleged decline in production, Requestors’ assertions are largely unsubstantiated. Specifically, Requestors rely on: (1) a declaration containing unsubstantiated statements

regarding one Indonesian firm’s purported conversion to manufacturing other products; and (2) tables summarizing the sales and production data for the remaining Indonesian firms that contain no explanation of the methodology that Requestors followed in preparing the tables or any supporting information. Requestors also did not provide any information indicating whether the remaining two firms’ alleged decline in CCP production and production capacity is permanent or whether the firms have converted their CCP production to other uses.

Second, with respect to Requestors’ assertions that the Indonesian CCP industry is no longer export oriented, these too are largely unsubstantiated. As discussed above, the Indonesian Industry’s tables summarizing producers’ sales records from 2021 to the present do not contain any supporting documentation or a sufficient explanation of the methodology used to prepare them. Nor did Requestors submit any other evidence indicating that they would not resume exports to the United States if the orders were revoked or other evidence indicating that they have otherwise reoriented production towards domestic customers in a manner that would preclude export activity.⁶

In addition to not adequately substantiating their assertions, Requestors have not explained why any of the alleged reduction in capacity and/or their export orientation would even rise to the level of changed circumstances indicating that revocation of the orders would not be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry. For example, in prior reviews, the Commission has found the fact that subject Indonesian and Chinese producers demonstrated “a degree of export orientation,” rather than a specific percentage, to be a sufficient basis for continuing the orders.⁷

In addition, Requestors have not adequately explained why the Commission should find that a firm’s decision that it would be more

² *Gray Portland Cement and Cement Clinker from Mexico*, 66 FR 65740, 65741 (Dec. 20, 2001). See, generally, *A. Hirsh, Inc. v. United States*, 737 F. Supp. 1186 (Ct. Int’l Trade 1990); *Avesta AB v. United States*, 724 F. Supp. 974 (Ct. Int’l Trade 1989), *aff’d*, 914 F.2d 232 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 111 S. Ct. 1308 (1991).

³ *Avesta AB v. United States*, 689 F. Supp. 1173, 1180–81 (Ct. Int’l Trade 1988); *A. Hirsh, Inc. v. United States*, 729 F. Supp. 1360, 1363 (Ct. Int’l Trade 1990), *aff’d following remand*, 737 F. Supp. at 1188 (Ct. Int’l Trade 1990).

⁴ *A. Hirsh*, 729 F. Supp. at 1363.

⁵ 19 U.S.C. § 1675(b).

⁶ In the first reviews, which were the last full reviews of the orders, relying on testimony from a respondent industry representative, the Commission noted that “[i]t is . . . undisputed that the Indonesian Industry intends to resume shipping free sheet CCP to the U.S. market if the orders are revoked.” *Certain Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from China and Indonesia*, Inv. Nos. 701–TA–470–471 and 731–TA–1169–1170 (Review), USITC Pub. 4656 (Dec. 2016) (“*First Reviews*”) at 17 & n.89.

⁷ *First Reviews*, USITC Pub. 4656 at 33–34.

¹ The original petitioner, NewPage Corp., was acquired by Verso Paper Corporation in January 2015, and in March 2022, Billerud Americas Corporation acquired Verso Corporation.

beneficial to either shift focus to more home market sales or to shift production capacity to more profitable products after the antidumping and countervailing orders were imposed are not the natural consequence of the orders.⁸

In short, the Commission has determined that the petition does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of a review investigation and has, therefore, dismissed the petition. The Commission notes that the third five-year reviews of the orders on imports of CCP from China and Indonesia are scheduled to commence in May 2027. The Commission's denial of the instant request in no manner prejudices the upcoming five-year reviews.

Authority: This notice is published pursuant to section 207.45 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 6, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-09240 Filed 5-8-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Receipt of Amended Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received an amended complaint entitled *Certain Pickleball Paddles, DN 3898*; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the amended complaint or complainant's filing pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (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 United States International Trade Commission

(USITC) at <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at <https://edis.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 has received an amended complaint and a submission pursuant to § 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Sport Squad, Inc. d/b/a/JOOLA on April 17, 2026. The original complaint was filed on April 7, 2026 and a notice of receipt of complaint; solicitation of comments relating to the public interest published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2026. The amended complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 pickleball paddles. The amended complaint names as respondents: Franklin Sports, Inc. of Stoughton, MA; Proton Sports, Inc. of Scottsdale, AZ; Vegas Pickleball LLC d/b/a RPM Pickleball of Delray Beach, FL; Engage Pickleball, LLC of Oxford, FL; Friday Labs, LLC of San Francisco, CA; Diadem Sports LLC of Pompano Beach, FL; Facolospickleball LLC of Denver, CO; Paddletek, LLC of Niles, MI; ProXR, LLC of Rolla, MO; All Racquet Sports, LLC of Wilmington, DE; All For Padel S.L. of Spain; Volair C Corp., Inc. of Austin, TX; Proton Pickleball, Inc. of Scottsdale, AZ; Engage Sporting, LLC of Oxford, FL; Facolos Sports Joint Stock Company of Vietnam; Paddletek Pickleball, LLC of Dover, DE; ProXR Pickleball, LLC of Dover, DE; Thirty-Five Capital, LLC of Chicago, IL; United Pickleball Properties, LLC of Dover, DE; and UPP Paddles, LLC ("UPP") of Dover DE. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order, cease and desist orders, and impose a bond upon respondents' alleged infringing articles during the 60-day Presidential review period pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(j).

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, members of the public, and interested government agencies are invited to file comments on any public interest issues raised by the amended complaint or § 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States,

competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions on the public interest must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation. Any written submissions on other issues must also be filed by no later than the close of business, eight calendar days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Complainant may file replies to any written submissions no later than three calendar days after the date on which any initial submissions were due, notwithstanding § 201.14(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. No other submissions will be accepted, unless requested by the Commission. Any submissions and replies filed in response to this Notice are limited to five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above. Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 3898") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures¹). Please note the

¹ Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf.

⁸ *Avesta*, 689 F. Supp. at 1184.