

Regulations, including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (91 FR 13996, March 24, 2026). The FTZ staff examiner reviewed the application and determined that it meets the criteria for approval. Pursuant to the authority delegated to the FTZ Board Executive Secretary (15 CFR 400.36(f)), the application to establish Subzone 104Y was approved on May 27, 2026, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including section 400.13, and further subject to FTZ 104's 2,000-acre activation limit.

Dated: May 27, 2026.

Elizabeth Whiteman,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026-10797 Filed 5-28-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

In the Matter of: Hans De Geetere, Paul Parmentierlaan 121, 8300 Knokke Heist, Belgium, and Nyckestraat 4, 8300 Knokke Heist, Belgium, Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management, a/k/a Hasa Invest, Paul Parmentierlaan 121, 8300 Knokke Heist, Belgium, and Nyckestraat 4, 8300 Knokke Heist, Belgium; Final Decision and Order

Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations (“Regulations”), 15 CFR parts 730–774, authorizes the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement (“Assistant Secretary”) to issue a Temporary Denial Order (“TDO”) for a period of up to 180 days to prevent an “imminent violation” of the Regulations. 15 CFR 766.24(b)(1), (b)(4).

On August 26, 2022, the Assistant Secretary issued a TDO against Hans De Geetere and his company, Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management (collectively, “Appellants”). See 87 FR 53716 (Sep. 1, 2022). The TDO stated that De Geetere engaged in conduct prohibited by the Regulations by acquiring or attempting to acquire under false pretenses items subject to the Regulations on behalf of prohibited end-users or for prohibited end uses. *Id.* The TDO was effective immediately and remained in effect for 180 days; it expired on February 22, 2023. *Id.* at 53718.

On February 11, 2026, the Appellants filed an appeal of the TDO under § 766.24(e)(3) of the Regulations. Litigation commenced, and on May 14, 2026, Administrative Law Judge Timothy G. Stueve issued a decision recommending dismissal of Appellants’

challenge as moot given that the TDO expired in February 2023 and was never renewed.¹ Judge Stueve further explained that the additional forms of relief requested by Appellants were not within the scope of § 766.24 of the Regulations.

Based on my review of the record, I accept Judge Stueve’s recommended decision. This appeal is therefore dismissed. This Final Decision and Order shall be served on Appellants and on BIS and it and the Recommended Decision shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This Order, which constitutes the Department’s final decision regarding this appeal, is effective immediately.

Dated: May 26, 2026.

Jeffrey I. Kessler,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

United States Department of Commerce

Bureau of Industry and Security

Washington, DC 20230

In the Matter of:

Docket Number: 26–BIS–TDO1 Hans De Geetere And Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management a/k/a Hasa-Invest Appellants.

Recommended Decision

Issued by: The Honorable Timothy Stueve, Administrative Law Judge

Issued: May 14, 2026

On February 12, 2026, the United States Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Docketing Center received an Appeal and Motion to Vacate filed by Hans De Geetere and Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management (collectively, Appellants) pursuant to 15 CFR 766.24(e). Appellants request I vacate the temporary denial order (TDO) issued on August 26, 2022, based on newly discovered evidence not previously available. For the reasons set forth below, I recommend this appeal be *dismissed* as moot.

Background

On August 26, 2022, BIS issued a TDO against Appellants based upon an investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement (OEE). Pursuant to 15 CFR 766.24(d)(1), TDOs are only valid for 180 days absent renewal, thus Appellants’ TDO expired on February 22, 2023. BIS did not seek renewal of the TDO. Further, BIS notes Appellants were subsequently added to BIS’s Entity List, a separate and distinct list from the

¹ The Office of the Under Secretary for Industry and Security received a certified copy of Judge Stueve’s recommended decision on May 18, 2026.

Denied Persons List, for acting contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States.

Appellants state their appeal is based on newly discovered evidence recently provided by the Belgian government, which was not available to Appellants at the time of the 2022 TDO. Appellants requested the 2022 TDO be vacated and various forms of relief including: (1) an investigation into alleged false statements made during the investigation; (2) the production of documents referenced in a government affidavit made at the time of the TDO; (3) costs and attorney’s fees; (4) expungement of all references to this matter from export control databases and public records; and (5) issuance of a public correction acknowledging that the 2022 TDO was improper. Appeal at 5.

BIS filed its response on February 26, 2026, arguing the appeal should be dismissed as moot or otherwise denied because the TDO issued against Appellants has expired. BIS did not seek renewal, despite Appellants’ contention the TDO has been renewed. Thus, BIS asserts Appellants do not have standing to bring an appeal.² This matter was assigned to me on May 6, 2026 for adjudication. Per BIS regulations, an ALJ shall issue a recommended decision within 10 working days after receipt of the appeal. 15 CFR 766.24(e)(4). However, due to the recent Department of Homeland Security funding hiatus, our office was unable to process this appeal when it was initially filed. The Department of Homeland Security was funded on April 30, 2026. As such, the 10 day deadline to issue a recommended decision started on May 6, 2026, when this case was assigned to me. The record is now closed, and the appeal is ripe for decision.

Recommended Findings of Fact

1. On August 26, 2022, the Assistant Secretary of Export Enforcement (Assistant Secretary) issue a TDO against Appellants. BIS Exhibit 1.³
2. The TDO expired on February 22, 2023. 15 CFR 766.24(d)(1)
3. BIS did not seek renewal of the TDO at any time. BIS Exhibit 1.

² On May 7, 2026, Appellants filed a reply to BIS’ response which I do not consider a part of the record because Appellants did not ask permission from the Court to file a reply and the regulations do not afford appellants the right to file a reply.

³ “BIS Exhibit” references the exhibits attached to BIS’s Response dated February 26, 2026.

Opinion and Recommended Conclusions of Law

BIS regulations related to export administration are issued “under laws relating to the control of certain exports, reexports, and activities.” 15 CFR 730.1.5. These export control provisions “are intended to serve the national security, foreign policy, nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and other interests of the United States.” 15 CFR 730.6. To prevent an imminent violation of the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), the Assistant Secretary may issue a TDO on an ex parte basis. 15 CFR 766.24(a). The TDO “will deny export privileges to any person named in the order as provided for in § 764.3(a)(2) of the EAR.” 15 CFR 766.24(a). The order is valid for 180 days, but the Assistant Secretary may renew it, more than once, in additional 180-day increments. 15 CFR 766.24(b)(4), 766.24(d)(4).

BIS regulations afford respondents the right to appeal a TDO. Specifically, “[a] respondent may, at any time, file an appeal of the initial or renewed temporary denial order with the administrative law judge.” 15 CFR

766.24(e)(1)(i). “A respondent may appeal on the grounds that the finding that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation is unsupported.” 15 CFR 766.24(e)(2). Within 10 working days after an appeal is filed, the administrative law judge shall submit a recommended decision to the Under Secretary. 15 CFR 766.24(e)(4). The regulations limit the scope of the recommended decision. The ALJ may only recommend whether the issuance or the renewal of the temporary denial order should be affirmed, modified or vacated. 15 CFR 766.24(e)(4).

Having outlined the relevant law governing this appeal, I now turn to the facts of in this case and conclude the appeal is moot because there is no valid TDO against Appellants. Here, BIS issued a TDO in August 2022 and the TDO expired February of 2023. Appellants have not provided any evidence that the 2022 TDO was renewed despite arguing such. BIS indicated it did not seek renewal of the 2022 TDO. Because there is no current TDO, I am dismissing Appellants appeal as moot because I cannot provide a

recommended decision on the merits in accordance with the regulations on an expired TDO. Specifically, I cannot affirm, modify or vacate an expired TDO nor can I evaluate whether the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation because there is no current order against Appellants. Doing so would hold no legal significance. Moreover, the additional forms of relief requested by Appellants outlined above are not within the scope of 15 CFR 766.24. Even if BIS erred in issuing the 2022 TDO, and that TDO was current, I cannot lawfully direct BIS to (1) perform an investigation into alleged false statements made during the investigation; (2) produce documents referenced in a government affidavit made at the time of the TDO; (3) provide costs and attorney’s fees; (4) expunge all references to this matter from export control databases and public records; or (5) issue of a public correction acknowledging that the 2022 TDO was improper. Considering the above, I recommend this appeal be *dismissed* as moot.

Done and dated May 14, 2026, at
Alameda, California



Honorable Timothy G. Stueve
Administrative Law Judge
U.S. Coast Guard

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing **ORDER** upon the following parties as indicated below:

ALJ Docketing Center
Attention: Hearing Docket Clerk
40 South Gay Street, Room 412
Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022
Email: aljdocketcenter@uscg.mil
Telephone: (410) 962-5100
Facsimile: (410) 962-1746
Sent electronically via email

Gregory Michelsen, Attorney-Advisor
Attorneys for Bureau of Industry and Security
Office of Chief Counsel for Industry and Security
U.S. Department of Commerce, Room H-3839
14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230
Email: gmichelsen@doc.gov
Sent electronically via email

Hans De Geetere
Email: slimslimmer@me.com
Sent electronically via email

I hereby certify that I have forwarded by Express Courier the foregoing Recommended Decision and the case file upon the following:

Jeffrey Kessler
Under Secretary for Industry and Security
Bureau of Industry and Security
U.S. Department of Commerce
1401 Constitution Ave., NW Room 3896
Washington, DC 20230
Sent by Federal Express

Done and dated May 14, 2026, at
Alameda, California

Beth Kim

Beth Kim
Paralegal Specialist to the
Administrative Law Judge

[FR Doc. 2026–10682 Filed 5–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[A–337–804, A–570–851, A–533–813, A–560–802]

Certain Preserved Mushrooms From Chile, the People’s Republic of China, India, and Indonesia: Final Results of the Expedited Fifth Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders**AGENCY:** Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) orders on certain preserved mushrooms (mushrooms) from Chile, the People’s Republic of China (China), India, and Indonesia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, at the levels indicated in the “Final Results of Sunset Reviews” section of this notice.**DATES:** Applicable May 29, 2026.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David De Falco, Trade Agreements Policy and Negotiations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2178.**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

On December 2, 1998, and February 19, 1999, Commerce published the AD orders on mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia in the *Federal Register*.¹ On February 2, 2026, Commerce published the notice of initiation of these fifth sunset reviews of the *Orders*, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act).²

On February 12, 2026, Commerce received a timely and complete notice of intent to participate in the sunset

¹ See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile*, 63 FR 66529 (December 2, 1998) (*Chile Order*); *Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People’s Republic of China*, 64 FR 8308 (February 19, 1999) (*China Order*); *Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India*, 64 FR 8311 (February 19, 1999) (*India Order*); and *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Indonesia*, 64 FR 8310 (February 19, 1999) (*Indonesia Order*) (collectively, *Orders*).

² See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 91 FR 4499 (February 2, 2026).

reviews from Giorgio Foods, Inc. (the domestic interested party) within the deadline specified in the 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i).³ The domestic interested party claimed the interested party status within the meaning of section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a producer of the domestic like product.⁴ On February 20, 2026, Commerce notified the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) that it had received a notice of intent to participate from the domestic interested party.⁵

On March 3, 2026, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i), the domestic interested party filed a timely and adequate substantive response.⁶ Commerce did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party. On March 27, 2026, Commerce notified the ITC that it did not receive substantive response from any respondent interested parties.⁷ As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), Commerce is conducting an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the *Order*.

Scope of the Orders

The product covered by these *Orders* is mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia. For the full description

³ See Domestic Interested Party’s Letter, “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile—Domestic Interested Party’s Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated February 12, 2026; “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People’s Republic of China—Domestic Interested Party’s Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated February 12, 2026; “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India—Domestic Interested Party’s Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated February 12, 2026; “Five-Year (5th Sunset) review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Indonesia—Domestic Interested Party’s Notice of Intent to Participate,” dated February 12, 2026.

⁴ *Id.* at 2.

⁵ See Commerce’s Letter, “Sunset Reviews Initiated on February 2, 2026,” dated February 20, 2026.

⁶ See Domestic Interested Party’s Letter, “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile—Domestic Interested Party’s Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation,” dated March 3, 2026; “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from the People’s Republic of China—Domestic Interested Party’s Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation,” dated March 3, 2026; “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India—Domestic Interested Party’s Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation,” dated March 3, 2026; and “Five-Year (5th Sunset) Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Indonesia—Domestic Interested Party’s Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation,” dated March 3, 2026.

⁷ See Commerce’s Letter, “Sunset Reviews Initiated on February 2, 2026,” dated March 27, 2026.

of the scope of the *Orders*, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁸

Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review, including the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping in the event of revocation of the *Orders* and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the *Orders* were to be revoked, is provided in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁹ A list of the topics discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is attached in the appendix to this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be directly accessed at <https://access.trade.gov/frnotices>.

Final Results of Sunset Reviews

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1), 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, Commerce determines that revocation of the *Orders* would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail would be weighted-average dumping margins up to 148.51 percent for Chile, 198.63 percent for China, 243.87 percent for India, and 16.24 percent for Indonesia.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Order (APO)

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to an APO of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective, orders is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these final results in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act,

⁸ See Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Expedited Fifth Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, the People’s Republic of China, India, and Indonesia,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

⁹ *Id.*