

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 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 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

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*

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

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