

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

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under 21 U.S.C. 823 “upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended . . . [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.” With respect to a practitioner, DEA has also long held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner’s registration. *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 270 (2006). (“The Attorney General can register a physician to dispense controlled substances ‘if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.’ . . . The very definition of a ‘practitioner’ eligible to prescribe includes physicians ‘licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices’ to dispense controlled substances. § 802(21).”). The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR 71371, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App’x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Rachel Jackson, P.A.*, 90 FR 13198, 13198–13199 (2025); *Merry Alice Troupe, N.P.*, 89 FR 81549, 81549–81550 (2024); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978).⁶

not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.” The material fact here is that Registrant, as of the date of this Order, is not licensed to practice medicine in California. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency’s finding by filing a properly supported motion for reconsideration of findings of fact within fifteen calendar days of the date of this Order. Any such motion and response shall be filed and served by email to the other party and to the Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

⁶ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined the term “practitioner” to mean “a physician . . . or other person licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . , to distribute, dispense, . . . [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.” 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner’s registration, Congress directed that “[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.” 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner’s registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer

According to California statute, “dispense” means “to deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user or research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the prescribing, furnishing, packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the substance for that delivery.” Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11010 (2026). Further, a “practitioner” means a person “licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted, to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or administer, a controlled substance in the course of professional practice or research in [the] state.” *Id.* at § 11026(c).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California. As discussed above, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense a controlled substance in California. Thus, because Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in California and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in California, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant’s DEA registration be revoked.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. MW1889534 issued to Amanda Ward, N.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Amanda Ward, N.D., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Amanda Ward, N.D., for additional registration in California. This Order is effective July 24, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on June 12, 2026, by DEA Administrator Terrance C. Cole. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for

authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.

publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Heather Achbach,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–12652 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Irina Gross, D.P.M.; Decision and Order

On November 17, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Irina Gross, D.P.M., of Chagrin Falls, Ohio (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. FG2593487, 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 Ohio, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.” *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

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. RFAAX 1, 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 1.¹ “A default, unless excused, shall be

¹ Based on the Government’s submissions in its RFAA dated February 5, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that shortly after the DI received a copy of the OSC, the DI attempted to locate Registrant for personal service, however, the DI was unsuccessful. RFAAX, at 2. On or about November 24, 2025, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to two different registered email addresses for Registrant, and the delivery of those emails was successful. *Id.*; *see also* RFAAX 3, at 2–3 (notifications of successful delivery of both emails). 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)); *see also* *Mohammed 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).