

Conference.—The Office of Investigations will hold a staff conference in connection with the preliminary phase of these investigations beginning at 9:30 a.m. on August 5, 2026. Requests to appear at the conference should be emailed to preliminaryconferences@usitc.gov (DO NOT FILE ON EDIS) on or before noon on August 3, 2026. Please provide an email address for each conference participant in the email. Information on conference procedures, format, and participation, including guidance for requests to appear as a witness via videoconference, will be available on the Commission's Public Calendar (Calendar (USITC) | United States International Trade Commission). A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to participate by submitting a short statement.

Please note the Secretary's Office will accept only electronic filings during this time. Filings must be made through the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, <https://edis.usitc.gov>). No in-person paper-based filings or paper copies of any electronic filings will be accepted until further notice.

Written submissions.—As provided in §§ 201.8 and 207.15 of the Commission's rules, any person may submit to the Commission on or before 5:15 p.m. on August 10, 2026, a written brief containing information and arguments pertinent to the subject matter of the investigations. Parties shall file written testimony and supplementary material in connection with their presentation at the conference no later than 4:00 p.m. on August 4, 2026. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of § 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on Filing Procedures*, available on the Commission's website at https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Certification.—Pursuant to § 207.3 of the Commission's rules, any person

submitting information to the Commission in connection with these investigations must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter's knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will acknowledge that any information that it submits to the Commission during these investigations may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of these or related investigations or reviews, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 16, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-14594 Filed 7-17-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1511]

Certain Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Devices, Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof (II); Notice of Institution of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on June 16, 2026, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on behalf of Netlist, Inc. of Irvine, California. Supplements to the complaint were filed on June 24 and 25, 2026. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain dynamic random access memory (DRAM) devices, products containing the same, and components thereof by reason of the infringement of certain

claims of U.S. Patent No. 12,646,537 ("the '537 patent") and U.S. Patent No. 12,650,937 ("the '937 patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by the applicable Federal Statute. The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained 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 at <https://www.usitc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Pathenia M. Proctor, The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

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 July 15, 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 1-8, 10, 11, 14-17, 19, and 20 of the '537 patent and claims 1-7 and 18-20 of the '937 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established 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 “dynamic random access memory devices (specifically DDR5 generation DIMM and high bandwidth memory (HBM)), products containing the same (such as servers, computing systems, and storage systems), and components thereof”;

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties or other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(4) 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:

Netlist, Inc., 111 Academy Way, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92617

(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:

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., 129 Samsung-ro, Yeongtong-gu, Suwon, Gyeonggi-do, 443-742, Republic of Korea

Samsung Electronics America, Inc., 6625 Excellence Way, Plano, TX 75023

Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., 6625 Excellence Way, Plano, TX 75023

Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043
Super Micro Computer, Inc., 980 Rock Ave., San Jose, CA 95131

NVIDIA Corp., 2788 San Tomas Expressway, Santa Clara, CA 95051
Broadcom Inc., 3421 Hillview Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94304

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

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

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: July 15, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-14535 Filed 7-17-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Clarification on Department of Justice Guidance Titled, “Statement of the Department of Justice on Enforcement of the Integration Mandate of Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act and *Olmstead v. L.C.*”

AGENCY: Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice; clarification.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (the Department) is issuing this document to clarify that the guidance issued by the Department on June 22, 2011, and last updated February 28, 2020, titled “Statement of the Department of Justice on Enforcement of the Integration Mandate of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and *Olmstead v. L.C.*” (*Olmstead* Guidance), and similar guidance documents are not enforceable. In addition, the Department plans to revisit the *Olmstead* Guidance in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 400 (2024), to assess whether the *Olmstead* Guidance is consistent with the single best meaning of the relevant statutory text. The Department will not rely upon the

Olmstead Guidance in its enforcement of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis E. Perez, Director, Disability Rights Section, Civil Rights Division, 202-320-6683.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 22, 2011, the Department issued a guidance document titled, “Statement of the Department of Justice on Enforcement of the Integration Mandate of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and *Olmstead v. L.C.*”¹ The *Olmstead* Guidance states, “To assist individuals in understanding their rights under Title II of the ADA and its integration mandate, and to assist state and local governments in complying with the ADA, the Department of Justice has created this technical assistance guide.” It provides eighteen questions and answers regarding enforcement of the Supreme Court's decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999).

The *Olmstead* Guidance concludes: “Guidance documents posted to this website are not intended to be a final agency action, have no legally binding effect, and have no force or effect of law. The documents may be rescinded or modified in the Department's complete discretion, in accordance with applicable laws. The Department's guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities beyond what is required by the terms of the applicable statutes, regulations, or binding judicial precedent.”² This is consistent with Supreme Court jurisprudence, which has held that guidance documents “do not have the force and effect of law.” *Perez v. Mortgage Bankers Ass'n*, 575 U.S. 92, 97 (2015) (quoting *Shalala v. Guernsey Mem'l Hosp.*, 514 U.S. 87, 99 (1995)). Despite the non-enforceable nature of the *Olmstead* Guidance, numerous courts have treated the *Olmstead* Guidance as authoritative. See *Davis v. Shah*, 821 F.3d 231, 263 (2d Cir. 2016); *Pashby v. Delia*, 709 F.3d 307, 322 (4th Cir. 2013); *Waskul v. Washtenaw Cnty. Cmty. Mental Health*, 979 F.3d 426, 460-61 (6th Cir. 2020); *Steimel v. Wernert*, 823 F.3d 902, 914 (7th Cir.

¹ U.S. Dep't of Just., *Statement of the Department of Justice on Enforcement of the Integration Mandate of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Olmstead v. L.C.*, ADA.gov (last updated Feb. 28, 2020), <https://www.ada.gov/resources/olmstead-mandate-statement/> [<https://perma.cc/65V6-QGXW>].

² See also U.S. Dep't of Just., Just. Manual § 1-19.000 (last updated Apr. 2022), <https://www.justice.gov/jm/1-19000-limitation-issuance-guidance-documents-1> [<https://perma.cc/E35H-F7FF>].