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)(l), 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. l337(d)(l), (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*].

2016); *but see United States* v. *Mississippi,* 82 F.4th 387, 393–94 (5th Cir. 2023). The Department is concerned about confusion over the non-enforceable nature of the *Olmstead* Guidance and issues this clarification that the *Olmstead* Guidance is not enforceable.

Further, the *Olmstead* Guidance was issued prior to the Supreme Court's decision in *Loper Bright,* 603 U.S. at 400, which held that agency interpretations must be consistent with the "single, best meaning" of the statute authorizing them. For these reasons, the Department plans to revisit the *Olmstead* Guidance in light of *Loper Bright* to determine whether the *Olmstead* Guidance is consistent with the "single, best meaning" of the ADA. The Department will not rely upon the *Olmstead* Guidance in its enforcement of Title II of the ADA.

Dated: July 13, 2026.

Harmeet K. Dhillon,

Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2026–14566 Filed 7–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–13–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–244; NRC–2026–3104]

Constellation Energy Generation, LLC; R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; Subsequent License Renewal Application

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Acceptance for docketing; opportunity to request a hearing and petition for leave to intervene.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) is considering an application for the subsequent renewal of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–18, which authorizes Constellation Energy Generation, LLC (CEG, the applicant), to operate R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (Ginna). The subsequent renewed license would authorize CEG to operate Ginna for an additional 20 years beyond the period specified in the current renewed license. The current renewed license for Ginna expires September 18, 2029.

DATES: Requests for a hearing or petitions for leave to intervene must be filed by September 18, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2026–3104 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly available information related to this action using any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Website:* Go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2026–3104. Address questions about Docket IDs in *Regulations.gov*to Bridget Curran; telephone: 301–415–1003; email *Bridget.Curran@nrc.gov.* For technical questions, contact the individual(s) listed in the "For Further Information Contact" section of this document.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at *https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select "Begin ADAMS Public Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, at 301–415–4737, or by email to *PDR.Resource@nrc.gov.* The subsequent license renewal application is available in ADAMS under Package Accession No. ML26168A222.
- *Public Library:* A copy of the subsequent license renewal application can be accessed at the following public library: Lyons Public Library, 122 Broad Street, Lyons, NY 14489.
- *NRC's PDR:* The PDR, where you may examine and order copies of publicly available documents, is open by appointment. To make an appointment to visit the PDR, please send an email to *PDR.Resource@nrc.gov* or call 1–800–397–4209 or 301–415–4737, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. eastern time (ET), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Harris, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–2277; email: *Brian.Harris2@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

The NRC received a subsequent license renewal application (SLRA) from Constellation Energy Generation, LLC (CEG, the applicant) dated June 17, 2026, requesting subsequent renewal of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–18, which authorizes CEG to operate R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (Ginna) up to 1,775 megawatts thermal. Ginna is located in Wayne County, New York. CEG submitted the SLRA pursuant to part 54 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants." A notice of receipt of the SLRA was published in the **Federal Register** on June 29, 2026 (91 FR 39125).

The NRC staff has determined that CEG has submitted sufficient information in accordance with 10 CFR 54.19, 54.21, 54.22, 54.23, 51.45, and 51.53(c) to enable the staff to undertake a review of the SLRA and that, therefore, the SLRA is acceptable for docketing. The current docket number, 50–244, for Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR–18 will be retained. The determination to accept the SLRA for docketing does not constitute a determination that a subsequent renewed license should be issued and does not preclude the NRC staff from requesting additional information as the review proceeds.

Before issuance of the requested subsequent renewed license, the NRC will have made the findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. In accordance with 10 CFR 54.29, the NRC may issue a subsequent renewed license on the basis of its review if it finds that actions have been identified and have been or will be taken with respect to: (1) managing the effects of aging during the period of extended operation on the functionality of structures and components that have been identified as requiring aging management review; and (2) time-limited aging analyses that have been identified as requiring review, such that there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the subsequent renewed license will continue to be conducted in accordance with the current licensing basis and that any changes made to the plant's current licensing basis will comply with the Act and the Commission's regulations.

The NRC staff will also complete an environmental review of the application and will document its findings in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions." The staff will prepare an environmental assessment that will be used to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary, or a finding of no significant impact is warranted to satisfy the NRC's NEPA obligations. In considering the SLRA, 10 CFR 54.29 requires that the Commission must find that the applicable requirements of subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 have been satisfied and that any matters raised under 10 CFR 2.335 have been addressed.