INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 751–TA–30 (Changed Circumstances Review)]

Fresh Tomatoes From Mexico; Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject review, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to Section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that changed circumstances sufficient to warrant revocation of the antidumping duty order on fresh tomatoes from Mexico do not exist.[2]

Background

On May 9, 2025, the Commission received a request filed on behalf of Bioparques de Occidente, S.A. de C.V., Agricola La Primavera, S.A. de C.V., and Kaliroy Fresh, LLC (''Bioparques Group'') to review its affirmative determination in antidumping duty investigation No. 731–TA–747 (Final). After consideration of the request for review and of responses to a **Federal Register** notice inviting comments (90 FR 26065), the Commission instituted investigation No. 751–TA–30 effective January 21, 2026 (91 FR 3216). Notice of the scheduling of the review and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on January 26, 2026 (91 FR 3216).[3] The Commission conducted its hearing on May 19, 2026. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on July 20, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5762 (July 2026), entitled *Fresh Tomatoes from Mexico: Investigation No. 751–TA–30 (Changed Circumstances Review).*

By order of the Commission.

[1] The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] Chairman David S. Johanson was recused and did not participate in this review.

[3] The period between the request by the Bioparques Group and the Commission's institution of the subject review included a lapse in appropriations and ensuing cessation of Commission operations.

Issued: July 20, 2026.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory and Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2026–14884 Filed 7–22–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Edwards LifeSciences Corp. and Genesis MedTech Group Limited; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America* v. *Edwards LifeSciences Corp. and Genesis MedTech Group Limited,* Civil Action No. 1:26–cv–02450. On July 13, 2026, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Edwards' acquisition of JC Medical, Inc. from Genesis violated the HSR Act, 15 U.S.C. 18a. The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires Edwards to pay a civil penalty of $10 million dollars, institute an antitrust compliance program, and to provide the FTC notice prior to acquiring any part of a firm that is selling or conducting clinical trials in the United States for a transcatheter aortic valve replacement for aortic regurgitation (''TAVR–AR'') device. The proposed Final Judgment also requires Genesis to pay a civil penalty of $2 million dollars.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at *http://www.justice.gov/atr* and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the Antitrust Division's website, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be submitted in English and directed to Maribeth Petrizzi, Special Attorney, United States, c/o Federal Trade Commission, Bureau of Competition, Compliance Division, GAO–5T57, Org Code 1031, GAO–5K21, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20580 (email address: *bccompliance@ftc.gov*).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States Of America, 450 Fifth Street NW, Washington, DC 20530; Plaintiff, v. *Edwards Lifesciences Corp., One Edwards Way, Irvine, California 92614* and *Genesis Medtech Group Limited, 16 Science Park Drive #04–03, DNV Technology Centre, Singapore 118227,* Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:26–cv–02450

Complaint for Civil Penalties and Other Equitable Relief for Failure To Comply With The Premerger Notification and Waiting Requirements of the Hart–Scott Rodino Act

1. On July 22, 2024, Edwards Lifesciences Corp. (''Edwards'') acquired JC Medical, Inc. (''JC Medical'') from Genesis MedTech Group Limited (''Genesis'') for $115 million and future milestone payments with an ostensible value of approximately $1.8 million. Contemporaneously, Edwards committed to making an investment in Genesis of $25 million. If aggregated, these payments would have exceeded the then-HSR reporting threshold of $119.5 million. But by viewing the payments as independent, Edwards acquired JC Medical without complying with the notification and waiting period requirements of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. 18a (''HSR Act'' or ''Act''). JC Medical was in clinical trials for a promising new treatment for severe aortic regurgitation, transcatheter aortic valve replacement for aortic regurgitation (''TAVR–AR''). By not filing HSR, Edwards and Genesis immediately closed the transaction. They also did not publicly announce the deal at that time. The day after closing the JC Medical acquisition, Edwards entered into an agreement to purchase JC Medical's only competitor, JenaValve Technology, Inc. (''JenaValve''), thereby seeking to own ''the only two companies in the United States with TAVR–AR devices in clinical trials.'' Memorandum Opinion at 1, Federal Trade Commission v. Edwards Lifesciences Corp./JenaValve Technology, Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02569–RC (D.D.C.) (''FTC v. Edwards''). Because Edwards and Genesis purposefully structured the JC Medical transaction to avoid filing HSR, and the transaction—in substance—was