

U.S.C. 1671b(b)) and sold at LTFV within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission's investigations 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 February 6, 2026 (91 FR 5510). The Commission conducted its hearing on June 9, 2026. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to §§ 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on July 30, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5766 (July 2026), entitled *Fiberglass Door Panels from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-758 and 731-TA-1739 (Final)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 28, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026-15423 Filed 7-29-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1494]

### Certain TOPCon Solar Cells, Modules, Panels, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting the Motion To Intervene of IC Star Solar (USA) LLC D/B/A Imperial Star

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 18) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting a motion to intervene filed by non-party IC Star Solar (USA) LLC d/b/a Imperial Star ("Imperial").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward S. Jou, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3316. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this

investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email [EDIS3Help@usitc.gov](mailto:EDIS3Help@usitc.gov). General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal, telephone (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on March 30, 2026, based on a complaint, as supplemented, filed by First Solar, Inc. ("First Solar") of Phoenix, Arizona. 91 FR 15632-34 (Mar. 30, 2026). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation into the United States and the sale of certain TOPCon solar cells, modules, panels, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 9,130,074. *Id.* at 15632. The complaint, as supplemented, further alleged that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents AXITEC, LLC of Radnor, Pennsylvania; AXITEC Energy GmbH & Co. KG of Böblingen, Germany; AXITEC SOLAR, LLC of Newark, Delaware; Canadian Solar Inc. of Ontario, Canada; CSI Solar Co., Ltd. of Suzhou, China; Canadian Solar (USA) Inc. of Walnut Creek, California; Canadian Solar Manufacturing (Thailand) Co., Ltd. of Bo Win, Thailand; Canadian Solar US Module Manufacturing Corporation of Mesquite, Texas; Canadian Solar International Ltd. of Kowloon, Hong Kong; JA Solar Technology Co., Ltd. of Beijing, China; JA Solar USA, Inc. of San Jose, California; JA Solar AZ, LLC of Phoenix, Arizona; JA Solar International, Ltd. of Kowloon, Hong Kong; JA Solar Vietnam Co., Ltd. of Bac Giang, Vietnam; JinkoSolar Holding Co., Ltd. of Jiangxi Province, China; Jinko Solar Co., Ltd. of Jiangxi Province, China; Jinko Solar (Vietnam) Industries Co. Ltd. of Quang Ninh, Vietnam; Jinko Solar Technology Sdn. Bhd. of Pulau Pinang, Malaysia; Zhejiang Jinko Solar Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang Province, China; JinkoSolar (U.S.) Inc. of Campbell, California; JinkoSolar (U.S.) Manufacturing Inc. of Dover, Delaware; JinkoSolar (U.S.) Industries Inc. of Jacksonville, Florida; Mundra Solar PV Limited of Gujarat, India; Mundra Solar

Energy Ltd. of Gujarat, India; Adani Green Energy Ltd. of Gujarat, India; Philadelphia Solar LLC of Amman, Jordan; Philadelphia Solar USA Inc. of San Mateo, California; Hanwha Q CELLS USA Inc. of Dalton, Georgia; Hanwha Q CELLS America Inc. of Irvine, California; Hanwha Q CELLS USA Corp. of Irvine, California; Hanwha Solutions Corporation of Seoul, Korea; Jiangsu Runergy New Energy Technology Co., Ltd. of Jiangsu Province, China; Runergy USA Inc. of Pleasanton, California; Runergy Alabama Inc. of Huntsville, Alabama; Runergy USA Trading LLC of Dover, Delaware; Runergy PV Technology (Thailand) Co., Ltd. of Rayong, Thailand; Trina Solar Co., Ltd. of Jiangsu Province, China; Trina Solar (U.S.), Inc. of Fremont, California; Trina Solar Energy Development Co., Ltd. of Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam; Changzhou Trina Solar Energy Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang, China; Trina Solar Yiwu Technology Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang, China; TI Energy, Inc. of Austin, Texas; TI Gl Dallas Solar Module LLC of Wilmer, Texas; Vietnam Sunergy Joint Stock Company of Bac Giang Province, Vietnam; VSUN Solar USA Inc. of Fremont, California; Toyo Co., Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; and Toyo Solar Texas, LLC of Humble, Texas. *Id.* at 15633. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") is also a party in this investigation. *Id.*

Respondents BYD America LLC and Tesla, Inc. were added to the investigation by intervention. Order No. 7 (Apr. 27, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 27, 2026), 91 FR 32434-35 (June 1, 2026); Order No. 10 (May 11, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (June 10, 2026), 91 FR 36000-01 (June 15, 2026). The complaint and notice of investigation were amended to change the name of respondent JA Solar AZ, LLC to American Panel Solutions LLC. Order No. 13 (May 28, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (June 23, 2026), 91 FR 38455-56 (June 25, 2026). Respondents Mundra Solar Energy Ltd., Adani Green Energy Ltd., Philadelphia Solar USA Inc., and Changzhou Trina Solar Energy Co. Ltd. were terminated from the investigation by withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 14 (May 28, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (June 24, 2026); Order No. 17 (June 24, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (July 24, 2026).

On May 29, 2026, Imperial filed a motion to intervene as a respondent pursuant to Commission Rule 210.19, 19 CFR 210.19. On June 10, 2026, First Solar filed a response that did not oppose the intervention if the procedural schedule was extended. Also

on June 10, 2026, OUII filed a response in support of the motion. On June 24, 2026, the ALJ granted a motion filed by First Solar amending the procedural schedule and extending the target date. Order No. 16 (June 24, 2026), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (July 24, 2026).

On June 25, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 18) granting Imperial's motion to intervene. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 27, 2026.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 28, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026–15426 Filed 7–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Joan Rubinger, N.P.; Decision and Order

#### I. Introduction

On June 17, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to Joan Rubinger, N.P., of Stockton, California (Respondent). OSC/ISO, at 1. The OSC/ISO informed Respondent of the immediate suspensions of her DEA Certificates of Registration, Nos. MM3336422 (based in California) and MR5666106 (based in New York), alleging that Respondent's continued registration constitutes “‘an imminent danger to the public health or safety.’” *Id.* (quoting 21 U.S.C. 824(d)). The OSC/ISO proposed the revocation of both of Respondent's registrations because Respondent has committed such acts as would render her registrations inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1); 824(a)(4)).

Specifically, the OSC/ISO alleged that from 2019 until 2024, Respondent prescribed over 2,500 controlled substance prescriptions without proper state authority. *Id.* at 2, 3–4. In addition, the OSC/ISO alleged that Respondent

prescribed controlled substances to a patient knowing that those substances were being diverted to another individual. *Id.* at 2, 4. Lastly, the OSC/ISO alleged that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records regarding the over 2,500 controlled substance prescriptions that she issued to patients.<sup>1</sup> *Id.* at 4. The OSC/ISO alleged that Respondent's above-described misconduct violated federal and state law. *Id.* at 2–4 (citing 21 CFR 1306.04(a); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2242(a); Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11150; Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11154; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2836.1(d); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 16, § 1474).<sup>2</sup>

An initial hearing was conducted on September 25, 2024. On September 26, 2024, Administrative Law Judge Paul E. Soeffing (the ALJ) issued an Order continuing the hearing and staying the proceedings pending resolution of an interlocutory appeal by the Government concerning the tribunal's rulings regarding four of the Government's exhibits.<sup>3</sup> The hearing was ultimately resumed and further conducted on December 10, 2024, and December 12, 2024.

On March 7, 2025, the ALJ issued his Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (Recommended Decision or RD). The RD recommended that the Agency revoke Respondent's registrations. RD, at 80.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Because of the substantial evidence of Respondent's unlawful dispensing, which includes acts of intentional diversion, this Decision and Order does not address the Government's recordkeeping allegations. The Agency has found that intentional acts of diversion “strike[] at the CSA's core purpose of preventing the abuse and diversion of controlled substances,” and that “proof of a single act of intentional diversion is sufficient to support the revocation of a registration.” See Samuel Mintlow, M.D., 80 FR 3630, 3653 (2015) (citing Dewey C. MacKay, M.D., 75 FR 49956, 49977 (2010)).

<sup>2</sup> The Agency need not adjudicate the criminal violations alleged in the OSC/ISO. *Ruan v. United States*, 597 U.S. 450 (2022) (decided in the context of criminal proceedings).

<sup>3</sup> See Order Continuing Hearing, Staying Proceedings, and For Briefing of Government's Interlocutory Appeal.

<sup>4</sup> On March 20, 2025, Respondent voluntarily surrendered for cause both her California and New York DEA registrations. On April 1, 2025, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss or Terminate Administrative Proceedings Based on Voluntary Surrender for Cause (Motion to Dismiss), arguing that the case was moot because Respondent had surrendered her DEA registrations. On April 3, 2025, the Government filed a motion requesting that the ALJ deny Respondent's Motion to Dismiss and continue the proceedings. See Government's Motion Requesting the Tribunal Certify the Record to DEA's Acting Administrator. On April 3, 2025, the ALJ issued an Order denying Respondent's Motion to Dismiss. See Order Denying Respondent's Motion to Dismiss or Terminate

On April 3, 2025, Respondent filed Exceptions to the RD. The Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the ALJ's credibility findings,<sup>5</sup> findings of fact, conclusions of law, sanctions analysis, and recommended sanction, and summarizes and clarifies portion thereof herein.

## II. Public Interest Determination

### A. Overview of Law

Congress enacted the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) “to conquer drug abuse and control the legitimate and illegitimate traffic in controlled substances.” *Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1, 12 (2005). A particular concern of Congress was “the need to prevent the diversion of drugs from legitimate to illicit channels,” and it “devised a closed regulatory system making it

Proceedings. Respondent renewed her mootness arguments in her Exceptions.

The Agency agrees with the ALJ's denial of Respondent's motion to dismiss and rejects Respondent's exception regarding mootness. The Agency has determined that its jurisdiction to adjudicate a matter to finality is not dependent on whether the respondent has an active DEA registration. *Jeffrey D. Olsen*, 84 FR 68474, 68475–80 (2019). Instead, the Agency's jurisdiction in an administrative action is over the *registrant*, not the *registration*. See *Abdul Naushad, M.D.*, 89 FR 54059, 54060 (2024) (“[O]ne way that the Administrator carries out the CSA is by investigating and administratively adjudicating a *registrant's* CSA-relevant actions and inactions. When the *registrant's* actions or inactions call for it, the sanction may be suspension or revocation of the *registrant's* registration. 21 U.S.C. 824(a). While the sanction involves the registration, the sanction is levied on the *registrant* and remains in the record throughout the rest of the registrant-Agency relationship, regardless of whether that relationship is either continuous or intermittent”) (emphasis added). When it serves the Agency's and the registrant's interests to litigate an expired registration to finality—for example, when a respondent intends to engage in regulated activity in the future, and memorializing a registrant's compliance (or non-compliance) with the CSA will aid the Agency's future relationship with the registrant—the Agency has determined that issuing a final order may be done in a manner that is with the Constitution, the CSA, applicable legal authority, and sound law enforcement principles. *Jeffrey D. Olsen*, 84 FR at 68475–80.

Here, adjudicating the matter to finality will achieve similar goals as in *Olsen*; it will support future interactions between the Agency and Respondent, inform current and prospective members of the registrant community about the Agency's expectations, provide continuing education to all DEA personnel, help coordinate law enforcement efforts, and informs stakeholders, such as legislators and the public, about the Agency's work. *Olsen*, 84 FR at 68479. Moreover, where, as here, a registrant has surrendered her registration after availing herself of the hearing process and receiving an unfavorable decision, the Agency has determined that failing to adjudicate the matter to finality “would be contrary to [the Agency's] duties under the CSA [and] allow the usurpation of the Agency's enforcement mission.” *Kotsonis*, 85 FR at 85668–69.

<sup>5</sup> The Agency adopts the ALJ's summary of each witness's testimony, as well as the ALJ's assessment of each witness's credibility. See RD, at 3–41.