hour'' cost burden associated with the collection of information.

An agency may not conduct, or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The authority for this action is the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

April Lockler,

Director of the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

[FR Doc. 2026–18526 Filed 9–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4335–30–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1014 and 1016 (Fourth Review)]

Polyvinyl Alcohol From China and Japan; Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on polyvinyl alcohol from China and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.[2]

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on March 2, 2026 (91 FR 10155) and determined on June 5, 2026, that it would conduct expedited reviews (91 FR 40590, July 2, 2026).[3]

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on September 8, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5787 (September 2026), entitled *Polyvinyl Alcohol from China and Japan: Investigation Nos.* 731–TA–1014 and 1016 *(Fourth Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 8, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–18525 Filed 9–10–26; 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] Chairman Brett W. Doyle and Commissioners Jason E. Kearns, Peter-Anthony Pappas, Bart Thanhauser, and David Foley Jr. voted in the affirmative.

[3] Commissioners David S. Johanson, Jason E. Kearns, and Amy A. Karpel concluded that the domestic interested party group responses were adequate, the respondent interested party group responses were inadequate, and there were no other circumstances that would warrant conducting full reviews. Chairman Brett W. Doyle and Commissioners Peter-Anthony Pappas, Bart Thanhauser, and David Foley Jr., who were not yet members of the Commission, did not participate in the adequacy votes.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–783–784 and 731–TA–1771–1772 (Final)]

Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From Canada and India; Scheduling of the Final Phase of Countervailing Duty and Antidumping Duty Investigations

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of the final phase of antidumping and countervailing duty investigation Nos. 701–TA–783–784 and 731–TA–1771–1772 (Final) pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports of citric acid and certain citrate salts, provided for in subheadings 2918.14.00, 2918.15.10, 2918.15.50, and 3824.99.93 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, from China that have been preliminarily determined by the Department of Commerce (''Commerce'') to be subsidized by the government of China and sold at less-than-fair-value, and by reason of imports of citric acid and certain citrate salts from Canada that have been preliminarily determined by Commerce to be subsidized by the government of Canada but preliminarily determined by Commerce not to be, or not likely to be, sold at less-than-fair-value.

DATES: August 26, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory Gutierrez (205–1999), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 (*https://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for these investigations may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Scope.—For purposes of these investigations, Commerce has defined the subject merchandise as ''all grades and granulation sizes of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate in their unblended forms, whether dry or in solution, and regardless of packaging type. The scope also includes blends of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate, as well as blends with other ingredients, such as sugar, where the unblended form(s) of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate constitute 40 percent or more, by weight, of the blend. The scope also includes all forms of crude calcium citrate, including dicalcium citrate monohydrate, and tricalcium citrate tetrahydrate, which are intermediate products in the production of citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate. The scope includes the hydrous and anhydrous forms of citric acid, the dihydrate and anhydrous forms of sodium citrate, otherwise known as citric acid sodium salt, and the monohydrate and monopotassium forms of potassium citrate. Sodium citrate also includes both trisodium citrate and monosodium citrate which are also known as citric acid trisodium salt and citric acid monosodium salt, respectively. The scope includes merchandise matching the above description that has been processed in a third country, including by commingling, diluting, introducing or removing additives, or performing any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigations if performed in the subject country. The scope also includes merchandise matching the above description that is commingled or blended with citric acid, sodium citrate, and potassium citrate from sources not subject to these investigations. Only the subject component of such commingled products is covered by the scope of these investigations. The scope does not include calcium citrate that satisfies the standards set forth in the United States Pharmacopeia and has been mixed with a functional excipient, such as dextrose or starch, where the excipient constitutes at least two percent, by weight, of the product.''

Background.—The final phase of these investigations is being scheduled

pursuant to sections 705(b) and 731(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 1673d(b)), as a result of a negative preliminary determination by Commerce regarding whether citric acid and certain citrate salts from Canada are being sold at less than fair value within the meaning of § 733 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b), and as a result of affirmative preliminary determinations by Commerce that certain benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning of § 703 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b) are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Canada and India of citric acid and certain citrate salts, and that such products from India are being sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of § 733 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b). The investigations were requested in petitions filed on January 21, 2026, by Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, Decatur, Illinois; Cargill, International, Wayzata, Minnesota; and Primary Products Ingredients Americas LLC, Schaumburg, Illinois.

For further information concerning the conduct of this phase of the investigations, hearing procedures, and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and C (19 CFR part 207).

Although Commerce has preliminarily determined that imports of citric acid and certain citrate salts from Canada are not being and are not likely to be sold in the United States at less than fair value, for purposes of efficiency the Commission hereby waives rule 207.21(b) [1] so that the final phase of the investigations may proceed concurrently in the event that Commerce makes a final affirmative determination with respect to such imports.

Participation in the investigations and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the subject merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in the final phase of these investigations as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in § 201.11 of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days prior to the hearing date specified in this notice. A party that filed a notice of appearance during the preliminary phase of the investigations need not file an additional notice of appearance during this final phase. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

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.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and BPI service list.—Pursuant to § 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI gathered in the final phase of these investigations available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the investigations, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days prior to the hearing date specified in this notice. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined by 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the investigations. A party granted access to BPI in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not reapply for such access. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Staff report.—The prehearing staff report in the final phase of these investigations will be placed in the nonpublic record on December 28, 2026, and a public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.22 of the Commission's rules.

Hearing.—The Commission will hold a hearing in connection with the final phase of this investigation beginning at 9:30 a.m. on January 12, 2027. Requests to appear at the hearing should be filed in writing with the Secretary to the Commission on or before January 6, 2027. Any requests to appear as a witness via videoconference must be included with your request to appear. Requests to appear via videoconference must include a statement explaining why the witness cannot appear in person; the Chairman, or other person designated to conduct the investigation, may in their discretion for good cause shown, grant such a request. Requests to appear as remote witness due to illness or a positive COVID–19 test result may be submitted by 3:00 p.m. the business day prior to the hearing. Further information about participation in the hearing will be posted on the Commission's website at *https://www.usitc.gov/calendarpad/calendar.html.*

A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the hearing. All parties and nonparties desiring to appear at the hearing and make oral presentations should attend a prehearing conference, if deemed necessary, to be held at 9:30 a.m. on January 8, 2026. Parties shall file and serve written testimony and presentation slides in connection with their presentation at the hearing by no later than noon on January 11, 2027. Oral testimony and written materials to be submitted at the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), and 207.24 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 business days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written submissions.—Each party who is an interested party shall submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of § 207.23 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is 5:15 p.m. on January 5, 2027. Parties shall also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of § 207.25 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is 5:15 p.m. on January 20, 2027. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigations may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations, including statements of support or opposition to the petition, on or before 5:15 p.m. on January 20, 2027. On February 2, 2027, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before 5:15 p.m. on February 4, 2027, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with § 207.30 of the Commission's rules. 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/*

[1] § 207.21(b) of the Commission's rules provides that, where Commerce has issued a negative preliminary determination, the Commission will publish a Final Phase Notice of Scheduling upon receipt of an affirmative final determination from Commerce.

handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to § 201.12 of the Commission's rules, shall not be accepted unless good cause is shown for accepting such submissions, or unless the submission is pursuant to a specific request by a Commissioner or Commission staff.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's 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.

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 9, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–18586 Filed 9–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Craig Cohen, DPM; Decision and Order

On March 23, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Craig Cohen, DPM, of Dublin, Ohio (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. AC1462302, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Ohio, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file a written request for hearing, and that if he failed to file such a request, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2.[1] ''A 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), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 3; *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, on April 1, 2025, Registrant's Ohio medical license expired by its own terms. RFAAX 1, at 1. According to Ohio online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[2] Registrant's Ohio medical license is expired. eLicense Ohio Professional Licensure License Look-Up, *https://elicense.ohio./oh_verifylicense* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in Ohio, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[3]

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 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Ashley Vermillion, N.P.,* 91 FR 35270 (2026); *Walter Walters, M.D.,* 91 FR 1816 (2026); *Nicholas J. Nardacci, M.D.,* 81 FR 47409 (2016).[4]

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated May 26, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that from February 9, 2026, through February 17, 2026, the DI made multiple attempts to contact Registrant by phone through various phone numbers associated with Registrant's DEA registration and law enforcement records, but none of these attempts were successful. RFAAX 2, at 2. On March 12, 2026, the DI attempted to serve Registrant in person at Registrant's registered address, but the location was closed at the time. *Id.* On March 25, 2026, the DI again traveled to Registrant's registered address to attempt service and spoke to two receptionists, who informed the DI that Registrant was no longer practicing at the registered address location, had retired approximately one year earlier, and had stopped his mail forwarding address. *Id.* at 2–3. On the same day, the DI emailed Registrant at Registrant's registered email address and received a delivery receipt for the email. *Id.* at 1–2; *see* RFAAX 4. 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 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).

[2] 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).

[3] Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 556(e), ''[w]hen an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact 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 Ohio. 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 DEA Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, at *dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.*

[4] This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the Controlled Substances Act (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