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: September 24, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–19875 Filed 9–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–523 and 731–TA–1259 (Second Review)]

Boltless Steel Shelving Units Prepackaged for Sale From China; 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 and countervailing duty orders on boltless steel shelving units prepackaged for sale from China 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 April 1, 2026 (91 FR 16234) and determined on July 6, 2026, that it would conduct expedited reviews (91 FR 52082, August 12, 2026).

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 24, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5793 (September 2026), entitled *Boltless Steel Shelving Units Prepackaged for Sale from China: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–523 and 731–TA–1259 (Second Review).*

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

[2] Commissioner Samuel T. Negatu not participating.

Issued: September 24, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–19852 Filed 9–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation 701–TA–499–500 and 731–TA–1215–1216, 1221–1223 (Second Review)]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From India, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and Vietnam; 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 countervailing duty orders on oil country tubular goods from India and Turkey and the antidumping duty orders on oil country tubular goods from India, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and Vietnam 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 July 1, 2025 (90 FR 28768, July 1, 2025) and determined on November 24, 2025 [3] that it would conduct full reviews (91 FR 5110, February 4, 2026).[4] Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews 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 March 24, 2026 (91 FR 14039). The Commission conducted its hearing on July 23, 2026. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

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 24, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5790 (September 2026), entitled *Oil Country Tubular Goods from India, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and Vietnam: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–499–500 and 731–TA–1215–1216 and 1221–1223 (Second Review).*

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

[2] Commissioner Jason E. Kearns voted in the negative with respect to the antidumping duty order on oil country tubular goods from Ukraine. Commissioner Samuael T. Negatu did not participate in these reviews as he was not a member of the Commission at the time.

[3] Due to the lapse in appropriations and ensuing cessation of Commission operations, the Commission tolled its schedule during the adequacy phase of this proceeding.

[4] Commissioners David S. Johanson, Jason E. Kearns, and Amy A. Karpel participated in the adequacy phase of these proceedings. Chairman Brett W. Doyle and Commissioners Peter-Anthony Pappas, Bart Thanhauser, David Foley Jr., and Samuel T. Negatu did not participate in the adequacy votes as they were not members of the Commission at the time.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 24, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–19879 Filed 9–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1534–1536 (Review)]

Methionine From France, Japan, and Spain; Notice of Commission Determination To Conduct Full Five-Year Reviews

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on methionine from France, Japan, and Spain would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date.

DATES: September 4, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexis Yim (202–708–1446), 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 reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov*.

For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 4, 2026, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). The Commission found that both the domestic and respondent interested party group responses from Japan to its notice of institution (91 FR 32435, June 1, 2026) were adequate, and determined to conduct a full review of the order on imports from Japan. The Commission also found that the respondent interested party group responses from France and Spain were inadequate but determined to conduct full reviews of the orders on imports from those countries in order to promote administrative efficiency in light of its determinations to conduct a full review of the order with respect to Japan. A record of the Commissioners' votes will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's website.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to § 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 25, 2026.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2026–19914 Filed 9–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 25–73]

Johann Farley, M.D.; Decision and Order

On August 29, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Johann Farley, M.D., of Merrillville, Indiana (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA registration, No. BF8869628,[1] alleging that he has been mandatorily excluded ''from participation in Medicare, Medicaid, and all Federal health care programs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a–7(a).'' *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(5)).

On August 10, 2026, the Government submitted an RFAA to the Administrator requesting that the Agency[2] issue a default final order revoking Registrant's registration. RFAA, at 1, 4. After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting the analysis as set forth in detail below, the Agency grants the Government's RFAA and revokes Registrant's registration.

I. Procedural History

On August 29, 2025, a DEA Diversion Investigator personally served the OSC on Registrant and sent an electronic copy of the OSC to his registered email address. RFAAX 2, at 1–2. On September 26, 2025, Registrant, through counsel, submitted a timely hearing request and answer to the Office of Administrative Law Judges. RFAAX 3. The matter was assigned to an administrative law judge, and on April 29, 2026, the Chief Administrative Law Judge (Chief ALJ) issued an Order for Prehearing Statements, ordering the Government to file a prehearing statement by May 13, 2026, and Registrant to file a prehearing statement by May 27, 2026. RFAAX 4, at 2, 4.

The Government timely filed its prehearing statement on May 12, 2026. RFAAX 5. On June 3, 2026, the Chief ALJ issued an Order Directing Compliance, noting that Registrant had not filed a prehearing statement by the initial May 27 deadline, and providing Registrant with a second opportunity to file a prehearing statement by June 8, 2026. RFAAX 6, at 1.

On the same day, Registrant sent an email to OALJ stating that the Order Directing Compliance was the '' 'first notification' '' he had received in this matter, after which the Government forwarded its prehearing statement to Registrant. RFAAX 7, at 1, n.1. On June 9, 2026, the Chief ALJ issued an Order Finding [Registrant] in Default and Terminating Proceedings (Termination Order), finding that Registrant failed for the second time to file a prehearing statement.[3] RFAAX 7. The Chief ALJ further found Registrant in default for ''display[ing] a pattern of noncompliance with [the Chief ALJ's] orders'' and failing to defend his case. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(3)). Accordingly, the Chief ALJ terminated the proceedings. *Id.*

II. Registrant Is in Default

DEA regulations provide that a registrant ''who has requested a hearing fails to plead . . . or otherwise defend'' his case, shall be deemed to be in default. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(3). Unless excused, a default is deemed to constitute ''an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].'' 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

The OSC notified Registrant that he would ''be deemed to have waived the right to a hearing and to be in default'' if he failed to plead or defend his case after requesting a hearing. RFAAX 1, at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(3)). The Chief ALJ's Order for Prehearing Statements and Order Directing Compliance also notified Registrant of the same. RFAAX 4, at 4; RFAAX 6, at 1.

Registrant was provided with two opportunities to file a prehearing statement and was notified in the OSC, Order for Prehearing Statements, and Order Directing Compliance that a failure to defend his case would result in a finding of default and deemed admission of the OSC's factual allegations. RFAAX 1, at 2; RFAAX 4, at 4; RFAAX 6, at 1. And yet, Registrant failed to file a prehearing statement as ordered by the Chief ALJ in two separate orders. RFAAX 4; RFAAX 6.

Accordingly, the Agency finds that the Chief ALJ did not err in finding

[1] According to the OSC and Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on September 30, 2025. RFAAX 1, at 1. The Agency has previously held that it is within its jurisdiction and discretion to adjudicate a matter to finality where a registration expired after issuance of an OSC and before issuance of a final order. *See Jeffrey D. Olsen, M.D.,* 84 FR 68474, 68475–79 (2019); *see also Abdul Naushad, M.D.,* 89 FR 54059, 54060 (2024) (applying the same principle and adjudicating a matter to finality where a registration expired before issuance of the OSC). Here, adjudicating the matter to finality will achieve similar goals as in *Olsen;* it will support future interactions between the Agency and Registrant, 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 inform stakeholders, such as legislators and the public, about the Agency's work. *Olsen,* 84 FR at 68479.

[2] The Controlled Substances Act delegates authority to the Attorney General, who has delegated it to the Administrator of DEA (the Agency). 28 CFR 0.100.

[3] The Termination Order notes that the Order for Prehearing Statements, Government's prehearing statement, and Order Directing Compliance were sent to the correct email address on file for Registrant's attorney. RFAAX 7, at 1, n.1. The Termination Order also notes that OALJ ''received no non-delivery notification when serving either the [Order for Prehearing Statements] or [Order Directing Compliance]'' on Registrant. *Id.*