

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 6, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–20715 Filed 10–8–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1472]

Certain Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Devices, Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation Based on Settlement; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (“the Commission”) has determined not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 31) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting an unopposed motion to terminate the investigation based on settlement. The investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Houda Morad, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–4716. 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. 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 on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on January 2, 2026, based on a complaint filed by Netlist, Inc. (“Netlist” or “Complainant”) of Irvine, California. 91 FR 155–56 (Jan. 2, 2026). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the

Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain dynamic random access memory (DRAM) devices, products containing the same, and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 12,373,366 (“the ‘366 patent”); 10,025,731 (“the ‘731 patent”); 10,268,608 (“the ‘608 patent”); 10,217,523 (“the ‘523 patent”); the ‘035 patent; and 12,308,087 (“the ‘087 patent”). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists or is in the process of being established. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents: (1) Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Suwon, Republic of Korea; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Plano, Texas; and Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. of Plano, Texas (collectively, “Samsung”); (2) Google LLC (“Google”) of Mountain View, California; and (3) Super Micro Computer, Inc. (“SMC”) of San Jose, California (collectively, “Respondents”). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also participating in the investigation. *Id.*

On August 24, 2026, the Commission partially terminated the investigation as to all asserted claims of the ‘035 patent, claims 2 and 3 of the ‘608 patent, claims 11 and 15 of the ‘366 patent, claims 7–9 and 12–16 of the ‘731 patent, claims 17 and 18 of the ‘523 patent, and claims 5, 7, 17, 20, 22, and 23 of the ‘087 patent based on withdrawal of the complaint allegations as to those claims. *See* Order No. 29 (July 23, 2026), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (Aug. 24, 2026).

On August 18, 2026, Netlist and Samsung (collectively, “the Settling Parties”) filed a joint motion (“Mot.”) to terminate the investigation as to all Respondents based on settlement. The motion notes that agreements between the Settling parties (“Agreements”) “completely resolve the dispute between the Settling Parties in this Investigation, as well as between Netlist and any remaining Respondents who receive their accused products from the Samsung Respondents.” Mot. at 2. The motion also indicates that Google and SMC do not oppose the motion. *Id.* at 5. On August 27, 2026, OUII filed a response in support of the motion.

On September 4, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 31) granting the motion to terminate pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1) (19 CFR 210.21(b)(1)). The ID notes that the motion includes confidential and public versions of the Agreements as well as a statement that “there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or

implied, between the Settling Parties concerning the subject matter of this Investigation.” ID at 2–3. The ID also notes that “the public interest favors settlement to avoid unnecessary litigation and to conserve public and private resources.” *Id.* at 3. The ID concludes that the motion complies with Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1). *Id.* at 4. The ALJ also granted the Settling Parties' request to limit service of the Agreements. *Id.*

No party filed a petition for review of the subject ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID (Order No. 31). The investigation is terminated.

The Commission's vote for this determination took place on October 6, 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: October 6, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–20716 Filed 10–8–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure; Meeting of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure will hold an in-person meeting on January 5, 2027 in Washington, DC. The meeting will be conducted in hybrid format with virtual attendance options available. The meeting is open to the public for observation but not participation. A meeting agenda and supporting materials will be posted at least 7 days in advance of the meeting at: <https://www.uscourts.gov/forms-rules/records-rules-committees/agenda-books>.

DATES: January 5, 2027 (meeting date) and December 29, 2026 (registration deadline for in-person observation).

ADDRESSES: Requests to observe must be made in writing by emailing the request to: RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov. Please see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section in

this notice for further instructions on observing the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carolyn A. Dubay, Chief Counsel, Rules Committee Staff, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle NE, Suite 7–300, Washington, DC 20544, Phone (202) 502–1820, RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To observe the meeting in person, individuals must contact the office listed above by 5 p.m. (eastern time) on December 29, 2026. After this deadline, only virtual observation is permitted. Virtual registration is available until the meeting date, provided it is completed before the projected end time.

(Authority: 28 U.S.C. 2073.)

Dated: October 7, 2026.

Shelly L. Cox,

Management Analyst, Rules Committee Staff.

[FR Doc. 2026–20728 Filed 10–8–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Vladimir Romaniv, P.A.; Decision and Order

On November 10, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to Vladimir Romaniv, P.A., of Yonkers, N.Y. (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action dated February 13, 2026¹ (Public Interest (PI) RFAA), Exhibit (PI RFAAX) 1, at 1, 6. The OSC/ISO informed Registrant of the immediate suspension of his DEA Certificates of Registration Nos. MR2205602 and MR6587919, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(d), alleging that Registrant's continued registration constitutes “‘an imminent danger to the public health or safety.’” *Id.*, at 1 (quoting 21 U.S.C. 824(d)). The OSC/ISO also proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA registrations, alleging that Registrant's continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest. *Id.* (citing to 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), 824(a)(4)).²

¹ This RFAA document is dated February 13, 2025, but this date appears to be a typographical error, because the RFAA was transmitted to the Administrator in 2026.

² Based on the Government's submissions in its PI RFAA, the Agency finds that service of the OSC/ISO on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on November 17, 2025, Registrant

More specifically, the OSC/ISO alleged that from at least January 7, 2025, through at least May 7, 2025, Registrant repeatedly violated federal and state law by issuing multiple prescriptions to a patient for whom Registrant failed to conduct the necessary examination and evaluations to justify prescribing controlled substances because the patient was incarcerated at the time. *Id.*, at 2–4. The OSC/ISO further alleged that Registrant repeatedly violated federal and state law by issuing overlapping prescriptions to this patient for the same controlled substance, as well as by issuing all of the prescriptions at issue without the contact information for Registrant's supervising physician. *Id.* The OSC/ISO alleged that Registrant's prescribing was in violation of 21 CFR 1306.04(a); N.Y. Pub. Health Law §§ 3331(2), 3390; N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 10, §§ 80.62(a), 80.65, 80.67(c), 94.2(e)(1)–(2). *Id.*³

The Government's PI RFAA requests that the Agency issue a default final order revoking Registrant's registrations Nos. MR2205602 and MR6587919. PI RFAA, at 5–6.

On November 12, 2025, DEA issued an additional Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Registrant, proposing the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration No. MR7746184,⁴ alleging that Registrant has no state authority to handle controlled substances. Request for Final Agency Action dated February 12, 2026⁵ (Loss of State Authority (LSA) RFAA), Exhibit (LSA RFAAX) 2, at 1, 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).⁶

Specifically, the OSC alleged that Registrant is “currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of

was personally served with the OSC/ISO. PI RFAAX 2, at 1–2; *see also id.*, Appendix A.

³ 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).

⁴ According to Agency records, Registrant's registration No. MR7746184 expired on April 30, 2026. The fact that a registrant allows his registration to expire during the pendency of an OSC does not impact the Agency's jurisdiction or prerogative under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to adjudicate the OSC to finality. *Jeffrey D. Olsen, MD*, 84 FR 68474, 68476–79 (2019).

⁵ The LSA RFAA is dated February 12, 2025, but this date appears to be a typographical error, because the LSA RFAA was transmitted to the Administrator in 2026.

⁶ Based on the Government's submissions in its LSA RFAA, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. Specifically, the Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on November 17, 2025, Registrant was personally served with the OSC. LSA RFAAX 1, at 2; *see also id.*, Appendix A.

Jersey, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA [under registration No. MR7746184].” *Id.*, at 1–2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

On February 12, 2026, the Government submitted a second RFAA requesting that the Agency issue a default final order revoking Registrant's registration, No. MR7746184, based in New Jersey. LSA RFAA, at 3–4.

After carefully reviewing the entire record and conducting analysis as set forth in more detail below, the Agency grants the Government's requests for final agency action and revokes Registrant's registrations Nos. MR2205602, MR6587919, and MR7746184.

I. Default Determination

Under 21 CFR 1301.43, a registrant entitled to a hearing who fails to file a timely hearing request “within 30 days after the date of receipt of the [OSC] . . . shall be deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default” unless “good cause” is established for the failure. 21 CFR 1301.43(a), (c)(1). In the absence of a demonstration of good cause, a registrant who fails to timely file an answer also is “deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default.” 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(2). Unless excused, a default is deemed to constitute “an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].” 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

Both the OSC/ISO and the additional 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. PI RFAAX 1, at 5–6 (citing to 21 CFR 1301.43); LSA RFAAX 2, at 2 (same). According to the Government's RFAs, Registrant failed to request a hearing in response to either the OSC/ISO or the OSC. PI RFAA, at 1–2; LSA RFAA, at 1. Thus, the Agency finds that Registrant is in default and therefore has admitted to the factual allegations in both the OSC/ISO and OSC. 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

II. Loss of State Authority

A. Findings of Fact

According to the OSC, on November 30, 2023, Registrant's New Jersey controlled dangerous substances (CDS) license expired by its own terms. LSA RFAAX 2, at 2. According to New Jersey online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,⁷ Registrant's New

⁷ Under the Administrative Procedure Act, an agency “may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.”

Continued