

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 this proceeding may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On September 4, 2026, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (91 FR 32431, June 1, 2026) of the subject five-year reviews was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting full reviews.¹ Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct expedited reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)).

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 and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the reviews has been placed in the nonpublic record, and will be made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for these reviews on December 23, 2026. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in § 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the reviews and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,² and any party other than an interested party to the reviews may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the reviews. Comments are due on or before December 30, 2026 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year

reviews nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the reviews by December 30, 2026. However, should the Department of Commerce ("Commerce") extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its reviews, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must 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/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (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.

Determination.—The Commission has determined these reviews are extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

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: October 21, 2026.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2026–21753 Filed 10–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Appointment of Individuals To Serve as Members of the Performance Review Board

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Appointment of individuals to serve as members of Performance Review Board.

DATES: Applicable Date: October 20, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Mozie, Director of Human Resources, U.S. International Trade Commission (202) 205–2651.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Chair of the U.S. International Trade Commission has appointed the following individuals to serve on the Commission's Performance Review Board (PRB):

Chair of the PRB: Commissioner Jason Kearns

Vice Chair of the PRB: Commissioner Peter-Anthony Pappas

Member—James Galkowski

Member—Nannette Christ

Member—Catherine DeFilippo

Member—Silvia Galluch

Member—Katie Higginbotham

Member—Margaret Macdonald

Member—William Powers

Member—Keith Vaughn

Member—Jeremy Wise

This notice is published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the requirement of 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4). Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting our TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

By order of the Chairman.

Issued: October 22, 2026.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2026–21771 Filed 10–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 26–112]

Vida Janson, M.D.; Decision and Order

On May 5, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Vida Janson, M.D., of Seattle, Washington (Respondent). OSC, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration No. BJ6418380, alleging that Respondent is "without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Washington, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA." *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

On June 3, 2026, Respondent filed a request for a hearing and filed a Supplemental Answer to the allegations in the OSC. Respondent also filed a Motion to Hold Proceeding in Abeyance seeking to defer the proceeding until

¹ A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's website.

² The Commission has found the response submitted on behalf of Cornerstone Chemical Company ("Cornerstone") to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

resolution of the underlying state authority matter. On August 7, 2026, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition, which Respondent opposed. On August 27, 2026, Chief Administrative Law Judge Derek C. Julius (Chief ALJ) granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition and recommended the revocation of Respondent's registration, finding that because Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances in Washington, the state in which she is registered with DEA, "there is no other fact of consequence for this tribunal to decide in order to determine whether or not she is entitled to maintain her DEA registration." Order Granting the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, and Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (RD), at 5. Respondent did not file exceptions to the RD.

Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction as found in the RD and summarizes and expands upon portions thereof herein.

Findings of Fact

Effective January 23, 2026, the Washington State Department of Health issued a Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Final Order suspending Respondent from the practice of medicine in the State of Washington as a result of Respondent committing unprofessional conduct. OSC, at 2.¹ According to Washington online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Respondent's Washington medical license is suspended.² Washington State Department of Health Provider Credential Search, <https://wahelms.my.site.com/s/license-search> (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Respondent does not have the state authority to handle controlled substances in Washington, the state in which she is registered with DEA.³

¹ See also Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, at 2.

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

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under section 823 of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) "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, 71372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied*, 481 F. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR 27616, 27617 (1978); *Scott Hansen, A.P.R.N.*, 90 FR 27338 (2025).⁴

Respondent, as of the date of this Order, is not authorized to prescribe controlled substances in Washington. Respondent may dispute this fact 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 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 General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices." 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner's registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. See, e.g., *James L. Hooper, M.D.*, 76 FR at 71371–72; *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.*, 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006);

According to Washington statute, "[a] practitioner may dispense or deliver a controlled substance to or for an individual or animal only for medical treatment or authorized research in the ordinary course of that practitioner's profession." Wash. Rev. Code § 69.50.308(j) (2025). Further, a "prescription" means "an order for controlled substances issued by a practitioner duly authorized by law or rule in the state of Washington to prescribe controlled substances within the scope of his or her professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose." *Id.* at § 69.50.101(41). Finally, a "practitioner" as defined by Washington statute includes "[a] physician licensed to practice medicine and surgery." *Id.* at § 69.50.101(40)(c).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant currently lacks authority to practice medicine in Washington. As already discussed, an individual must be a licensed practitioner to dispense or prescribe a controlled substance in Washington. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice medicine in Washington and, therefore, is not authorized to handle controlled substances in Washington, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a DEA registration in Washington. RD, at 7. Accordingly, the Agency will order that Registrant's DEA registration be revoked.

Order

Pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a), I hereby revoke DEA Certificate of Registration No. BJ6418380 issued to Vida Janson, M.D. Further, pursuant to 28 CFR 0.100(b) and the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), I hereby deny any pending applications of Vida Janson, M.D., to renew or modify these registrations, as well as any other pending application of Vida Janson, M.D., for additional registration in Washington. This Order is effective November 25, 2026.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on October 19, 2026, by DEA Administrator Terrance C. Cole. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to

Dominick A. Ricci, M.D., 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988); *Frederick Marsh Blanton, M.D.*, 43 FR at 27617.

sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Heather Achbach,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–21799 Filed 10–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Barry Backiewicz, D.D.S.; Decision and Order

On April 7, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Barry Backiewicz, D.D.S., of Gahanna, Ohio (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1, 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. BB2606436, alleging that Registrant's registration should be revoked because 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)).¹

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.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds him to be in default. RFAA, at 2.² "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), 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 December 31, 2023, Registrant's Ohio dental license expired by its own terms. RFAAX 2, at 2. According to Ohio online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,³ Registrant's Ohio dental license is expired. eLicense Ohio Professional Licensure License Lookup, https://elicense.ohio.gov/oh_verifylicense (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice dentistry in Ohio, the state in which he is registered with DEA.⁴

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).

³ 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).

⁴ 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 dentistry 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 Office of the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, at dea.addo.attorneys@dea.gov.

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., Lawrence Rudolph, D.M.D.*, 89 FR 79310 (2024); *Henry-Norbert O. Ndekwe, M.D.*, 90 FR 15990 (2025); *Benson Sergiles, P.A.*, 90 FR 32016 (2025).⁵

According to Ohio statute, "[n]o person shall knowingly obtain, possess, or use a controlled substance or a controlled substance analog," except pursuant to a "prescription issued by a licensed health professional authorized to prescribe drugs if the prescription was issued for a legitimate medical purpose." Ohio Rev. Code § 2925.11(A), (B)(1)(d) (2025). Further, a "[l]icensed

⁵ This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the 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 General shall register practitioners . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices." 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the CSA, DEA has held repeatedly that revocation of a practitioner's registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the state in which he practices. *See, e.g., Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A.*, 90 FR 31242 (2025); *Jason Weakley, R.N., A.P.R.N.*, 90 FR 10085 (2025); *Khursheed Haider, M.D.*, 90 FR 21950 (2025).

¹ According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on July 31, 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, M.D.*, 84 FR 68474, 68476–79 (2019).

² Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated July 21, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The RFAA's included Declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on or about April 9, 2026, the DI along with a second DI traveled to Registrant's registered address to attempt personal service of the OSC, which was unsuccessful. RFAAX 3, at 2. On the same date, the DI mailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered address and emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address, which received successful delivery confirmation. *Id.* at 2–3; *see also id.*, Attachments B–D. 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