identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 13 and 14 of the '714 patent; claims 1–20 of the '016 patent; claims 1–14 of the '973 patent; claims 7, 8, and 10–13 of the '518 patent; claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13–21, 23–28, and 30–34 of the '164 patent; and claims 1–23 of the '591 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is ''multi-band Wi-Fi routers, Wi-Fi Access Points, mesh Wi-Fi systems, network controllers, and networking devices and components thereof'';

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties and other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(4) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:

Estelgia, LLC, 8 The Green #21452, Dover, DE 19901

(b) The respondent are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

ASUStek Computer Inc., No. 15, Li-Te Road, 1st Floor, Beitou District, Taipei City, 112 Taiwan

ASUS Computer International, 48720 Kato Rd., Fremont, CA 94538

D-Link Corporation, 4F 289 Sinhu 3rd Road, Neihu District, Taipei, 114 Taiwan

D-Link Systems, Inc., 14420 Myford Road, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92606

Linksys Holdings, Inc., 121 Theory Drive, Irvine, CA 92617

Linksys USA, Inc., 121 Theory Drive Suite 200, Irvine, CA 92617

Plume Design Inc., 325 Lytton Avenue, Suite 200, Palo Alto, CA 94301

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(5) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 17, 2025.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory and Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–11405 Filed 6–20–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1444]

Certain Nasal Devices and Components Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant's Motion For Leave To Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (''Commission'') has determined not to review an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 9) of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ''), granting Complainant's motion for leave to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan D. Link, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3103. 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 March 26, 2025, based on a complaint filed by Aardvark Medical Inc. (''Complainant''). 90 FR 13781–82 (Mar. 26, 2025). 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 nasal devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–5, 7–14, and 16–19 of U.S. Patent No. 9,750,856; claims 1–4, 6, 8–12, 14–17, 21–24, 27, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 11,318,234; 1–3, 6–8, 10–12, 16–18, 21, 22, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 11,883,009; claims 1–8, 10–15, and 17–22 of U.S. Patent No. 11,883,010; and claims 1–9, 12–21, 23, 24, and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 11,889,995. *Id.* at 13781. The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents: Xiamenximier Electronic Commerce Co., Ltd (d/b/a Cenny) and Xia Men Deng Jia E-Commerce Co., Ltd. (d/b/a Ronfnea) of Fujian, China; Chongqing Moffy Innovation Technology Co., Ltd. of Chongqing City, China; Guangdong XINRUNTAO Technology Co., Ltd. and Shenzhen Jun&Liang Media Tech Limited of Shenzhen, China; RhinoSystems, Inc. of Brooklyn, Ohio; and Spa Sciences LP of Port St. Lucie, Florida. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in the investigation. *Id.*

On April 4, 2025, Complainant filed a motion to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation (''Motion to Amend'') to substitute and correct the appropriate entity from named

Respondent ''Spa Sciences LP'' to ''Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences.'' Pursuant to Ground Rule 2.2, Complainant reported that third-party Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences (''MTB'') would ''take a position on the Motion as filed.'' *See* Mot. to Amend at 1.

On April 10, 2025, before the opposition to the Motion to Amend was due, the ALJ issued Order No. 7, granting Complainant's Motion to Amend. On April 11, 2025, MTB filed an opposition to Complainant's Motion to Amend. On April 17, 2025, MTB filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. 7.

On May 7, 2025, the Commission determined to review Order No. 7 and remanded Order No. 7 to the ALJ to consider both MTB's Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. 7 and its Opposition to Complainant Aardvark Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint. *See* Order No. 7, *reviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 7, 20225).

On May 22, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 9) granting Complainant's motion for leave to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation. *See* Order No. 9 (May 22, 2025). No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The named respondent Spa Sciences LP has been changed to ''Michael Todd Beauty LP d/b/a Spa Sciences.''

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 17, 2025.

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: June 17, 2025.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory and Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–11406 Filed 6–20–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

William Thompson IV, M.D.; Decision and Order

On December 2, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to William Thompson IV, M.D., of Newport Beach, California (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. FT3578082, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of California, 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.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 4.[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 1; *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 May 15, 2024, the Medical Board of California issued a Default Decision and Order revoking Registrant's state medical license effective on June 14, 2024. RFAAX 1, at 2. According to California online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[3] Registrant's California medical license remains revoked. California DCA License Search, *https://search.dca.ca.gov* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice medicine in California, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[4]

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General may 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 71,371, 71,372 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 F. App'x 826 (4th

[1] According to Agency records, Registrant's registration expired on November 30, 2024. *See also* RFAAX 1, at 1. The Agency has previously held that it is within its jurisdiction and prerogative to adjudicate a matter to finality where a registration expired before issuance of the OSC. *Abdul Naushad, M.D.,* 89 FR 54,059, 54,059–60 (2024).

[2] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated March 5, 2025, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on December 20, 2024, the DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address and the email was not returned. RFAAX 2, at 1. Here, the Agency finds that the DI's efforts to serve Registrant 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.

[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 decision, is not licensed to practice medicine in California. 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.*