MOKA International Ltd. of Sha Tin, New Territories, Hong Kong; and TCL Smart Device (Vietnam) Co., Ltd. of Bac Tan Uyen District, Binh Duong Province, Vietnam (collectively, "TCL"). Id. at 66356. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was not named as a party to this investigation. Id.

The Commission has partially terminated the investigation with respect to certain patents and patent claims. Order No. 25 (Jan. 15, 2021), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (Feb. 1, 2021); Order No. 34 (Feb. 19, 2021), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (March 15, 2021); Order No. 49 (April 21, 2021), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (May 10, 2021); Order No. 65 (June 28, 2021), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (July 28, 2021).

The Commission has also partially terminated the investigation with respect to certain respondents due to settlement agreements. See Order No. 37 (terminating MediaTek), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (March 12, 2021); Order No. 67 (July 16, 2021) (terminating RealTek), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (Aug. 4, 2021); Order No. 69 (Aug. 12, 2021) (terminating LG, Samsung), unreviewed by Comm'n Notice (Sept. 15, 2021).

On April 19, 2022, DivX and TCL jointly moved to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement that resolves the dispute between the parties.

On April 22, 2022, the presiding ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 76) granting the joint motion to terminate the investigation based on the settlement agreement. The ID finds that, pursuant to Commission Rules 210.21(a)(1), (b)(1) (19 CFR 210.21(a)(1), (b)(1)), DivX and TCL have represented that there are no other agreements, express or implied, oral or written, between them regarding the subject matter of this investigation. The ID further finds that termination is proper because it would not be contrary to the public health and welfare, competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, the production of like or directly competitive conditions in the United States, or U.S. consumers. The ID further finds that termination is in the public interest, and it will conserve public and private resources.

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

On October 4, 2021, former respondent RealTek filed a motion for sanctions against DivX, pursuant to Commission Rules 210.4 and 210.25 (19 CFR 210.4, 210.25), for alleged misrepresentations and misconduct during the investigation. DivX filed its

opposition to RealTek's motion on October 14, 2021.

On April 22, 2022, the presiding ALJ issued Order No. 75, denying RealTek's motion for sanctions. Order No. 75 (April 22, 2022).

The Commission has determined not to review Order No. 76. This investigation is hereby terminated.

The Commission has set the following schedule in connection with Order No. 75. Any petition for review of Order No. 75 must be filed by June 1, 2022. Responses to a petition for review, if any, must be filed by June 8, 2022.

The Commission voted to approve this determination on May 24, 2022.

The authority for the Commission's determinations 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: May 24, 2022.

### Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 2022–11460 Filed 5–26–22; 8:45 am]

# INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

# Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled Certain Barcode Scanners, Scan Engines, Mobile Computers with Barcode Scanning Functionalities, Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof II, DN 3623; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (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 United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at https://www.usitc.gov. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at https://edis.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 has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to § 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Honeywell International Inc. and Hand Held Products, Inc. on May 23, 2022. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain barcode scanners, scan engines, mobile computers with barcode scanning functionalities, products containing the same, and components thereof II. The complainant names as respondents: Zebra Technologies Corporation of Lincolnshire, IL; and Symbol Technologies, Inc. of Holtsville. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order, cease and desist orders, and impose a bond upon respondents alleged infringing articles during the 60day Presidential review period pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(j).

Proposed respondent, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or § 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

- (i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States:
- (ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders:
- (iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the

United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions on the public interest must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation. Any written submissions on other issues must also be filed by no later than the close of business, eight calendar days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Complainant may file replies to any written submissions no later than three calendar days after the date on which any initial submissions were due. No other submissions will be accepted, unless requested by the Commission. Any submissions and replies filed in response to this Notice are limited to five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments. Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above. Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 3623") in a prominent place on the cover page and/ or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures 1). 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 paperbased filings or paper copies of any electronic filings will be accepted until further notice. Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary at EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents

for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) By the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, 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 nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.3 This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of §§ 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission. Issued: May 23, 2022.

#### Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2022–11379 Filed 5–26–22;  $8:45~\mathrm{am}$ ]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

# Drug Enforcement Administration [Docket No. 22–14]

# Omar Garcia, M.D.; Decision and Order

On November 4, 2021, the former Acting Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause (hereinafter, OSC) to Omar Garcia, M.D. (hereinafter, Respondent) of Ocala, Florida. OSC, at 1 and 3. The OSC proposed the revocation of Respondent's Certificate of Registration No. FG2055158. Id. at 1. It alleged that Respondent is "without authority to handle controlled substances in Florida, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA." Id. at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that on September 3, 2021, the Florida Board of Medicine entered an Order that, effective immediately, revoked Respondent's state medical license after a finding that he had been convicted of six counts of Health Care Fraud and excluded for cause from participating in the Florida Medicaid program. *Id.* 

The OSC notified Respondent of the right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement, while waiving the right to a hearing, the procedures for electing each option, and the consequences for failing to elect either option. *Id.* (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The OSC also notified Respondent of the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan. *Id.* at 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

By email dated January 25, 2022,1 Respondent's wife submitted a Request for Hearing on Respondent's behalf, stating that Respondent was in federal prison. Request for Hearing dated January 25, 2022. The Office of Administrative Law Judges put the matter on the docket and assigned it to Administrative Law Judge Teresa A. Wallbaum (hereinafter, the ALJ). On January 26, 2022, the ALJ issued an Order Regarding Request for Hearing Attachments and Filing Procedures 2 as well as an Order Directing the Government to File Evidence Regarding Service of the Order to Show Cause. On January 28, 2022, the Respondent's wife filed a copy of her Power of Attorney as well as an updated Request for Hearing dated January 26, 2022. In the updated Request for Hearing, Respondent's wife represented that although Respondent's Florida medical license was revoked, his DEA registration had been issued in Illinois, not Florida. Request for Hearing dated January 26, 2022, at 1. Respondent's wife also noted that Respondent holds three other state licenses and that his DEA registration record was "impeccable." *Id.* On February 9, 2022, the Government filed its Notice of Filing of Evidence Regarding Proof of Service.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook\_on\_ filing\_procedures.pdf.

 $<sup>^2\,\</sup>mathrm{All}$  contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): https://edis.usitc.gov.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because the Request for Hearing was emailed after 5:00 p.m. on January 25, 2022, it was deemed filed on January 26, 2022. Order Regarding Request for Hearing Attachments and Filing Procedures, at <sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the Request for Hearing email, Respondent's wife represented that she had included her Power of Attorney in the form of fourteen file attachments, but the ALJ was unable to access the attachments. Order Regarding Request for Hearing Attachments and Filing Procedures, at 1; see also Request for Hearing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Government's Notice of Filing of Evidence Regarding Proof of Service showed that Respondent was not served with the OSC until January 4, 2022, thus, Respondent's Request for Hearing was timely filed. 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 (hereinafter,