that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal, telephone (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 22, 2025, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint filed by Modumetal, Inc. of Snohomish, Washington (''Modumetal''). 90 FR 7704 (Jan. 22, 2025). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain nanolaminate alloy coated metal parts, components thereof, and products containing the same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 10,253,419 and 11,242,613. *Id.* at 7704. The Commission instituted the investigation as to certain nanolaminate alloy coated metal parts and products containing the same. *Id.* at 7704 n.1. The Commission's notice of investigation named the following respondents: Parker Hannifin Corporation of Cleveland, Ohio and Lu Chu Shin Yee Works Co., Ltd. of Kaohsiung City, Taiwan (collectively, ''Respondents''). *Id.* at 7704. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to this investigation. *Id.*

On May 28, 2025, the Commission amended the complaint and notice of investigation to add seven new respondents: Jiangsu DVP Hi Press Tech Co. of Jiangsu, China (''Jiangsu DVP Hi Press''); Kunshan Huizong Machine Co. of Jiangsu, China (''Kunshan''); Maxort Philippines Inc. of Laguna, Philippines; Paloma Turning Co. Pvt Ltd. of Karnataka, India; Shaoxing Xuantong Fluid Connectors Manufacturing Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang, China; Overseas International Group of Shanghai, China (''Overseas''); and Zhejiang Unifull Industrial Fibre Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang, China (''Zhejiang Unifull''). Order No. 13 at 1, 7 (May 8, 2025), *unreviewed by* Notice (May 28, 2025).

On June 6, 2025, Modumetal filed an unopposed motion pursuant to Commission Rule 210.14(b)(1) & (c), 19 CFR 210.14(b)(1) & (c), to: amend the notice of investigation (''NOI'') to replace Zhejiang Unifull with Zhejiang Fitting Machinery Co., Ltd., also of Zhejiang China; correct the name of Jiangsu DVP Hi Press as Jiangsu DVP Hi Pressure Technology Co., Ltd., also of Jiangsu, China; correct the name of Overseas as Shanghai Overseas Enterprises Co., Ltd., also of Shanghai, China; and remove reference in the NOI to Kunshan to conform to evidence.

On June 10, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 18) granting the motion. The ID finds that good cause exists to grant the motion. ID at 5–6. The ID explains that the parties worked together to ensure that each of the respondents had been identified correctly. *Id.* at 2. Additionally, the ID notes that Kunshan should not be identified as a respondent because it was omitted from the amended complaint and was not served with the amended complaint. *Id.* at 4. Modumetal represented that there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between itself and Kunshan concerning the subject matter of the investigation. *Id.* at 5.

No petitions for Commission review of the ID were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 9, 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: July 10, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–13114 Filed 7–11–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Advisory Committees on Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, Criminal, and Evidence Rules; Hearings of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Advisory Committees on Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, Criminal, and Evidence Rules; notice of proposed amendments and open hearings.

DATES: All written comments and suggestions with respect to the proposed amendments may be submitted on or after the opening of the period for public comment on August 15, 2025, but no later than February 16, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Written comments must be submitted electronically, following the instructions provided on the website. Comments will be available to the public.

Virtual public hearings are scheduled on the proposed amendments as follows:

- Appellate Rules on January 16, 2026, and February 6, 2026;
- Bankruptcy Rules on January 23, 2026, and January 30, 2026;
- Civil Rules on January 13, 2026, and January 27, 2026;
- Criminal Rules on January 22, 2026 and February 5, 2026; and
- Evidence Rules on January 15, 2026, and January 29, 2026.

Those wishing to testify must contact the Secretary of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure by email at: *RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov,* at least 30 days before the hearing date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carolyn A. Dubay, Esq., 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: The Advisory Committees on Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, Criminal, and Evidence Rules have proposed amendments to the following rules:

- Appellate Rule 15;
- Bankruptcy Rule 2002;
- Bankruptcy Official Forms B101 and 106C;
- Civil Rules 7.1, 26, 41, 45, and 81;
- Criminal Rule 17; and
- Evidence Rule 609 and new Rule 707.

The text of the proposals will be posted on August 15, 2025, on the Judiciary's website at: *https://www.uscourts.gov/forms-rules/proposed-amendments-published-public-comment*.

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

Dated: July 10, 2025.

Shelly L. Cox,

Management Analyst, Rules Committee Staff.

[FR Doc. 2025–13104 Filed 7–11–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A.; Decision and Order

On July 22, 2024, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A., of Yuma, Arizona (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.

MG8041206, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Arizona, the state in which [he is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of his right to file with DEA 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 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing. RFAA, at 2.[1] ''A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant'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.* 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 admitted. Registrant admits that, on the date the OSC was issued, Registrant was registered as a physician assistant in the State of Arizona. RFAAX 2, at 2. That registration expressly prohibited Registrant from prescribing controlled substances. *Id.* According to Arizona online records, of which the Agency takes official notice, Registrant's Arizona physician assistant license has since expired.[2] Arizona Medical Board, Licensee Search, *https://www.azmd.gov/doctorsearch/doctorsearch#* (last visited date of signature of this Order). The same Arizona online records confirm that Registrant's license—while active—prohibited him from prescribing controlled substances. *Id.* Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not currently licensed to practice as a physician assistant or to handle controlled substances in Arizona, the state in which he is registered with DEA.[3]

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., 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).[4]

According to Arizona statute, ''[e]very person who manufactures, distributes, dispenses, prescribes or uses for scientific purposes any controlled substance within [Arizona] or who proposes to engage in the manufacture, distribution, prescribing or dispensing of or using for scientific purposes any controlled substance within [Arizona]must first: (1) [o]btain and possess a current license or permit as a medical practitioner as defined in § 32–1901 . . . .'' Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 36–2522(A)(1) (West 2025). Section 32–1901 defines a ''[m]edical practitioner'' as ''any medical doctor . . . or other person who is licensed and authorized by law to use and prescribe drugs and devices to treat sick and injured human beings or animals or to diagnose or prevent sickness in human beings or animals in [Arizona] or any state, territory or district of the United States.'' *Id.* at 32–1901.

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to practice as a physician assistant or to handle controlled substances in Arizona. As discussed above, only a licensed medical practitioner can dispense controlled substances in Arizona. Thus, because Registrant lacks authority to practice as a physician assistant or to handle controlled substances in Arizona, and therefore is not a licensed medical practitioner, Registrant is not eligible to maintain a

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated March 6, 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 July 24, 2024, DI emailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's registered email address and received a confirmation message from the Mail Delivery Subsystem that the OSC was successfully delivered to Registrant. RFAAX 3, at 2 & Attachment B. The DI then emailed Registrant a copy of the OSC to Registrant's newly discovered business email address and received an additional confirmation message from the Mail Delivery Subsystem that the OSC was successfully delivered. *Id.* at 3 & Attachment D. The DI also mailed a copy of the OSC to Registrant's newly discovered business mailing address, to which delivery cannot be confirmed. *Id.* The Agency finds that Registrant was successfully served the OSC by email and that DI's efforts to serve Registrant by other means 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.

[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 Registrant, as of the date of this Order, is not licensed to practice as a physician assistant or to handle controlled substances in Arizona. 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 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 Yeats, M.D.,* 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *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.

DEA registration in Arizona. 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. MG8041206 issued to Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A. 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 Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A., to renew or modify this registration, as well as any other pending application of Elias Garcia Garcia, P.A., for additional registration in Arizona. This Order is effective August 13, 2025.

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on July 9, 2025, by Acting Administrator Robert J. Murphy. 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 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. 2025–13119 Filed 7–11–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

JYA LLC d/b/a Webb's Square Pharmacy; Decision and Order

I. Introduction

On November 18, 2024, the Agency issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration (OSC/ISO) to JYA LLC d/b/a Webb's Square Pharmacy of Davenport, Florida (Registrant). OSC/ISO, at 1. The OSC/ISO informs Registrant of the immediate suspension of its Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) Certificate of Registration, No. FJ2231570, 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.* (quoting 21 U.S.C. 824(d)). The OSC/ISO also proposes the revocation of Registrant's registration, No. FJ2231570, as well as the denial of ''any pending application for renewal or modification of such registration, or for additional DEA registrations, because . . . [Registrant's] continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest.'' *Id.*

More specifically, the OSC/ISO alleges that Registrant dispensed controlled substances to individuals without a valid prescription and for other than a legitimate medical purpose ''between on or about July 31, 2021, until at least on or about March 28, 2024.'' *Id.* at 2.

II. Adequacy of Service and Default Finding

According to the signed DEA–12, Registrant's designated contact person received the OSC/ISO through personal delivery by a Diversion Investigator and a Task Force Officer on November 21, 2024. Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 2, at 1. According to the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and its implementing regulations, Registrant had thirty days from November 21, 2024, to request a hearing. 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(B); 21 CFR 1301.43(a), 21 CFR 1316.47. The Government represents in its RFAA that Registrant ''fail[ed] to submit a request for a hearing and answer,'' and that as of February 7, 2025, Registrant ''has not filed a motion showing good cause to excuse the default or to reinstate the proceedings.'' RFAA, at 2, 9.

Accordingly, based on the Government's representations, the Agency finds that Registrant has not filed a request for a hearing, is deemed to have waived its right to a hearing, is in default, and is deemed to admit the factual allegations of the OSC/ISO. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(1) and (e). The Agency, therefore, issues this Decision and Order based on the record submitted by the Government, which constitutes the entire record before the Agency. 21 CFR 1301.43(e).

III. The CSA and Florida Pharmacy Standards of Practice

The main objectives of the CSA, according to the Supreme Court, are to ''conquer drug abuse and to control the legitimate and illegitimate traffic in controlled substances.'' *Gonzales* v. *Raich,* 545 U.S. 1, at 12 (2005). Given these objectives, the Supreme Court states, particular congressional concerns included ''the need to prevent the diversion of drugs from legitimate to illicit channels.'' *Id.* at 12–13. Further, according to the Supreme Court, to accomplish these goals in the CSA, ''Congress devised a closed regulatory system making it unlawful to . . . dispense[ ] or possess any controlled substance except in a manner authorized by'' the statute.[1] *Id.* at 13. ''Accordingly, the Supreme Court states, the ''CSA and its implementing regulations set forth strict requirements regarding registration . . . .'' *Id.* at 14.

According to the CSA's implementing regulations, a lawful controlled substance order or prescription is one that is ''issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his professional practice.'' 21 CFR 1306.04(a). As the Supreme Court explained in the context of the Act's requirement that Schedule II controlled substances may be dispensed only by written prescription, ''the prescription requirement . . . ensures patients use controlled substances under the supervision of a doctor so as to prevent addiction and recreational abuse . . . [and] also bars doctors from peddling to patients who crave the drugs for those prohibited uses.'' *Gonzales* v. *Oregon,* 546 U.S. 243, 274 (2006), *see also United States* v. *Hayes,* 595 F.2d 258 (5th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied,* 444 U.S. 866 (1979).

While the ''responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, . . . a corresponding responsibility rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription.'' 21 CFR 1306.04(a). The regulations state the parameters of the pharmacist's corresponding responsibility.

> An order purporting to be a prescription issued not in the usual course of professional treatment . . . is not a prescription within the meaning and intent of section 309 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 829) and the person knowingly filling such a purported prescription, as well as the person issuing it, shall be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the provisions of law relating to controlled substances.

Id. Accordingly, a pharmacy's registration authorizes it to ''dispense,'' or ''deliver a controlled substance to an ultimate user . . . by, or pursuant to the lawful order of, . . . a practitioner.'' 21 U.S.C. 802(10).

The OSC/ISO is addressed to Registrant at its registered address in Florida. Therefore, the Agency also evaluates Registrant's actions according

[1] 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1) (''[I]t shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally . . . to . . . distribute[ ] or dispense, or possess with intent to . . . distribute[ ] or dispense, a controlled substance . . . [e]xcept as authorized by'' the CSA.). The CSA defines ''dispense'' to include ''prescribing'' a controlled substance. 21 U.S.C. 802(10).