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 Organ Preservation Systems and Components Thereof, DN 3949;* 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 Paragonix Technologies, Inc. on November 6, 2026. 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 organ preservation systems and components thereof. The complaint names as a respondent: Traferox Technologies Inc. of Canada. 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 60-day Presidential review period pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(j).

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, members of the public, and interested government agencies 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 (5:15 p.m.),[1] eight calendar days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Complainant(s) may file replies to any written submissions no later than three calendar days after the date on which the written submissions were due. Notwithstanding § 201.14(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the deadlines for written submissions and replies shall be counted by calendar days starting with the first calendar day following the **Federal Register** publication date or the due date for written submissions, respectively. The provisions of § 201.14(a) regarding the last day of the period still apply concerning the due date of any filings. 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. 3949'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures[2]). Please note the Secretary's Office will accept only electronic filings unless an exemption is granted. Filings must be made through the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, *https://edis.usitc.gov.*) 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[3], solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public

[1] *See* 19 CFR 201.3(c).

[2] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf.*

[3] All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS [4].

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: November 9, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–23043 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N.; Decision and Order

On June 26, 2026, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Traci B. Lujan, A.P.R.N., of Holladay, Utah (Registrant). Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA), Exhibit (RFAAX) 1, at 1, 4. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. ML5284815 CFR, alleging that Registrant is ''currently without authority to prescribe, administer, dispense, or otherwise handle controlled substances in the State of Utah, the state in which [she is] registered with DEA.'' *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3)).

The OSC notified Registrant of her right to file a written request for hearing, and that if she failed to file such a request, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. *Id.* at 2–3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). Here, Registrant did not request a hearing, and the Agency finds her to be in default. RFAA, at 2.[1] ''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.* 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), and 1301.46. RFAA, at 4; *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. 21 CFR 1301.43(e). According to the OSC, effective April 21, 2026, the Utah Division of Professional Licensing revoked Registrant's Utah Registered Nurse (RN) license, Registrant's Utah Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) license, and Registrant's Utah APRN controlled substance license. RFAAX 2, at 2. According to Utah online records, of which the Agency takes official notice,[2] Registrant's Utah RN, APRN, and APRN controlled substance licenses are all revoked. Utah Division of Professional Licensing License Lookup & Verification System, *https://secure.utah.gov/llv/search/index.html* (last visited date of signature of this Order). Accordingly, the Agency finds that Registrant is not licensed to practice nursing, to practice as an APRN, nor to handle controlled substances in Utah, the state in which she 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).'').[4] The Agency has applied these principles consistently. *See, e.g., Thomas Andr'e Endicott, D.D.S.,* 90 FR 13892 (2025); *Gerald M. Baltz, N.P.,* 87 FR 6749 (2022); *Paul E. Pilgram, M.D.,* 82 FR 11058 (2017).

According to Utah statute, ''[e]very person who . . . distributes, prescribes, dispenses, [or] administers . . . any controlled substance in Schedules I through V within [the] state . . . shall obtain a license issued by the [Division of Professional Licensing].'' Utah Code Ann. § 58–37–105(2)(a)(i) (West 2026).

Here, the undisputed evidence in the record is that Registrant lacks authority to handle controlled substances in Utah because Registrant's Utah APRN controlled substance license is revoked. As discussed above, an individual must

[4] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

[1] Based on the Government's submissions in its RFAA dated August 18, 2026, the Agency finds that service of the OSC on Registrant was adequate. The included declaration from a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) indicates that on June 29, 2026, the DI, along with other DEA personnel, traveled to Registrant's registered location to personally serve Registrant, but they were unsuccessful because no one was at the facility, the lights were off, and the doors were locked. RFAAX 2, at 2. On the same day, the DI sent a copy of the OSC to Registrant via certified mail and to Registrant's registered email address. *Id.; see also id.,* Attachment C. On or about July 3, 2026, Registrant responded to the DI's email indicating her receipt of the OSC. *Id.; see also id.,* Attachment D.

[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 nursing, to practice as an APRN, nor to handle controlled substances in Utah. Accordingly, Registrant may dispute the Agency's findings 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.*

[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., 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).