

are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainants are:

Nokia Technologies Oy, Karakaari 7A, FIN-02610, Espoo, Finland.

Nokia Corporation, Karakaari 7A, FIN-02610, Espoo, Finland.

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

Lenovo (United States), Inc., 8001 Development Drive, Morrisville, NC 27560.

Lenovo Group Limited, Lincoln House, 23rd Floor, Taikoo Place, 979 King's Road, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong.

Lenovo (Beijing) Limited, 6 Chuangye Rd., Shangdi Haidian District, 100085 Beijing, China.

Lenovo (Shanghai) Electronics Technology Co. Ltd., No. 696 Songtao Road, 200000 Shanghai, China.

Lenovo PC HK Limited, Lincoln House, 23rd Floor, Taikoo Place, 979 King's Road, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong.

Lenovo Information Products Shenzhen Co. Ltd., No. 30 Tao Hua Road, Free Trade Zone, Futian District, Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province, 518038 Shenzhen, China.

Lenovo Mobile Communication, No. 19, Gaixin 4th Road, East Lake New Technology Development Zone, Hubei, 430079 Wuhan, China.

Lenovo Corporation, No. 2088 Pangjin Road, Wujiang City, Jiangsu, 215217 Wujiang, China.

Lenovo Centro Tecnologico S. de RL CV, Blvd. Escobedo No. 316, Parque Industrial Technology, 66600 Apodaca, Nuevo Leon, Mexico.

(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), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainants 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: August 4, 2020.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2020-17360 Filed 8-7-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1209]

### Certain Movable Barrier Operator Systems and Components Thereof; Notice of Institution

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on July 6, 2020, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on behalf of Overhead Door Corporation of Lewisville, Texas and GMI Holdings Inc. of Mount Hope, Ohio. A supplement to the complaint was filed on July 22, 2020. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain movable barrier operator systems and components thereof by reason of infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,970,345 ("the '345 Patent"); U.S. Patent No. 9,483,935 ("the '935 Patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,173,516 ("the '516 Patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,180,260 ("the '260 Patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,956,718 ("the '718 Patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 8,410,895 ("the '895 Patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by the applicable Federal Statute. The complainants request that the Commission institute an

investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

**ADDRESSES:** The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email [EDIS3Help@usitc.gov](mailto:EDIS3Help@usitc.gov). Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810. Persons with mobility 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 at <https://www.usitc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Katherine Hiner, Office of Docket Services, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-1802.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2020).

**SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION:** Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on August 4, 2020, *ordered that*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 16, and 17 of the '345 patent; claims 1, 4, 16, and 19 of the '935 patent; claims 10-12, 14-16, and 18 of the '516 patent; claims 1-3, 7, and 8 of the '260 patent; claims 18 and 24 of the '718 patent; and claim 17 of the '895 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 "garage door systems and components thereof, remote controls, wireless transmitters, and software for operating the garage door systems";

(3) 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 complainants are:

Overhead Door Corporation, 2501 South State Highway 121, Bus., Suite 200, Lewisville, TX 75067.

GMI Holdings Inc., One Door Drive, Mount Hope, OH 44660.

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

The Chamberlain Group, Inc., 300 Windsor Drive, Oak Brook, IL 60523.

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

The Office of Unfair Import Investigations will not participate as a party in this investigation.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent 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), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainant 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 the 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: August 4, 2020.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2020-17358 Filed 8-7-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Tommy L. Louisville, M.D.; Decision and Order

On June 28, 2019, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause (hereinafter, OSC) to Tommy L. Louisville, M.D. (hereinafter, Registrant) of Lakeland, Florida. OSC, at 1. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration No. AL9587330. *Id.* It alleged that Registrant does "not have authority to handle controlled substances in Florida, the state in which . . . [he is] registered with the DEA." *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that, "effective May 31, 2019, the [State of Florida] Board [of Medicine, (hereinafter FBM)] issued its Final Order whereby . . . [Registrant's] license to practice medicine (License No. ME0037525) was suspended for a period of two years." OSC, at 1-2. The OSC further alleged that "[a]s of the date of this . . . [OSC], the suspension of . . . [Registrant's] Florida medical license has not been lifted" and "[a]s a result, . . . [he] currently lack[s] authority to handle controlled substances in Florida." *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f), and 824(a)(3)). The OSC concluded that "DEA must revoke . . . [Registrant's] registration based upon . . . [his] lack of authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Florida." OSC, at 2.

The OSC notified Registrant 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 Registrant of the opportunity to submit a corrective action plan. OSC, at 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(c)(2)(C)).

#### Adequacy of Service

In a sworn Declaration, dated August 13, 2019, a DEA Diversion Investigator assigned to the Tampa District Office of the Miami Division (hereinafter, TDDI) stated that she attempted personal service of the OSC on Registrant at the request of a DI assigned to the Miami Division (hereinafter, MDDI). Government's Submission Regarding Service of Order to Show Cause Upon Legal Counsel of Respondent and Motion for Termination of Proceedings

Based Upon Respondent's Untimely Hearing Request, dated Aug. 15, 2019, filed *In re Tommy L. Louisville, M.D.*, DEA Docket No. 2019-36 (hereinafter, Government Submission), Attachment 3 (hereinafter, TDDI Declaration), at 2. When Registrant was not at his residence, she reached him by telephone, explained that she had the OSC to deliver to him, and learned that he was in Miami. *Id.* at 3. When Registrant asked if DEA could serve the OSC on his attorney, TDDI responded that "this was a permissible arrangement if that was his preference." *Id.* According to the TDDI Declaration, Registrant "reiterated" that service on his attorney was his preference. *Id.* TDDI stated that she informed MDDI of Registrant's preference. *Id.*

In a sworn Declaration, dated August 13, 2019, MDDI stated that he left the OSC with Registrant's attorney on July 8, 2019. Government Submission, Attachment 4 (hereinafter, MDDI Declaration), at 2-3. MDDI stated that later the same day, the attorney sent him written confirmation of receipt of the OSC and of the forwarding of the OSC to Registrant. *Id.* at 3; *see also* Government Submission, Attachment 2, at 1 (attorney's written confirmation).

I agree with Administrative Law Judge Charles Wm. Dorman (hereinafter, ALJ) that service of the OSC was proper. Order Terminating Proceedings, dated Sept. 10, 2019 (hereinafter, OTP), at 6.

#### Hearing Request

By letter, dated August 8, 2019, the same attorney who accepted service of the OSC for Registrant transmitted a hearing request (hereinafter, Hearing Request) to the Office of Administrative Law Judges (hereinafter, OALJ).<sup>1</sup> The Hearing Request was emailed and received on August 8, 2019. It was also sent Federal Express and stamped "received" by OALJ on August 13, 2019. Hearing Request, at 1.

According to the nine-page Hearing Request, Registrant acknowledged the suspension of his Florida medical license, advised that he appealed it, and stated that he "is in the process of filing a Motion to Stay the . . . [FBM] Final Order." *Id.* "Accordingly," the Hearing Request concludes, "DEA acted prematurely in issuing an Order to Show Cause in this matter." *Id.* "We

<sup>1</sup> Among the nine pages comprising the Hearing Request is Form DEA-12 signed by Registrant's attorney showing his receipt of the OSC "on behalf of" Registrant on July 8, 2019. Hearing Request, at 7.

The Hearing Request states that "[a]ll notices to be sent pursuant to the proceeding in this matter should be addressed to" the attorney and, under "Contact Information for Proceeding," provides a physical address. *Id.* at 2.