



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

In the Matter of:)
))
Hans De Geetere)
Paul Parmentierlaan 121)
8300 Knokke Heist)
Belgium)
))
and)
))
Nyckestraat 4))
8300 Knokke Heist)
Belgium)
))
Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management)
a/k/a Hasa Invest)
Paul Parmentierlaan 121)
8300 Knokke Heist)
Belgium)
))
and)
))
Nyckestraat 4))
8300 Knokke Heist)
Belgium)
))

Final Decision and Order

Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations (“Regulations”), 15 C.F.R. parts 730-774, authorizes the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement (“Assistant Secretary”) to issue a Temporary Denial Order (“TDO”) for a period of up to 180 days to prevent an “imminent violation” of the Regulations. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(b)(1), (b)(4).

On August 26, 2022, the Assistant Secretary issued a TDO against Hans De Geetere and his company, Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management (collectively, “Appellants”). *See* 87 Fed. Reg. 53716 (Sep. 1, 2022). The TDO stated that De Geetere engaged in conduct prohibited by the Regulations by acquiring or attempting to acquire under false pretenses items subject to the Regulations on behalf of prohibited end-users or for prohibited end uses. *Id.* The TDO was

effective immediately and remained in effect for 180 days; it expired on February 22, 2023. *Id.* at 53718.

On February 11, 2026, the Appellants filed an appeal of the TDO under § 766.24(e)(3) of the Regulations. Litigation commenced, and on May 14, 2026, Administrative Law Judge Timothy G. Stueve issued a decision recommending dismissal of Appellants' challenge as moot given that the TDO expired in February 2023 and was never renewed.¹ Judge Stueve further explained that the additional forms of relief requested by Appellants were not within the scope of § 766.24 of the Regulations.

Based on my review of the record, I accept Judge Stueve's recommended decision. This appeal is therefore dismissed. This Final Decision and Order shall be served on Appellants and on BIS and it and the Recommended Decision shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

This Order, which constitutes the Department's final decision regarding this appeal, is effective immediately.

Dated: May 26, 2026.

Jeffrey I. Kessler,
*Under Secretary of Commerce for
Industry and Security.*

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20230**

In the Matter of:

Hans De Geetere

And

**Knokke-Heist Support Corporation
Management**

Docket Number:

26-BIS-TDO1

¹ The Office of the Under Secretary for Industry and Security received a certified copy of Judge Stueve's recommended decision on May 18, 2026.

a/k/a Hasa-Invest

Appellants.

RECOMMENDED DECISION

Issued by: The Honorable Timothy Stueve, Administrative Law Judge

Issued: May 14, 2026

On February 12, 2026, the United States Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Docketing Center received an Appeal and Motion to Vacate filed by Hans De Geetere and Knokke-Heist Support Corporation Management (collectively, Appellants) pursuant to 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(e). Appellants request I vacate the temporary denial order (TDO) issued on August 26, 2022, based on newly discovered evidence not previously available. For the reasons set forth below, I recommend this appeal be **DISMISSED** as moot.

Background

On August 26, 2022, BIS issued a TDO against Appellants based upon an investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement (OEE). Pursuant to 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(d)(1), TDOs are only valid for 180 days absent renewal, thus Appellants' TDO expired on February 22, 2023. BIS did not seek renewal of the TDO. Further, BIS notes Appellants were subsequently added to BIS's Entity List, a separate and distinct list from the Denied Persons List, for acting contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States.

Appellants state their appeal is based on newly discovered evidence recently provided by the Belgian government, which was not available to Appellants at the time of the 2022 TDO. Appellants requested the 2022 TDO be vacated and various forms of relief including: (1) an investigation into alleged false statements made during the investigation; (2) the production of documents referenced in a government affidavit made at the time of the TDO; (3) costs and attorney's fees; (4) expungement of all references to this matter from export control databases and public records; and (5) issuance of a public correction acknowledging that the 2022 TDO was improper. Appeal at 5.

BIS filed its response on February 26, 2026, arguing the appeal should be dismissed as moot or otherwise denied because the TDO issued against Appellants has expired. BIS did not seek renewal, despite Appellants' contention the TDO has been renewed. Thus, BIS asserts Appellants do not have

standing to bring an appeal.² This matter was assigned to me on May 6, 2026 for adjudication. Per BIS regulations, an ALJ shall issue a recommended decision within 10 working days after receipt of the appeal. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(e)(4). However, due to the recent Department of Homeland Security funding hiatus, our office was unable to process this appeal when it was initially filed. The Department of Homeland Security was funded on April 30, 2026. As such, the 10 day deadline to issue a recommended decision started on May 6, 2026, when this case was assigned to me. The record is now closed, and the appeal is ripe for decision.

Recommended Findings of Fact

1. On August 26, 2022, the Assistant Secretary of Export Enforcement (Assistant Secretary) issue a TDO against Appellants. BIS Exhibit 1.³
2. The TDO expired on February 22, 2023. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(d)(1)
3. BIS did not seek renewal of the TDO at any time. BIS Exhibit 1.

Opinion and Recommended Conclusions of Law

BIS regulations related to export administration are issued “under laws relating to the control of certain exports, reexports, and activities.” 15 C.F.R. § 730.1.5. These export control provisions “are intended to serve the national security, foreign policy, nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and other interests of the United States.” 15 C.F.R. § 730.6. To prevent an imminent violation of the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), the Assistant Secretary may issue a TDO on an ex parte basis. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(a). The TDO “will deny export privileges to any person named in the order as provided for in § 764.3(a)(2) of the EAR.” 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(a). The order is valid for 180 days, but the Assistant Secretary may renew it, more than once, in additional 180-day increments. 15 C.F.R. §§ 766.24(b)(4), 766.24(d)(4).

BIS regulations afford respondents the right to appeal a TDO. Specifically, “[a] respondent may, at any time, file an appeal of the initial or renewed temporary denial order with the administrative law judge.” 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(e)(1)(i). “A respondent may appeal on the grounds that the finding that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation is unsupported.” 15 C.F.R. §

² On May 7, 2026, Appellants filed a reply to BIS’ response which I do not consider a part of the record because Appellants did not ask permission from the Court to file a reply and the regulations do not afford appellants the right to file a reply.

³ “BIS Exhibit” references the exhibits attached to BIS’s Response dated February 26, 2026.

766.24(e)(2). Within 10 working days after an appeal is filed, the administrative law judge shall submit a recommended decision to the Under Secretary. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(e)(4). The regulations limit the scope of the recommended decision. The ALJ may only recommend whether the issuance or the renewal of the temporary denial order should be affirmed, modified or vacated. 15 C.F.R. § 766.24(e)(4).

Having outlined the relevant law governing this appeal, I now turn to the facts of in this case and conclude the appeal is moot because there is no valid TDO against Appellants. Here, BIS issued a TDO in August 2022 and the TDO expired February of 2023. Appellants have not provided any evidence that the 2022 TDO was renewed despite arguing such. BIS indicated it did not seek renewal of the 2022 TDO. Because there is no current TDO, I am dismissing Appellants appeal as moot because I cannot provide a recommended decision on the merits in accordance with the regulations on an expired TDO. Specifically, I cannot affirm, modify or vacate an expired TDO nor can I evaluate whether the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation because there is no current order against Appellants. Doing so would hold no legal significance. Moreover, the additional forms of relief requested by Appellants outlined above are not within the scope of 15 C.F.R. § 766.24. Even if BIS erred in issuing the 2022 TDO, and that TDO was current, I cannot lawfully direct BIS to (1) perform an investigation into alleged false statements made during the investigation; (2) produce documents referenced in a government affidavit made at the time of the TDO; (3) provide costs and attorney's fees; (4) expunge all references to this matter from export control databases and public records; or (5) issue of a public correction acknowledging that the 2022 TDO was improper. Considering the above, I recommend this appeal be **DISMISSED** as moot.

Done and dated May 14, 2026, at
Alameda, California



Honorable Timothy G. Stueve
Administrative Law Judge
U.S. Coast Guard

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing **ORDER** upon the following parties as indicated below:

ALJ Docketing Center
Attention: Hearing Docket Clerk
40 South Gay Street, Room 412
Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022
Email: aljdocketcenter@uscg.mil
Telephone: (410) 962-5100
Facsimile: (410) 962-1746
Sent electronically via email

Gregory Michelsen, Attorney-Advisor
Attorneys for Bureau of Industry and Security
Office of Chief Counsel for Industry and Security
U.S. Department of Commerce, Room H-3839
14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230
Email: gmichelsen@doc.gov
Sent electronically via email

Hans De Geetere
Email: slimslimmer@me.com
Sent electronically via email

I hereby certify that I have forwarded by Express Courier the foregoing Recommended Decision and the case file upon the following:

Jeffrey Kessler
Under Secretary for Industry and Security
Bureau of Industry and Security
U.S. Department of Commerce
1401 Constitution Ave., NW Room 3896
Washington, DC 20230
Sent by Federal Express

Done and dated May 14, 2026, at
Alameda, California

Beth Kim

Beth Kim
Paralegal Specialist to the
Administrative Law Judge