

reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,849,881 (“the ‘881 patent”); 6,975,011; 7,106,090 (“the ‘090 patent”); 7,151,283; and 7,271,425. 76 FR 40746 (Jul. 11, 2011). The respondents are LG Electronics, Inc. of Seoul, South Korea; LG Innotek Co., Ltd. of Seoul, South Korea; LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; and LG Innotek U.S.A., Inc. of San Diego, California (collectively, “LG”). *Id.*

Complainant OSRAM moved to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to withdraw all allegations with respect to the ‘881 and ‘090 patents, and to add allegations of a violation of Section 337 by all respondents as to claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9–12, 15–17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 33–35 of U.S. Patent No. 7,341,925 (“the ‘925 patent”). Respondent LG filed a response supporting the withdrawal of allegations with respect to the ‘881 and ‘090 patents, and opposing OSRAM’s request to add allegations with respect to the ‘925 patent.

On December 8, 2011, the presiding ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 9). The ALJ granted OSRAM’s motion in part to the extent that it sought termination of the ‘881 patent and the ‘090 patent from the investigation, and denied the portion of OSRAM’s motion that sought to add the ‘925 patent to this investigation. No party petitioned for review. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 section 210.42(h) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.42(h).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 30, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–13 Filed 1–5–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–738]

Certain Components for Installation of Marine Autopilots With GPS or IMU; Termination of Investigation on the Basis of Settlement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade

Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge’s initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 26) granting a joint motion to terminate the investigation as to the last remaining respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement, and terminating the investigation in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2532. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <http://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://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 instituted this investigation on September 28, 2010, based on a complaint filed by American GNC of Simi Valley, California (“AGNC”), alleging a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain components for installation of marine autopilots with GPS or IMU (*i.e.*, devices for pointing and stabilizing marine navigation equipment) by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,596,976. The complaint named eight respondents: Furuno Electronics Co. of Nishinomiya City, Japan and Furuno U.S.A. Inc. of Camas, Washington (collectively “Furuno”); Navico Holdings AS of Lysaker, Norway, Navico UK, Ltd. of Romsey Hampshire, United Kingdom, and Navico, Inc. of Nashua, New Hampshire (collectively “Navico”); and Raymarine UK Ltd. of Portsmouth, Hampshire, United Kingdom; Raymarine Inc. of Merrimack, New Hampshire; and FLIR Systems, Inc. of Wilsonville, Oregon (collectively “Raymarine”).

On June 8, 2011, the Commission determined not to review the ALJ’s IDs terminating the investigation as to

Furuno and Raymarine on the basis of settlement agreements.

On November 28, 2011, AGNC and Navico jointly moved to terminate the investigation as to the Navico respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement. The Commission investigative attorney supported the motion. On December 6, 2011, the ALJ granted the motion. Order No. 26. Because the Navico parties are the last remaining respondents, termination against Navico results in termination of the investigation.

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

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 sections 210.21 and 210.42 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.21, 210.42).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 30, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–14 Filed 1–5–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–795]

Certain Video Analytics Software, Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Motion To Amend Complaint and Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 16) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting complainant’s motion to amend complaint and notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3106. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E

Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <http://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://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 instituted this investigation on August 1, 2011, based on a complaint filed by ObjectVideo, Inc. of Reston, Virginia. 76 FR 45859 (Aug. 1, 2011). The complaint, as amended, 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 video analytics software, systems, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,696,945; 6,970,083; 7,613,324; 7,424,175; 7,868,912; and 7,932,923. The complaint names Robert Bosch GmbH of Stuttgart, Germany; Bosch Security Systems, Inc. of Fairpoint, New York; Samsung Techwin Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea; Samsung Opto-Electronics America, Inc. (d/b/a Samsung Techwin America, Inc.) of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; Sony Corporation of Tokyo, Japan; and Sony Electronics, Inc., of San Diego, California as respondents.

On December 6, 2011, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 16) granting complainant's motion to amend complaint and notice of investigation to add Bosch Sicherheitssysteme GmbH of Grasbrunn, Germany; Bosch Security Systems B.V. of Eindhoven, The Netherlands; Bosch Sicherheitssysteme Engineering GmbH of Nurnberg, Germany; Bosch Security Systems—Sistemas de Seguranca, S.A. of Ovar, Portugal; Bosch (Zhuhai) Security Systems, Co., Ltd. of Zhuhai, China; and Extreme CCTV, Inc. of Burnaby, Canada as respondents. No party petitioned for review of the ID, and the Commission has determined not to review it.

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 section 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.42(h).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 30, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–16 Filed 1–5–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of a Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby given that on December 29, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States and State of Indiana v. City of South Bend, Indiana*, Civil Action No. 3:11CV505 was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana.

In this case, the United States and the State of Indiana (Indiana) seek civil penalties and injunctive relief for violations of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*, Title 13 of the Indiana Code, Title 327 of the Indiana Administrative Code, and certain terms and conditions of National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits that Indiana issued to the City of South Bend (South Bend) for the relevant time periods, related to alleged discharges of untreated sewage from South Bend's combined sewer collection system, i.e. "combined sewer overflows," during wet weather events, and some dry weather time periods, into "waters of the United States" and "waters of the state."

The proposed Consent Decree would require South Bend to reduce its combined sewer overflows by comprehensively upgrading and expanding its sewage collection, storage, conveyance, and treatment system, at a cost of approximately \$509.5 million in 2007 dollars. South Bend must complete these improvements by December 31, 2031 or, if South Bend demonstrates financial hardship, by December 31, 2036. Additionally, the proposed Decree requires South Bend to pay a total civil penalty of \$88,200 split equally between the United States and the State of Indiana.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to *United States and State of Indiana v. City of South Bend, Indiana*, No. 3:11–CV–505 (N.D. Ind.), D.J. Ref. 90–5–1–1–08182.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Northern District of Indiana, 5400 Federal Plaza, Suite 1500, Hammond, IN 46320 (contact Assistant United States Attorney Wayne Ault (219) 937–5650)), and at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604–3590 (contact Associate Regional Counsel Gary Prichard (312) 886–0570)).

During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree also may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ConsentDecrees.html>. A copy of the proposed consent decree also may be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611 or by faxing or emailing a request to "Consent Decree Copy" (EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–5271. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$21.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by email or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the address given above.

Maureen Katz,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2012–41 Filed 1–5–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

[OJP (NIJ) Docket No. 1578]

Request for Proposals for Certification and Testing Expertise for the Ballistic Resistance of Personal Body Armor (2008) Standard

AGENCY: National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Request for Proposals for Certification and Testing Expertise.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is in the process of revising its *Ballistic Resistance of Personal Body Armor* (2008) Standard and corresponding certification program requirements. This work will be performed by a Special Technical Committee (STC), comprised of practitioners from the field, researchers, testing experts, certification experts, and representatives from stakeholder organizations. It is anticipated that the