

independent inventors, assistance to small businesses, prevention of unlawful intellectual property practices, international trends, and cooperation between Intellectual Property entities, in addition to other types of information. The USPTO sponsors conferences, fairs, speaking engagements, and training seminars such as those offered under the Patent and Trademark Depository Library Program, as well as other events, to disseminate this information. In order to plan for these events, the USPTO must collect information from the attendees.

The USPTO plans to use an online registration screen available through the <http://www.uspto.gov> Web site for all of the event registrations. However, the USPTO believes that some of the PTDL registrations may still be submitted in paper. Online registration will standardize data collection for USPTO-sponsored events and provide for more efficient event planning. Attendees may complete forms for event registration online and e-mail them to the USPTO, or they may print, complete in ink, and

mail the registrations to the USPTO. The USPTO has no plans to disseminate this information electronically or otherwise.

**II. Method of Collection**

Registrations for events other than the PTDLs can only be submitted using the online registration option. Registration for various PTDL events can be submitted electronically. The registrations can also be submitted by mail or by hand delivery if applicants choose to submit the information in paper form.

**III. Data**

*OMB Number:* 0651-00xx.  
*Form Number(s):* No Form Numbers.  
*Type of Review:* New collection.  
*Affected Public:* Primarily business or other for-profit organizations, but also individuals or households; not-for-profit institutions; farms, Federal Government; and state, local or tribal Government.  
*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 4,100 responses per year.  
*Estimated Time Per Response:* The USPTO estimates that it will take the public approximately 5 minutes (0.08

hours) to complete this information, whether it is mailed to the USPTO or submitted electronically. This includes the time to gather the necessary information, complete the request, and submit it to the USPTO.

*Estimated Total Annual Respondent Burden Hours:* 328 hours per year.

*Estimated Total Annual Respondent Cost Burden:* \$43,296. It is estimated that the respondent audience will be 1/3 attorneys, 1/3 paraprofessionals and members of the Patent and Trademark Depository Library Program, and 1/3 independent inventors, students, or other members of the public. Using a combination of the professional hourly rates of \$286 for associate attorneys in private firms, \$81 for paraprofessionals and members of the Patent and Trademark Depository Library Program, and \$30 for independent inventors, students, and other members of the public, the USPTO is using an hourly rate of \$132 to calculate the respondent costs. The USPTO estimates that the respondent cost burden for this collection will be \$43,296 per year.

Item	Estimated time for response	Estimated annual responses	Estimated annual burden hours
Event Registrations (electronic) .....	5 minutes .....	4,000	320
PTDL Registrations (paper) .....	5 minutes .....	10	1
PTDL Registrations (electronic) .....	5 minutes .....	90	7
Total .....	.....	4,100	328

*Estimated Total Annual Non-hour Respondent Cost Burden:* \$4. This collection does not have any capital start-up, maintenance, operation, or recordkeeping costs or filing fees associated with it. Customers can register for PTDL events electronically or they can print out the request, complete it, and mail it to the USPTO through the United States Postal Service. The USPTO estimates that 10 PTDL registrations will be submitted via first class mail. First class postage is 39 cents. Therefore, the USPTO estimates a total annual (non-hour) cost burden of \$4 due to mailing costs.

**IV. Request for Comments**

*Comments are invited on:* (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be

collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, e.g., the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 6, 2006.

**Susan K. Brown,**

*Records Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Architecture, Engineering and Technical Services, Data Architecture and Services Division.*

[FR Doc. E6-3561 Filed 3-13-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-16-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Patent And Trademark Office**

**Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request**

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Agency:* United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).  
*Title:* Statutory Invention Registration.  
*Form Number(s):* PTO/SB/94.  
*Agency Approval Number:* 0651-0036.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.  
*Burden:* 4 hours annually.  
*Number of Respondents:* 8 responses per year.

*Avg. Hours Per Response:* The USPTO estimates that it will take 24 minutes (0.4 hours) to submit a Statutory

Invention Registration request. This includes time to gather the necessary information, create the documents, and submit the completed request.

*Needs and Uses:* 35 U.S.C. 157, administered by the USPTO through 37 CFR 1.293–1.297, authorizes the USPTO to publish a statutory invention registration containing the specifications and drawings of a regularly filed application for a patent without examination, providing the applicant meets all the requirements for printing, waives the right to receive a patent on the invention within a certain period of time prescribed by the USPTO, and pays all application, publication, and other processing fees. This collection includes information needed by the USPTO to review and approve and/or deny such requests. The applicant may petition the USPTO to review final refusal to publish or to withdraw a request to publish a statutory invention registration prior to the date of the notice of the intent to publish.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; farms, the Federal Government, and State, Local or Tribal Governments.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by any of the following methods:

- E-mail: [Susan.Brown@uspto.gov](mailto:Susan.Brown@uspto.gov). Include “0651–0036 copy request” in the subject line of the message.
- Fax: 571–273–0112, marked to the attention of Susan Brown.
- Mail: Susan K. Brown, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Architecture, Engineering and Technical Services, Data Architecture and Services Division, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before April 13, 2006 to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: March 6, 2006.

**Susan K. Brown,**

*Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Architecture, Engineering and Technical Services, Data Architecture and Services Division.*

[FR Doc. E6–3562 Filed 3–13–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–16–P**

## CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[CPSC Docket No. 06–C0002]

### Acuity Brands, Inc., Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** It is the policy of the Commission to publish settlements which it provisionally accepts under the Consumer Product Safety Act in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the terms of 16 CFR 1118.20(e). Published below is a provisionally-accepted Settlement Agreement with Acuity Brands, Inc., containing a civil penalty of \$700,000.00.

**DATES:** Any interested person may ask the Commission not to accept this agreement or otherwise comment on its contents by filing a written request with the Office of the Secretary by March 29, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Persons wishing to comment on this Settlement Agreement should send written comments to the Comment 06–C0002, Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Seth B. Popkin, Trial Attorney, Office of Compliance, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; telephone (301) 504–7612.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The text of the Agreement and Order appears below.

Dated: March 8, 2006.

**Todd A. Stevenson,**  
*Secretary.*

In the Matter of Acuity Brands, Inc.

### Settlement Agreement and Order

1. In accordance with 16 CFR 1118.20, Acuity Brands, Inc. and the staff (“Staff”) of the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission (“Commission”) enter into this Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”). The Agreement and the incorporated attached Order (“Order”) settle the Staff’s allegations set forth below.

#### Parties

2. The Commission is an independent federal regulatory agency established pursuant to, and responsible for the enforcement of, the Consumer Product Safety Act, 15 U.S.C. 2051–2084 (“CPSA”).

3. Acuity Brands, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of

the state of Delaware, and its principal offices are located in Atlanta, Georgia. Acuity Brands, Inc.’s businesses, among other things, design and manufacture lighting equipment. Lithonia Lighting conducted the product recalls referenced in the Agreement and identified itself as the manufacturer of those recalled products. Lithonia Lighting is a division of, and is wholly owned by, Acuity Lighting Group, Inc., which is wholly owned by Acuity Brands, Inc. Lithonia Lighting is also a brand of lighting products sold by Acuity Lighting Group, Inc. Acuity Brands Inc., Acuity Lighting Group, Inc., and Lithonia Lighting are collectively referred to herein as “Acuity.”

4. Paragraphs 5 through 38 constitute the Staff’s allegations based on the Staff’s investigations. Paragraphs 39 through 48 constitute Acuity’s responsive allegations disputing the Staff’s allegations.

#### Staff Allegations

##### *ELM/ELM II Emergency Lights*

5. From August 1992 to May 1997, Acuity manufactured, and wholesalers and distributors sold, approximately 1.2 million ELM/ELM2 emergency lights later recalled on April 13, 2001 (“ELM Lights”). The ELM Lights were installed near exit doors in buildings such as schools, offices, and shopping centers, to aid in evacuation in the event of an emergency.

6. Each ELM Light is a “consumer product” that Acuity “distributed in commerce,” and Acuity is a “manufacturer” of that consumer product, as those terms are defined in CPSA sections 3(a)(1), (4), (11), and (12), 15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(1), (4), (11), and (12).

7. The ELM Lights had an electrical component that could overheat when connected to 277-volt electrical systems, and that could melt and burn the light enclosures and other objects, posing a fire hazard.

8. From January 1996 through September 2000, Acuity received reports of ELM Light capacitor failures and incidents from 33 sites, involving 109 failed capacitors, many of which included incidents of smoking, melting, rupturing, burning, and fire. Results included melted or damaged light enclosures, damaged walls and carpet, and one injury, i.e., a burned finger. From 1996 to 1999, Acuity replaced 345 ELM Lights due to the hazard.

9. Beginning in 1996, Acuity conducted testing and analysis, and it made an engineering change relating to the hazard by switching to a different and safer type of capacitor. By July