

OHIO**Cuyahoga County**

Audubon School, 3055 Martin Luther King Jr. Dr., Cleveland, SG100007904
McKinley School, 3349 W 125th St., Cleveland, SG100007907

TENNESSEE**Dickson County**

Montgomery Bell CCC Camp SP-5/NP-15, 1020 Jackson Hill Rd., Burns, SG100007906

Additional documentation has been received for the following resources:

ARIZONA**Yavapai County**

East Prescott Historic District (Additional Documentation), (Prescott Territorial Buildings MRA), 512 East Willis St., Prescott, AD89000165

MAINE**York County**

Kennebunk Historic District (Additional Documentation), Vicinity of Summer, Maine, Portland, Fletcher, and Dane St., Kennebunk, AD74000324

MONTANA**Sanders County**

Thompson Falls Hydroelectric Dam Historic District (Additional Documentation) (Thompson Falls MRA), US ALT 10 at Clark Fork River within NW part of Thompson Falls, Thompson Falls vicinity, AD86002756

NEW JERSEY**Passaic County**

Belle Vista (Additional Documentation), 3 Valley Rd., Paterson, AD76001180

Nominations submitted by Federal Preservation Officers:

The State Historic Preservation Officer reviewed the following nominations and responded to the Federal Preservation Officer within 45 days of receipt of the nominations and supports listing the properties in the National Register of Historic Places.

ALABAMA**Baldwin County**

C.S.S. HUNTSVILLE and C.S.S. TUSCALOOSA Historic and Archaeological District, Address Restricted, Mobile vicinity, SG100007894

CALIFORNIA**Santa Barbara County**

Santa Rosa Island Archaeological District, Address Restricted, Santa Rosa Island vicinity, SG100007896

NEW YORK**Albany County**

Albany VA Main Hospital Building, (United States Third Generation Veterans

Hospitals, 1946–1958 MPS), 113 Holland Ave., Albany, MP100007908

Westchester County

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Veterans Hospital Historic District, (United States Third Generation Veterans Hospitals, 1946–1958 MPS), 2094 Albany Post Rd., Montrose, MP100007887

(Authority: Section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60)

Dated: June 7, 2022.

Sherry A. Frear,

Chief, National Register of Historic Places/ National Historic Landmarks Program.

[FR Doc. 2022–12789 Filed 6–13–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1295]

Certain Integrated Circuit Products and Devices Containing the Same; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant's Motions To Terminate the Investigation Based on Withdrawal and Settlement; Termination of the Investigation In Its Entirety

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 ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 17), granting complainant's motions to terminate the investigation based on withdrawal and settlement. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cathy Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2392. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (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 <https://www.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 January 31, 2022, based on a complaint, as supplemented, filed on behalf of Future Link Systems, LLC of Santa Clara, California. 87 FR 4915 (Jan. 31, 2022). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain integrated circuit products and devices containing the same that infringe one of more of claims 1–6 of U.S. Patent No. 7,685,439 and claims 1–9 of U.S. Patent No. 8,099,614. *Id.* at 4916. The complaint also alleged the existence of a domestic industry. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named seventeen respondents: Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. of Santa Clara, CA; Apple, Inc. of Cupertino, CA; Broadcom Inc. of San Jose, CA; Broadcom Corp. of San Jose, CA; Qualcomm Inc. of San Diego, CA; Qualcomm Technologies Inc. of San Diego, CA; Amlogic Holdings Ltd. of Cayman Islands; Amlogic (CA) Co., Inc. of Santa Clara, CA; Realtek Semiconductor Corp. of Taiwan ("Realtek"); Dell Technologies Inc. of Round Rock, TX; HP INC. of Palo Alto, CA; Acer Inc. of Taiwan; Acer America Corp. of San Jose, CA; Lenovo Group Ltd. of Hong Kong, China; Lenovo (United States) Inc. of Morrisville, NC; Motorola Mobility LLC of Chicago, IL; and Google LLC of Mountain View, CA. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") was also named as a party in this investigation. *Id.*

On April 28, 2022, Complainant filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to Respondent Realtek based on withdrawal of the complaint. *Id.* at 1. Thereafter, on May 6, 2022, Complainant filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to all remaining Respondents other than Realtek based on a single patent license agreement and multiple release agreements. *Id.* at 1–2. Realtek opposed the motions to the extent they would prevent the ALJ from ruling on any pending issues. *Id.* at 1, 2. OUII filed statements in support of the motions. *Id.* All other Respondents either did not oppose or did not take a position on the motions. *Id.*

On May 31, 2022, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 17), granting Complainant's motions to terminate the investigation. The ID found that the motion to terminate Respondent Realtek complies with Commission Rule 210.21(a), 19 CFR 210.21(a), and there are no extraordinary circumstances preventing the withdrawal. *Id.* at 3–4.

As for the motion to terminate all other Respondents, the ID noted that not

all Respondents other than Realtek are named in the patent license agreement and/or release agreements. *Id.* at 4 n.2. For those not named, the ID stated that “termination by settlement under Commission Rule 210.21(b) would not be appropriate, as opposed to general withdrawal under Commission Rule 210.21(a).” *Id.* The ID found that “[r]egardless, the motion complies with all Commission Rules.” *Id.* The ID also found that “there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant denying the motion” and “there is no evidence indicating that terminating this investigation based on various agreements would be contrary to the public interest.” *Id.* at 4, 5. The ID also noted that the motion attached confidential and public versions of the agreements. *Id.* at 4. No petition for review of the ID was filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 9, 2022.

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 Part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR part 210.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 9, 2022.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2022–12794 Filed 6–13–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1273]

Certain Residential Premises Security Monitoring and Automation Panels, and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination of Non-Infringement; Termination of the 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. 18) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting summary determination of no violation based on non-infringement of

the asserted patent claims. The investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2392. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (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 <https://www.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: On August 5, 2021, the Commission instituted this investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), based on a complaint filed by ADT LLC and the ADT Security Corporation, both of Boca Raton, Florida, (collectively, “ADT”). 86 FR 42879–80. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges a violation of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, sale for importation, or sale after importation into the United States of certain residential premises security monitoring and automation control panels, and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 1 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 8,976,937 (“the ‘937 patent”) and claims 1–4, 7–15, and 18–20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,286,772 (“the ‘772 patent”). *Id.* at 42880. The complaint also alleges the existence of a domestic industry. The notice of investigation names as a respondent Vivint, Inc., of Provo, Utah (“Vivint”). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also a party to the investigation. 87 FR 476 (Jan. 5, 2022).

The Commission subsequently terminated the investigation with respect to all asserted claims of the ‘937 patent and claims 1, 7–12, and 18–20 of the ‘772 patent based on withdrawal of the complaint as to those claims. Order No. 10 (Dec. 17, 2021), *unreviewed by* Notice (Jan. 18, 2022); Order No. 15 (Mar. 21, 2022), *unreviewed by* Notice (Apr. 12, 2022). Claims 2, 3, and 4 of the ‘772 patent are therefore the only claims that remain in the investigation.

On March 10, 2022, Vivint moved for a summary determination pursuant to Commission Rule 210.18 (19 CFR 210.18) of no violation of section 337 based on invalidity, and alternatively,

non-infringement. Vivint argued that the “processor” limitations of the asserted claims should be construed to allow those limitations to be satisfied by multiple processors, and that under that construction, all the asserted claims are invalid as anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2010/0102171. Vivint alternatively argued that, if the “processor” limitations of the asserted claims are construed to require that a single processor must satisfy all of the “processor” limitations, none of the accused products infringe the asserted claims because no single processor satisfies all the “processor” limitations.

On March 21, 2022, ADT filed a response opposing the motion, arguing that the “processor” limitations require a single processor, but contending that the accused products contained a processor that satisfied all the limitations. On March 28, OUII filed a response in support of the motion, arguing that the “processor” limitations require at least one processor that satisfies all the “processor” limitations and that the accused products do not infringe because they do not contain a processor that satisfies all of the “processor” limitations. On March 24, 2022, and March 31, 2022, Vivint filed replies to ADT’s and OUII’s responses, respectively.

On April 22, 2022, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 18) pursuant to Commission Rules 210.18(b) and 210.42(c) (19 CFR 210.18(b), 210.42(c)), granting in part Vivint’s motion and finding summary determination of no violation because ADT failed to establish that the accused products infringe any asserted claim. The ID finds that the “processor” limitations require at least one processor that satisfies all of the “processor” limitations, and that ADT failed to show that the accused products contain a “processor” that satisfies all the “processor” limitations.

On May 4, 2022, ADT filed a petition for review of the ID. Also on May 4, 2022, Vivint filed a contingent petition for review of the ID. On May 9, 2022, Vivint responded to ADT’s petition, and on May 11, 2022, ADT responded to Vivint’s contingent petition for review. Also on May 11, 2022, OUII responded to both petitions.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is hereby terminated with a finding of no violation.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 8, 2022.

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 part