

cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5.

Ruth Welch,

BLM Colorado State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015-07013 Filed 3-26-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4130-JB-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 704-TA-1 and 734-TA-1 (Review)]

Sugar from Mexico; Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject reviews, the United States International Trade Commission ("Commission") determines, pursuant to sections 704(h) and 734(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671c(h) and 1673c(h)) ("the Act"), that agreements the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Commerce") has entered into with Mexican exporters of sugar and the government of Mexico suspending antidumping and countervailing duty investigations concerning sugar from Mexico eliminate completely the injurious effect of subject imports.²

Background

The Commission instituted these investigations effective January 8, 2015, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission by Imperial Sugar Company ("Imperial"), Sugar Land, Texas and AmCane Sugar LLC ("AmCane"), Taylor, Michigan. The Commission determined that Imperial and AmCane are interested parties who were parties to the underlying investigations at the time the petitions were filed, and consequently are appropriate petitioning parties. Notice of the scheduling of these reviews and of a public oral presentation to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on January 26, 2015 (80 FR 3977). The oral presentation was held in Washington, DC, on February 19, 2015, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission completed and filed its determination in these reviews on

March 24, 2015. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4523 (April 2015), entitled *Sugar From Mexico: Investigation Nos. 704-TA-1 and 734-TA-1 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 24, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-07071 Filed 3-26-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Application: HOSPIRA

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class, and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a) on or before April 27, 2015. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 on or before April 27, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA **Federal Register** Representative/ODW, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. Request for hearings should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: Hearing Clerk/LJ, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Attorney General has delegated his authority under the Controlled Substances Act to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), 28 CFR 0.100(b). Authority to exercise all necessary functions with respect to the promulgation and implementation of 21 CFR part 1301, incident to the registration of manufacturers, distributors, dispensers, importers, and exporters of controlled substances (other than final orders in connection with suspension, denial, or revocation of registration) has been redelegated to the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the DEA Office of Diversion Control ("Deputy Assistant Administrator") pursuant to section 7 of 28 CFR pt. 0, subpt. R, App.

In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on October 31, 2014, Hospira, 1776 North Centennial Drive, McPherson, Kansas

67460-1247, applied to be registered as an importer of remifentanyl (9739), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to import remifentanyl for use in dosage form manufacturing.

Dated: March 20, 2015.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,

Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015-06969 Filed 3-26-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Application: Meda Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic class, and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a) on or before April 27, 2015. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 on or before April 27, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA **Federal Register** Representative/ODXL, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. Request for hearings should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: Hearing Clerk/LJ, 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Attorney General has delegated his authority under the Controlled Substances Act to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), 28 CFR 0.100(b). Authority to exercise all necessary functions with respect to the promulgation and implementation of 21 CFR part 1301, incident to the registration of manufacturers, distributors, dispensers, importers, and exporters of controlled substances (other than final orders in connection with suspension, denial, or revocation of registration) has been redelegated to the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the DEA Office of Diversion Control ("Deputy Assistant Administrator") pursuant to section 7 of 28 CFR part 0, appendix of subpart R.

In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on December 5, 2014, Meda

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² All six Commissioners voted in the affirmative.

Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 705 Eldorado Street, Decatur, Illinois 62523 applied to be registered as an importer Nabilone (7379), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to import the FDA approved drug product in finished dosage form for distribution to its customers.

Dated: March 20, 2015.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,

Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015-06971 Filed 3-26-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States and State of New York v. Twin America, LLC, et al.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in *United States and State of New York v. Twin America, LLC, et al.*, Civil Action No. 12-cv-8989 (ALC) (GWG). On December 11, 2012, the United States and the State of New York filed a Complaint. The United States alleged that the formation of Twin America, LLC by Coach USA, Inc. and CitySights LLC violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18) and Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1). The proposed Final Judgment, filed on March 16, 2015, requires Defendants to relinquish all of CitySights's Manhattan bus stop authorizations granted by the New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT) to NYC DOT, and to pay \$7.5 million in disgorgement.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division's internet Web site, filed with the Court and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be directed to William H. Stallings, Chief, Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-9323).

Patricia A. Brink

Director of Civil Enforcement.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

United States of America, and State of New York, Plaintiffs, v. Twin America, LLC, et al., Defendants.

Civil Action No. 12-cv-8989 (ALC) (GWG). ECF CASE.

COMPETITIVE IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act ("APPA" or "Tunney Act"), 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), Plaintiff United States of America ("United States") files this Competitive Impact Statement relating to the proposed Final Judgment submitted for entry in this civil antitrust proceeding.

I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROCEEDING

On March 17, 2009, Defendants Coach USA, Inc. (through subsidiary International Bus Services, Inc. ("IBS")) and CitySights LLC (through subsidiary City Sights Twin, LLC) formed Twin America, LLC ("Twin America"), a joint venture that combined the companies' hop-on, hop-off bus tour businesses in New York City. The United States and the State of New York (collectively, "Plaintiffs") filed a civil antitrust Complaint on December 11, 2012, alleging that the formation of Twin America substantially lessened competition in the market for hop-on, hop-off bus tours in New York City in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18), and also violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1), Section 340 of the Donnelly Act (N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340), and Section 63(12) of the New York Executive Law (N.Y. Exec. Law § 63(12)).¹ The

¹ The Tunney Act applies to "proposal[s] for a consent judgment submitted by the United States for entry in any civil proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws [of the United States]." 15 U.S.C. 16(b). Therefore,

Complaint sought to remedy harm to competition and disgorge Defendants' ill-gotten gains.

The Parties completed discovery and dispositive motions practice and trial was scheduled to begin on February 23, 2015. On December 10, 2014, the Parties informed the Court that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle the litigation and the trial date was adjourned while the Parties finalized the settlement.

Concurrent with the filing of this Competitive Impact Statement, Plaintiffs have filed a proposed Stipulation and Order, a proposed Final Judgment, and an Explanation of Consent Decree Procedures. The proposed Final Judgment is designed to remedy the competitive concerns resulting from Defendants' formation of Twin America and deprive Defendants of ill-gotten gains. As explained more fully below, the proposed Final Judgment requires Defendants to relinquish the complete set of City Sights's Manhattan bus stop authorizations to the New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) and to pay \$7.5 million in disgorgement, among other remedial actions.²

Plaintiffs and Defendants have stipulated that Defendants are bound by the terms of the proposed Final Judgment and that the proposed Final Judgment may be entered after compliance with the APPA. Entry of the proposed Final Judgment would terminate this action, except that the Court would retain jurisdiction to construe, modify, or enforce the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment and to punish violations thereof.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENTS GIVING RISE TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION

A. The Defendants and the Transaction

Coach USA, Inc. ("Coach"), a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Paramus, New Jersey, operated hop-on, hop-off bus tours in New York City under the "Gray Line New York" brand. Coach acquired the Gray Line business in 1998, and, by the early 2000s, was the dominant

the proposed Final Judgment's settlement of Plaintiff State of New York's claims under N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340 and N.Y. Exec. Law § 63(12) are not subject to the Tunney Act.

² Defendant Coach USA and the United States have also reached a settlement relating to costs and expenses incurred by the United States associated with discovery into allegations that Coach did not meet its document preservation obligations. This settlement, which is being filed concurrently with the filing of the proposed Final Judgment, is not subject to Tunney Act review.