

(Authority: 43 C.F.R. 2711.1–2(a) and (c))

### Termination of Portions of R&PP Classification—SNPLMA Withdrawal

A portion of the following lease granted under the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, 43 U.S.C. 869 et. seq.) has been relinquished: N–63336 (68FR47929). The Notice officially terminates the R&PP classification and segregation of a portion of that parcel. A portion of R&PP application, N–78724 has been withdrawn by the applicant. This notice serves to inform you that land previously leased and previously requested for R&PP purposes is no longer required and is now part of this sale. It does not serve as an opening order because those parcels are within the disposal boundary set by Congress in SNPLMA. Pursuant to section 4(c) of SNPLMA, these parcels are withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from entry and appropriation under the public land laws, location and entry under the mining laws and from operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, until such time as the Secretary of the Interior terminates the withdrawal or the lands are conveyed.

Dated: March 15, 2006.

**Juan Palma,**

*Field Manager.*

[FR Doc. 06–3773 Filed 4–17–06; 11:42 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–P

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–355 and 731–TA–659 and 660 (Second Review)]

#### Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel from Italy and Japan

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Termination of five-year reviews.

**SUMMARY:** The subject five-year reviews were initiated in February 2006 to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty order on grain-oriented silicon electrical steel from Italy and the antidumping duty orders on grain-oriented silicon electrical steel from Italy and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. On March 28, 2006, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the orders effective March 14, 2006, “{b}ecause the domestic interested parties did not participate in these sunset reviews \* \* \*” (71 FR 15376). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff

Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the subject reviews are terminated.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 14, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary Messer (202–205–3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

**Authority:** These reviews are being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission’s rules (19 CFR 207.69).

Issued: April 13, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 06–3711 Filed 4–18–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–551]

#### In the Matter of Certain Laser Bar Code Scanners and Scan Engines, Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant’s Motion To Amend the 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. 9) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting complainant’s motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michelle Walters, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. 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:** This investigation was instituted on October 26, 2005, based on a complaint filed by Symbol Technologies Inc. (“Symbol”) of Holtsville, New York. The complaint 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 laser bar code scanners or scan engines, components thereof, or products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 5,457,308 (“the ‘308 patent”), 5,545,889 (“the ‘889 patent”), 6,220,514 (“the ‘514 patent”), 5,262,627, and 5,917,173. 70 FR 61841 (Oct. 26, 2006). The complaint named two respondents: Metro Technologies Co., Ltd. of Suzhou, China, and Metrologic Instruments, Inc. of Blackwood, New Jersey (collectively, “Metrologic”).

On March 9, 2006, Symbol filed a motion for leave to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add claims 10 and 11 of the ‘308 patent, claims 8 and 11 of the ‘889 patent, and claims 3, 7, 9, and 10 of the ‘514 patent. Metrologic filed an opposition to Symbol’s motion, asserting that Symbol failed to show good cause for its amendment and that Metrologic would be unduly prejudiced by an amendment to the complaint just one month before the close of discovery. The Commission investigative attorney supported Symbol’s motion.

On March 22, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 9) granting Symbol’s motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation. The ALJ found that, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.14(b)(1) (19 CFR 210.14(b)(1)), there was good cause to add claims 10 and 11 of the ‘308 patent, claims 8 and 11 of the ‘889 patent, and claims 3, 7, 9, and 10 of the ‘514 patent to the complaint and notice of investigation. The ALJ found that Symbol had obtained new