

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 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2012).

Scope Of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 22, 2013, ORDERED THAT—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products having laminated packaging, laminated packaging, and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 17, and 25 of the '242 patent and claims 1 and 19 of the '067 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Notwithstanding any Commission Rules that would otherwise apply, the presiding Administrative Law Judge shall hold an early evidentiary hearing, find facts, and issue an early decision, as to whether the complainant has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. Any such decision shall be in the form of an initial determination (ID). Petitions for review of such an ID shall be due five calendar days after service of the ID; any replies shall be due three business days after service of a petition. The ID will become the Commission's final determination 30 days after the date of service of the ID unless the Commission determines to review the ID. Any such review will be conducted in accordance with Commission Rules 210.43, 210.44, and 210.45, 19 CFR 210.43, 210.44, and 210.45. The Commission expects the issuance of an early ID relating to the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement within 100 days of institution, except that the presiding

ALJ may grant a limited extension of the ID for good cause shown. The issuance of an early ID finding that the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement is not satisfied shall stay the investigation unless the Commission orders otherwise; any other decision shall not stay the investigation or delay the issuance of a final ID covering the other issues of the investigation.

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: Lamina Packaging Innovations LLC, 3301 W. Marshal Avenue, Suite 303, Longview, TX 75604.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Remy Cointreau USA, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, 10th Floor, New York, NY 10104.

Pernod Ricard USA LLC, 250 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10177.

John Jameson Import Company, 100 Manhattanville Road, Purchase, NY 10577.

Moet Hennessy USA, 85 Tenth Avenue, New York, NY 10011.

Champagne Louis Roederer, 21 Boulevard Lundy, 51100 Reims, France.

Maisons Marques & Domaines USA Inc., 383 Fourth Street, Suite 400, Oakland, CA 94607.

Freixenet USA, 967 Broadway, Sonoma, CA 95476.

L'Oreal USA, Inc., 575 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10017.

Hasbro, Inc., 1027 Newport Avenue, Pawtucket, RI 02861.

Cognac Ferrand USA, Inc., 454 5th Avenue, Suite 640, New York, NY 10018.

WJ Deutsch & Son, 709 Westchester Avenue, Suite 300, White Plains, NY 10604.

Diageo North America, Inc., 801 Main Avenue, Norwalk, CT 06851.

Sidney Frank Importing Co., Inc., 20 Cedar Street, New Rochelle, NY 10801.

Beats Electronics LLC, 1601 Cloverfield Boulevard, Suite 5000N, Santa Monica, CA 90404.

Camus Wines & Spirits Group, 29 Rue Marguerite de Navarre, 16100 Cognac, France.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge,

U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the amended complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)–(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the amended complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the amended complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the amended complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the amended complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the amended complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

Issued: March 22, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013–07130 Filed 3–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JOINT BOARD FOR THE ENROLLMENT OF ACTUARIES

Meeting of the Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

ACTION: Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Executive Director of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries gives notice of a closed meeting of the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations.

DATES: The meeting will be held on April 26, 2013, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at The Segal Company, 333 W. 34th Street, New York, NY 10001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Patrick W. McDonough, Executive Director of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries, 202-622-8225.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations will meet at The Segal Company, 333 W. 34th Street, New York, NY, on April 26, 2013, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss topics and questions that may be recommended for inclusion on future Joint Board examinations in actuarial mathematics, pension law and methodology referred to in 29 U.S.C. 1242(a)(1)(B).

A determination has been made as required by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App., that the subject of the meeting falls within the exception to the open meeting requirement set forth in Title 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B), and that the public interest requires that such meeting be closed to public participation.

Dated: March 21, 2013.

Patrick W. McDonough,

Executive Director, Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

[FR Doc. 2013-07160 Filed 3-27-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Antitrust Division****Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials**

Notice is hereby given that, on March 11, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials ("IAPMO") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the nature and scope of IAPMO's standards development activities are to provide for the erection, installation, alteration, repair, relocation, replacement, addition to, use, or maintenance of solar energy, geothermal, and hydronic systems including but not limited to equipment

and appliances intended for space heating or cooling; water heating; swimming pool heating or process heating; and snow and ice melt systems.

On September 14, 2004, IAPMO filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 29, 2004 (69 FR 69396).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 10, 2004. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5485).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2013-07134 Filed 3-27-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Antitrust Division****Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Sematech, Inc. D/B/A International Sematech**

Notice is hereby given that, on March 7, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Sematech, Inc. d/b/a International Sematech ("SEMATECH") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Poongsan, Seoul, REPUBLIC OF KOREA; Advantest, Tokyo, JAPAN; and Air Products, Allentown, PA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Micron, Boise, ID, has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and SEMATECH intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 22, 1988, SEMATECH filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 19, 1988 (53 FR 17987).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 16, 2013. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 12, 2013 (78 FR 9939).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2013-07136 Filed 3-27-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Drug Enforcement Administration**

[Docket No. 13-7]

Gary Alfred Shearer, M.D.; Decision And Order

On February 4, 2013, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Christopher B. McNeil issued the attached recommended decision. Neither party filed exceptions to the decision.

Having reviewed the record in its entirety, including the ALJ's recommended decision, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law,¹ and

¹ In opposing the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, Respondent argues that the Kentucky Board of Medical Licensure's Order is based upon information provided by law enforcement which "is seriously flawed, misconstrued, unverified, unsupported, or simply, untrue." Resp. Reply to Govt's Mot. for Summ. Disp., at 2. Respondent raises a plethora of contentions, including that the conduct of the investigators "was highly prejudicial and, frankly, inept," *id.*; that the Board "cherry-picked" the charts its consultant reviewed and that the consultant's conclusion that Respondent "violated the standard of care was wrong—because *there was no standard of care* in Kentucky regarding what a physician should do in the face of inconsistent [urine drug screens] at the time these patients were being treated," *id.* at 4; and that the Board ignored the consultant's recommendations that his prescribing issues could be addressed by educating [him] about proper follow up." *Id.* at 8. He then concludes by arguing that "DEA created the case against [him] that led to his suspension[.]" that "[t]he agency now wants to bootstrap the suspension it caused as a reason to revoke [his] license to write controls" [sic], and that the Board "most likely would never have suspended [his] medical license without the DEA's biased, unfairly prejudicial input." *Id.* at 26-27. As relief, Respondent seeks a hearing and a stay of the matter until after the Board's hearing.

The fact remains that the Board's Order of Emergency Suspension remains in effect, and "DEA has held repeatedly that a registrant cannot collaterally attack the result of a state criminal or administrative proceeding in a proceeding under section 304, 21 U.S.C. 824, of the CSA." *Zhiwei Lin*, 77 FR 18862, 18864 (2012) (citing cases). As I held in *Lin*, "Respondent's various challenges to the validity of the [Board's] Suspension Order must be litigated in the forums provided by the State," and his "contentions regarding the validity of the [Board's] Suspension Order are therefore not material to this Agency's resolution of whether he is entitled to maintain his DEA registration in"

Continued