

38. Accordingly, the Commission finds no violation of section 337 as to the asserted claims of the '151 patent, namely independent claims 1 and 16, and asserted claims dependent upon them.

The Commission has determined not to review the final ID's determination that claim 16 of the '151 patent is invalid for indefiniteness. Final ID at 29–31; *see* IA Pet. 6–12; InterDigital Pet. 24–29; *see also* *Rembrandt Data Techs., LP v. AOL, LLC*, 641 F.3d 1331, 1339–40 (Fed. Cir. 2011). Accordingly, there can be no violation of section 337 as to claim 16 and its asserted dependent claims.

The Commission has determined to review the final ID's construction of “and to” in claim 16 of the '151 patent, Final ID at 31–34; *see* InterDigital Pet. at 29–33, and on review finds that the term is to be afforded its plain and ordinary meaning. In view of the Commission's claim construction, the final ID's finding of noninfringement of asserted claims 16–21 and 23–24 based upon the final ID's construction, Final ID at 58–60, is reversed. The Commission has also determined to review the final ID's infringement analysis of “and if so” for claim 1, Final ID at 58–60; *see* InterDigital Pet. at 38–43, and on review takes no position whether the accused products practice the determining steps in sequence as required for asserted claims 1–6 and 8–9.

3. Domestic Industry, FRAND, and Other Issues

Except as recited above concerning the Commission's finding that the domestic industry products do not practice the asserted patent claims, the Commission reviews and takes no position on the remaining domestic industry issues raised in the parties' petitions. Similarly, the Commission reviews and takes no position on the FRAND issues raised by the respondents concerning their affirmative defenses. The Commission finds that it is in the interest of the efficient use of administrative, judicial, and private resources for the domestic industry and FRAND issues to be decided, if at all, subsequent to final disposition of the pending appeal in *InterDigital Communications LLC v. ITC*, No. 2014–1176 (Fed. Cir.), which involves many of the same parties and issues with regard to related patents.

The Commission does not review any other issues raised in the parties' petitions except as otherwise recited above. The reasoning in support of the Commission's decision will be set forth in fuller detail in a forthcoming opinion.

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: August 14, 2014.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014–19715 Filed 8–19–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–505 and 731–TA–1231, 1232, 1235, and 1237 (Final)]

Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel (“GOES”) From China, Czech Republic, Korea, and Russia

Supplemental schedule for the subject investigations.

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 13, 2014.

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 persons can obtain information on this matter 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>). The public record for these investigations may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Effective May 9, 2013, the Commission established a schedule for the conduct of the final phase of the subject investigations (79 FR 32310, June 4, 2014). The Department of Commerce extended the date for its final determinations in the investigations concerning China, Czech Republic, Korea, and Russia to no later than 135 days after the publication of the preliminary determinations (79 FR 26936, May 12, 2014 (China); 79 FR 26717, May 9, 2014 (Czech Republic); 79 FR 26939, May 12, 2014 (Korea); and 79 FR 26941, May 12, 2014 (Russia)).

The Commission, therefore, is supplementing its schedule to conform with Commerce's postponed schedule.

The Commission's supplemental schedule for the investigations is as follows: the deadline for filing party comments on Commerce's final determinations is October 2, 2014; the staff report in the final phase of these investigations will be placed in the nonpublic record on October 14, 2014, and a public version will be issued thereafter.

Supplemental party comments may address only Commerce's final determinations regarding imports from China, Czech Republic, Korea, and Russia. These supplemental final comments may not contain new factual information and may not exceed five (5) pages in length.

For further information concerning these investigations see the Commission's notice cited above and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and C (19 CFR part 207).

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 14, 2014.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014–19716 Filed 8–19–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Glenn R. Unger, D.D.S.; Declaratory Order

On March 7, 2014, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Glenn R. Unger, D.D.S., of Clifton Park, New York. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of the Certificate of Registration issued to Dr. Unger on three separate grounds.

First, the Show Cause Order alleged that Dr. Unger's New York State dental license expired on June 30, 2010, and that he is “currently without authority to practice dentistry or handle controlled substances in the State of New York, the State in which [he is] registered with the DEA.” GX 1, at 1–2. The Order thus alleged that Dr. Unger's registration is subject to revocation under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3). *Id.* at 2.

Second, the Show Cause Order alleged that on June 25, 2012, Dr. Unger submitted an application to renew his DEA registration. *Id.* The Order alleged that notwithstanding that his New York State dental license had expired on June 30, 2010, Dr. Unger falsely stated that his license did not expire until June 30, 2013. *Id.* The Order thus alleged that this constituted a material falsification of the application and was ground to revoke the registration under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1).

Third, the Show Cause Order alleged that notwithstanding his lack of state authority to dispense controlled substances, “between December 2010 and November 2012,” Dr. Unger “issued at least seven controlled substance prescriptions” to L.B. and M.N., for drugs which included hydrocodone 10/325mg, Ambien 10mg, and Percocet 5/325mg. *Id.* The Order further alleged that Dr. Unger violated federal law by authorizing six refills for two of the hydrocodone prescriptions and twelve refills for an Ambien prescription. *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 829(b) and 21 CFR 1306.22(a)). Finally, the Order alleged that Dr. Unger violated federal law which prohibits the refilling of a schedule II prescription when he authorized two refills of a Percocet prescription. *Id.* at 3 (citing 21 U.S.C. 829(a) and 21 CFR 1306.12(a)). The Order thus alleged that Dr. Unger had committed acts rendering his registration “inconsistent with the public interest.” 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4).

The Show Cause Order also notified Dr. Unger of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement in lieu of a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence of failing to elect either option. GX 1, at 3 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). On March 11, 2014, a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) personally served the Show Cause Order on Dr. Unger who was then incarcerated at the Rennselaer County Jail. GX 3.

Since the date of service, thirty (30) days have now passed and neither Dr. Unger, nor anyone purporting to represent him, has requested a hearing on the allegations or submitted a written statement in lieu of a hearing. I therefore find that Dr. Unger has waived his right to a hearing or to submit a written statement and issue this Decision and Order based on evidence contained in the Investigative Record submitted by the Government. 21 CFR 1301.43(d) & (e). I make the following findings of fact.

Findings

Dr. Unger was licensed as a dentist by the State of New York between July 16, 1976 and June 30, 2010, at which point

he became unregistered to practice dentistry. GX 4. Dr. Unger remains unregistered by the State as of the date of this order.

Dr. Unger also previously held DEA Certificate of Registration FU1504477, pursuant to which he was authorized to dispense controlled substances as a practitioner in schedules II through V. GX 6. While this registration apparently expired in May 2012, on June 22, 2012, a renewal application was submitted for this registration. *Id.* The application listed Dr. Unger’s former New York State license number and provided an expiration date of June 30, 2013. *Id.* at 2; GX 5, at 1. The application was not, however, signed by Dr. Unger but by a person named “Nathan Green.” GX 5, at 2.

Notably, the Application contains the following statement immediately above the signature line: “Name of Applicant (For Individual registrants, the registrant themselves MUST complete this E-Signature).” *Id.* Moreover, immediately below the E-Signature line, the Application contains the following statement: “This electronic application/DEA form must be certified by the applicant/registant, if an individual” *Id.*

Discussion

Under DEA regulations:

[e]ach application, attachment, or other document filed as part of an application, shall be signed by the applicant, if an individual. . . . An applicant may authorize one or more individuals, who would not otherwise be authorized to do so, to sign applications for the applicant by filing with the Registration Unit of the Administration a power of attorney for each such individual. The power of attorney shall be signed by a person who is authorized to sign applications under this paragraph and shall contain the signature of the individual being authorized to sign applications.

21 CFR 1301.13(j).

As found above, Dr. Unger did not sign the application. Moreover, according to the registration records of the Agency (of which I take official notice, *see* 5 U.S.C. 556(e)), Dr. Unger has not submitted a power of attorney designating any person as authorized to sign his application. Accordingly, I find that the June 22, 2012 application was defective and should not have been accepted for filing. I further declare that DEA Certificate of Registration FU1504477 issued to Dr. Glenn R. Unger on June 25, 2012, was void *ab initio* and order that the registration be terminated. *See id.* § 554(e). There being no application to act upon or registration to revoke, I further order that the Order to Show Cause be dismissed.

It is so ordered.

Dated: August 7, 2014.

Thomas M. Harrigan,
Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2014–19785 Filed 8–19–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–396]

Electronic Prescriptions for Controlled Substances Notice of Approved Certification Process

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) is announcing one new DEA-approved certification process for providers of Electronic Prescriptions for Controlled Substances (EPCS) applications. Certifying organizations with a certification process approved pursuant to 21 CFR 1311.300(e) are posted on DEA’s Web site upon approval.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Imelda L. Paredes, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration; Mailing Address: 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152, Telephone: (202) 598–6812.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Legal Authority

The DEA implements and enforces titles II and III of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, as amended. Titles II and III are referred to as the “Controlled Substances Act” and the “Controlled Substances Import and Export Act,” respectively, and are collectively referred to as the “Controlled Substances Act” or the “CSA” for the purpose of this notice. 21 U.S.C. 801–971. The DEA publishes the implementing regulations for these statutes in title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), parts 1300 to 1321. The CSA and its implementing regulations are designed to prevent, detect, and eliminate the diversion of controlled substances and listed chemicals into the illicit market while providing for the legitimate medical, scientific, research, and industrial needs of the United States. Controlled substances have the potential for abuse and dependence and are controlled to protect the public health and safety.

The CSA and DEA’s implementing regulations establish the legal