

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may: (1) Issue an order that could result in the exclusion of articles manufactured or imported by the respondents; and/or (2) issue a cease and desist order that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7-10 (December 1994).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors that the Commission will consider include the effect that the exclusion order and/or cease and desists orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Complainants are requested to submit

proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainants are further requested to state the date upon which the patents expire and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported and to provide identification information for all known importers of the subject articles.

Written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on December 30, 2014. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on January 7, 2015. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadline stated above and submit eight true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the investigation number ("Inv. No. 337-TA-883") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. A redacted nonconfidential version of the document must also be filed simultaneously with any confidential filing. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

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).

Dated: December 16, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014-29808 Filed 12-19-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-14-044]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission
TIME AND DATE: December 29, 2014, at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

Matters to be Considered

1. Agendas for future meetings: none
 2. Minutes
 3. Ratification List
 4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701-TA-526-527 and 731-TA-1262-1263 (Preliminary)(Melamine from China and Trinidad and Tobago). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations on December 29, 2014; views of the Commission are currently scheduled to be completed and filed on January 6, 2015.
 5. Outstanding action jackets: none
- In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission:

Issued: December 17, 2014.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-29990 Filed 12-18-14; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Rules of Appellate Procedure

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States, Advisory Committee on Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ACTION: Notice of cancellation of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal

Rules of Appellate Procedure has been canceled: Appellate Rules Hearing, January 9, 2015, in Phoenix, Arizona. Announcements for this meeting were previously published in 79 FR 48250 and 79 FR 72702.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan C. Rose, Secretary and Chief Rules Officer, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1820.

Dated: December 16, 2014.

Jonathan C. Rose,
Secretary and Chief Rules Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-29793 Filed 12-19-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Continental AG and Veyance Technologies, Inc.; 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, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America v. Continental AG, and Veyance Technologies, Inc.*, Civil No. 1:14-cv-02087. On December 11, 2014, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Continental's proposed acquisition of Veyance would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed the same time as the Complaint, requires Continental to divest Veyance's North American commercial vehicle air springs business, including manufacturing and assembly facilities in San Luis Potosi, Mexico; research, development, engineering, and administrative assets in Fairlawn, Ohio; and certain tangible and intangible assets.

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 District of Columbia. 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 Maribeth Petrizzi, Chief, Litigation II Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-307-0924).

Patricia A. Brink,
Director of Civil Enforcement.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. Continental AG, Vanrenwalder Strasse 9, D-30165, Hanover, Germany, and Veyance Technologies, Inc., 703 S. Cleveland Massillon Road, Fairlawn, Ohio 44333, Defendants.

Case: 1:14-cv-2087

Filed: 12/11/2014

Judge: Hon. Reggie B. Walton

COMPLAINT

The United States of America ("United States"), acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action to enjoin the proposed acquisition by Defendant Continental AG ("Continental") of Defendant Veyance Technologies, Inc. ("Veyance"). The United States alleges as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated February 10, 2014, Continental has agreed to purchase Veyance from Carlyle Partners IV, L.P. for \$1.8 billion. The merger would combine two of the three leading suppliers of air springs used in commercial vehicles in North America.

2. Continental has competed aggressively with Veyance for sales in North America, which has resulted in lower prices for commercial vehicle air springs. Elimination of the competition between Continental and Veyance likely would result in higher prices and decreased quality of service for customers, and would increase the likelihood that the two remaining suppliers would substantially reduce competition through successful coordination. As a result, the proposed

acquisition likely would substantially lessen competition in the development, manufacture, and sale of commercial vehicle air springs in North America in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18.

II. THE PARTIES TO THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION

3. Defendant Continental AG, a corporation organized under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, is based in Hanover, Germany. Continental is a leading German automotive manufacturing company, specializing in tires, brake systems, and components, and it is one of the world's largest producers of rubber products. Its annual sales for 2013 were approximately \$40 billion. ContiTech North America, Inc., of Montvale, New Jersey, is a part of ContiTech AG, a division of Continental. ContiTech North America produces and sells parts, components and systems, including commercial vehicle air springs, for the automotive engineering industry in North America.

4. Defendant Veyance Technologies, Inc. is incorporated in Delaware with its headquarters in Fairlawn, Ohio. Veyance manufactures engineered rubber products for heavy-duty industrial, automotive and military applications. Veyance produces and sells automotive and commercial vehicle parts, including commercial vehicle air springs, in North America. In 2013, Veyance had \$2.1 billion in sales.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. The United States brings this action pursuant to Section 15 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 25, as amended, to prevent and restrain Defendants from violating Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18.

6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Section 15 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 25, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345. Defendants produce and sell commercial vehicle air springs in a regular, continuous, and substantial flow of interstate commerce. Defendants' activities in the development, manufacture, and sale of commercial vehicle air springs have had a substantial effect upon interstate commerce.

7. Defendants have consented to venue and personal jurisdiction in this District.

8. Venue is proper in this Court under Section 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 22, and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c).