

issues under review and on remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

On May 17, 2006, SigmaTel filed a motion to strike portions of Actions' initial brief concerning the issues under review or in the alternative for an extension of two days to respond. On May 19, 2006, Actions filed an opposition to SigmaTel's motion to strike. Also on May 19, 2006, the Chairman of the Commission granted the motion for the two-day extension, thus rendering the motion to strike moot.

On May 24, 2006, all parties filed responses to the initial briefs concerning the issues under review and on remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID and the submissions of the parties, the Commission has (1) determined to reverse the ALJ's construction of the claim phrase "produce the system clock control signal and power supply control signal based on a processing transfer characteristic of the computation engine" and provide as its own construction that both the system clock control signal and the power supply control signal are required to be produced during operation of the integrated circuit such that the voltage and the frequency of the integrated circuit are adjusted based on a processing transfer characteristic, but that the processing transfer characteristic is not determined in any particular manner; (2) determined to remand this investigation in part to the ALJ for the purpose of determining whether the accused products utilizing the version 952436 firmware infringe the '522 patent under the Commission's claim construction; (3) determined with respect to the accused products that do not use the version 952436 firmware, that the ALJ made sufficient findings to find infringement of the asserted claims of the '522 patent under our claim construction, and to adopt his findings with respect to those products; (4) determined that SigmaTel's 35XX products satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with regard to the '522 patent under the Commission's claim construction; (5) determined to delete the term "firmware" from the ALJ's construction of the claim term "memory" in claim 13 of the '187 patent; (6) determined to defer addressing issues relating to remedy, public interest, and bonding, for both the '187 patent and the '522 patent until after the ALJ issues his initial determination on remand regarding the '522 patent; and (7) determined to extend the target date in

the investigation until September 15, 2006.

Further, the Commission has determined not to consider Actions' discussion in its submissions on the issues under review with respect to the '187 patent because this discussion is outside the scope of the Commission's review.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.45 and 210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.45, 210.51).

Issued: June 19, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-9972 Filed 6-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-309-A-B and 731-TA-696 (Second Review)]

Pure and Alloy Magnesium From Canada and Pure Magnesium From China

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the countervailing duty orders on pure and alloy magnesium from Canada would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

With respect to China, revocation of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

With respect to Canada, the Commission instituted the reviews on July 1, 2005 (70 FR 38199) and determined on October 4, 2005 that it would conduct full reviews (70 FR 60108, October 14, 2005). With respect to China, the Commission instituted the review on September 1, 2005 (70 FR 52122) and determined on December 5,

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

2005 that it would conduct a full review (70 FR 75483, December 20, 2005).

Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing 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 12, 2006 (71 FR 2065). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on April 25, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on June 26, 2006. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3859 (June 2006), entitled *Pure and Alloy Magnesium from Canada and Pure Magnesium from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-309-A-B and 731-TA-696 (Second Review)*.

Issued: June 21, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 06-5668 Filed 6-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-678, 679, 681, and 682 (Second Review)]

Stainless Steel Bar From Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Scheduling of full five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar from Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of full reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar from Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 20, 2006.