

from the date of publication of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carol McCue Verratti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3088. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission can also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

In connection with the Crawfish investigation, Messrs. Lehat, Soni, and several other attorneys filed applications for APOs with the Commission. In the applications, they swore (i) not to disclose without written permission any of the information obtained under the APO except to certain enumerated categories of approved persons, (ii) to serve all materials containing BPI disclosed under the APO as directed by the Secretary, and (iii) to otherwise comply with the terms of the APO and the Commission's regulations regarding access to BPI. They also acknowledged in the APO that violation of the APO may subject them, and their firm, to debarment from practice before the Commission, referral to the U.S. Attorney or appropriate professional association, or "such other administrative sanctions determined to be appropriate * * * ." The Commission granted their applications.

The firm had little experience with practice before the Commission. Early in the investigation, one of the firm's attorneys breached the APO by releasing BPI obtained from the Commission to the Commerce Department. Commerce personnel were not authorized to have access to such materials under the Commission APO. As a result, the firm decided to place Mr. Soni and Mr. Lehat in charge of the investigation. They delegated primary responsibility for APO compliance to a junior attorney. Mr. Soni and Mr. Lehat each deny that they had responsibility for supervising the junior attorney.

After finalizing the prehearing brief, the junior attorney mistakenly served it on individuals who were not subject to the APO. Those copies of the brief were retrieved before any unauthorized person saw the BPI. The junior attorney was admonished to be more careful, but the firm did not make any additional effective changes in its procedures for protecting BPI from public release. In finalizing the public version of the post-

hearing brief, the junior attorney failed to redact BPI from one page. Again, copies of the erroneous public version were retrieved before any unauthorized person saw the BPI. In both instances, the breaches were inadvertent and the attorneys made prompt efforts to prevent the dissemination of BPI to the public.

Both Mr. Soni and Mr. Lehat argued that they should bear limited blame for the breaches because they either did not supervise the junior attorney's compliance with APO compliance or were not present during the finalization of the briefs. This argument evinces a failure to understand that their noninvolvement is the problem, not an exculpation. By remaining removed, they effectively left the junior attorney with the ultimate responsibility for protecting BPI. Such a delegation might be reasonable if made to a junior attorney who had extensive experience with Commission practice or to a senior attorney who had a longer experience with the general practice of law, but the junior attorney in this case had neither.

Therefore, the Commission found that Mr. Soni and Mr. Lehat breached their obligation to take reasonable steps to prevent the release of BPI at the time of the prehearing brief. They committed a second, more egregious breach in continuing to allow the junior attorney to operate unsupervised in the preparation of the post-hearing brief when they knew that the junior attorney's inexperience had already resulted in one breach. They committed an additional breach in failing to remedy the problems with the firm's APO compliance procedures that were exposed by the earlier breaches. Finally, Mr. Soni and Mr. Lehat again breached the APO by failing to certify to the return or destruction of the BPI obtained under the APO. This breach came about, in part, by the reliance on the same inexperienced junior attorney to prepare and transmit the certifications without appropriate supervision.

The breaches outlined above show a serious disregard for the protection of BPI that "rise[s] to the level of willful misbehavior or gross negligence characteristic of investigations where the Commission has issued public letters of reprimand." Summary of Commission Practice Relating to Administrative Protective Orders, 62 FR 13164, 13167 (Case 8). The Commission did not place great weight on the fact that none of the breaches resulted in a widespread dissemination of sensitive information, since it viewed that circumstance as purely fortuitous. See *Investigations Relating to Potential Breaches of Administrative Protective*

Orders, Sanctions Imposed for Actual Violations, 56 FR 4846, 4849 (Case 5).

In light of the foregoing, the Commission determined to issue Mr. Lehat and Mr. Soni this public reprimand and to bar them from access to BPI for six months, starting with date of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In addition, the Commission will require that the next application, if any, that Mr. Lehat or Mr. Soni files with the Commission for access to materials released under APO must be accompanied by a detailed description of the procedures of his firm for protecting APO materials.

Steven B. Lehat and Surjit P. Soni are reprimanded for (1) delegating primary responsibility for APO compliance to a junior attorney and then failing to provide appropriate supervision of that attorney, which resulted in two APO breaches, (2) failing to remedy obvious flaws in procedures for protecting BPI released to the firm under APO, and (3) failing to certify to the return or destruction of the BPI obtained under the APO. They are also barred from access to BPI for six months, starting with the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

The authority for this action is conferred by section 777(c)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677f(c)(1)(B)) and by section 207.7(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.7(d)).

Issued: November 27, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-30671 Filed 11-30-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 701-TA-355 (Review) and 731-TA-659-660 (Review)]

Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel From Italy and Japan

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Revised schedule for full five-year reviews concerning the countervailing duty and antidumping duty orders on grain-oriented silicon electrical steel from Italy and Japan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 27, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen Taylor (202-708-4101), 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>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 10, 2000, the Commission established a schedule for the conduct of the subject full five-year reviews (**Federal Register** 65 FR 50004, August 16, 2000). On November 16, 2000, the Commission received a request from a party to the full five-year reviews to postpone the hearing date. The Commission, therefore, is revising its schedule to make the appropriate adjustments in the scheduling of these reviews.

The Commission's new schedule for these reviews is as follows: the hearing will be held at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building at 9:30 a.m. on January 11, 2001; the deadline for filing posthearing briefs is January 19, 2001; the Commission will make its final release of information to parties on February 6, 2001; and final party comments are due on February 8, 2001.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: November 28, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-30675 Filed 11-30-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-434]

In the Matter of Certain Magnetic Resonance Injection Systems and Components Thereof; Notice of Decision to Extend the Deadline for Determining Whether To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination of Invalidity

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to extend the deadline for determining whether to review an initial determination (ID)

(Order No. 16) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation until 30 days after it has ruled on a motion filed by complainant to stay the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3104. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on May 26, 2000, based on a complaint filed by Medrad, Inc. of Indianola, Pennsylvania. The complaint alleged a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based on infringement of U.S. Letters Patent Re. 36,648, (the '648 patent) owned by complainant. The respondents named in the investigation are Nemoto Kyorindo Co., Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; Liebel-Flarshiem Co. of Cincinnati Ohio; and Mallinckrodt Inc., of Hazelwood, Mo. 65 FR 34231. On September 26, 2000, the ALJ issued an ID finding the '648 patent invalid due to certain omissions that occurred during patent reissue proceedings at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. On request of the parties, the ALJ suspended the procedural schedule of the investigation while the ID was before the Commission. Petitions for review of the ID were filed on October 6, 2000, by complainant and by the Commission investigative attorney. Responses were filed on October 19, 2000. On October 16, 2000, the Commission determined to extend the date for determining whether to review the ID until December 6, 2000. 65 FR 63096 (October 20, 2000). On November 17, 2000, complainant Medrad filed a motion to stay the investigation pending completion of reissue proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Medrad argued that the reissue proceedings would rectify the defect found by the ALJ.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and section 210.42(h)(3) of the Commission of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.42(h)(3).

Copies of the nonconfidential version of the ID and all other nonconfidential 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. Copies of these documents may also be downloaded from the Commission's Internet server at (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Hearing impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

Issued: November 27, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-30674 Filed 11-30-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Criminal Division; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review: extension of a currently approved collection: foreign agents registration act form (registration statement) as required by rule 200(b) of the act.

The Department of Justice, Criminal Division, has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until January 30, 2001.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated,