

(8) A list of known sources of information on national or regional prices for the Domestic Like Product or the Subject Merchandise in the U.S. or other markets.

(9) If you are a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, provide the following information on your firm's operations on that product during calendar year 2010, except as noted (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. production of the Domestic Like Product accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Domestic Like Product (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix);

(c) the quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s); and

(d) the quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s).

(e) the value of (i) Net sales, (ii) cost of goods sold (COGS), (iii) gross profit, (iv) selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and (v) operating income of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s) (include both U.S. and export commercial sales, internal consumption, and company transfers) for your most recently completed fiscal year (identify the date on which your fiscal year ends).

(10) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2010 (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports

and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') imports;

(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country; and

(c) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country.

(11) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2010 (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping duties). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') production; and

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix); and

(c) the quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of Subject Merchandise and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the Domestic Like Product that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country after 2004, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production

facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the Domestic Like Product produced in the United States, Subject Merchandise produced in the Subject Country, and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (OPTIONAL) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the Domestic Like Product and Domestic Industry; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 23, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.

[FR Doc. 2011-4445 Filed 2-28-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-692]

In the Matter of Certain Ceramic Capacitors and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination To Review in Part A Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on December 22, 2010, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in this investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. Copies of non-confidential

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. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<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>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on November 4, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Murata Manufacturing Co., Ltd. of Kyoto, Japan and Murata Electronics North America, Inc. of Smyrna, Georgia (collectively, "Murata"). 74 FR 57193-94 (Nov. 4, 2009). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain ceramic capacitors and products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,266,229 ("the '229 patent"); 6,014,309 ("the '309 patent"); 6,243,254 ("the '254 patent"); and 6,377,439 (subsequently terminated from the investigation). The complaint named Samsung Electro-Mechanics Co., Ltd. of Suwon City, Korea and Samsung Electro-Mechanics America, Inc. of Irvine, California (collectively, "Samsung") as respondents.

On December 22, 2010, the ALJ issued his final ID, finding no violation of section 337 by Respondents with respect to any of the asserted claims of the asserted patents. Specifically, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the '254 patent. The ALJ also found that none of the cited references anticipated the asserted claims and that none of the cited references rendered the asserted claims obvious. The ALJ further found that the asserted claims were not rendered unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The ALJ, however, found that asserted claims 11-14, 19, and 20 of the '254 patent failed to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of written description. Likewise, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe asserted claim 3 of the '309 patent and that none of the cited

references anticipated or rendered obvious the asserted claims. The ALJ further found that the asserted claim was not rendered unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. Similarly, the ALJ found that the accused products meet all the limitations of the asserted claims of the '229 patent and that the claims are not rendered unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The ALJ further found that the cited references do not anticipate the asserted claims but found that the prior art rendered the asserted claims obvious. The ALJ concluded that an industry exists within the United States that practices the '254 and '229 patents but that a domestic industry does not exist with respect to the '309 patent as required by 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(2) and (3).

On January 4, 2011, Murata and the Commission investigative attorney filed petitions for review of the ID. That same day, Samsung filed a contingent petition for review of the ID. On January 12, 2011, the parties filed responses to the various petitions and contingent petition for review.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the findings related to the '229 patent and in particular the finding that AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) does not invalidate the asserted claims of the '229 patent. With respect to the '309 patent, it is unclear whether the ALJ made a specific finding that Nakano discloses a thickness ratio of 0.01 to 10. ID at 167. To the extent that the ALJ made such a finding, the Commission reverses and does not adopt such a finding as its own. The Commission has determined not to review the issues related to the '309 patent and '254 patent raised by the petitions for review and terminates the '309 and '254 patents from the investigation.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the issues under review with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record. In connection with its review, the Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

1. Can characterizations of the prior art that patent applicants make in the specification constitute the "single allegedly anticipatory reference pursuant to Section 102"? See ID at 139. Even if those characterizations cannot constitute such a reference, are applicants bound by characterizations of the prior art contained in the specification? In your response, please

consider *Pharmastem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.*, 491 F.3d 1342, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2007) and *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

2. Assume that patent applicants are bound by their characterizations as described above. Have the '229 applicants made concessions showing that the asserted claims of the '229 patent are anticipated or obvious? Please specify how the alleged applicant admissions disclose that a single prior art reference discloses each limitation of the asserted claims and/or that a combination of prior art references render the claims obvious. Please cite only record evidence and relevant legal authority to support your position.

3. Assume that the specification can constitute a single allegedly anticipatory reference pursuant to Section 102. Please provide an analysis as to anticipation and obviousness. Please cite only record evidence and relevant legal authority to support your position.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent(s) 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 *In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist 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. 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: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. 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. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding with respect to the '29 patent. Complainants and the IA are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainants are also requested to state the date that the patent expires and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on Tuesday, March 8, 2011. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on Tuesday, March 15, 2011. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 210.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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

sections 210.42–46 and 210.50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–46 and 210.50).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 23, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.

[FR Doc. 2011–4442 Filed 2–28–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–728]

In the Matter of Collaborative System Products and Components Thereof (II); Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the final initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 20) issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on January 24, 2011 granting a consent motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation in its entirety based upon a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jia Chen, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–4737. Copies of non-confidential 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. 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>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on July 19, 2010, based on a complaint filed by eInstruction Corporation ("eInstruction") of Denton, Texas on

May 12, 2010. 75 FR 41889 (Jul. 19, 2010). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain collaborative system products and components thereof by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent No. 6,930,673. The complaint, as amended, named the following respondents: Promethean Inc. of Alpharetta, Georgia; Promethean Technology Shenzhen Ltd. of Shanghai, China; and Promethean Ltd. of Blackburn, Lancashire, United Kingdom.

On January 4, 2011, eInstruction filed a consent motion to terminate the instant investigation on the ground that the parties have reached a settlement agreement pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(b). On January 24, 2011, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the motion. On January 24, 2011, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the motion. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

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 sections 210.21(b) and 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.21(b), 210.42(h)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 23, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.

[FR Doc. 2011–4441 Filed 2–28–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1122–0010]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection

ACTION: 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Semi-Annual Progress Report for Grantees From the Grants To Support Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program.

The Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Comments are encouraged and will be