

respondents in default under Commission Rules 210.16(a)(2) and (b)(2) based on those respondents' elections to default. Commission Notice (Mar. 3, 2011) (Order Nos. 15–16); Commission Notice (Mar. 11, 2011) (Order Nos. 17–18); Commission Notice (Mar. 11, 2011) (Order No. 19). The Commission determined not to review two other initial determinations finding the remaining respondents in default. Commission Notice (Mar. 23, 2011) (Order No. 23); Commission Notice (April 6, 2011) (Order No. 24).

On April 25, 2011, Lexmark filed a motion pursuant to Commission Rule 210.18 (19 CFR 210.18) for summary determination of violation of Section 337 and requesting issuance of a general exclusion order and cease and desist orders against defaulting respondents. On May 5, 2011, the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) filed a response supporting the motion, on the condition that Lexmark submit the following: (1) A declaration from its expert, Charles Reinholdt, averring that the statements in his expert report are true and correct, and (2) a declaration from Andrew Gardner that the accused products do not have any substantial non-infringing uses. Lexmark filed the submissions per the IA’s request.

On June 1, 2011, the ALJ issued an initial determination (Order No. 26) (“ID”) granting Lexmark’s motion for summary determination of violation of Section 337. The ID also contained the ALJ’s recommended determination on remedy and bonding. Specifically, the ALJ recommended issuance of a general exclusion order (“GEO”) and cease and desist orders (“CDOs”) against the defaulting respondents. The ALJ further recommended that the Commission set a bond of 100 percent during the period of Presidential review.

On July 12, 2011, the Commission determined not to review the ID and called for briefing on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. 76 FR 41822–24 (July 15, 2011). On August 1, 2011, Lexmark submitted an initial brief on remedy, the public interest, and bonding, requesting that the Commission issue a GEO and CDOs and set a bond of 100 percent during the period of Presidential review. The brief included a proposed GEO and a proposed CDO. Also on August 1, 2011, the IA submitted an initial brief on remedy, the public interest, and bonding, supporting Lexmark’s request for a GEO and CDOs, as well as a bond of 100 percent. The IA’s brief also included a proposed GEO and a proposed CDO.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief is the

following: (1) A GEO under 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(2), prohibiting the unlicensed entry of toner cartridges and components thereof that infringe one or more of claim 1 of the ‘032 patent; claims 1–3, 32, 33, 36, and 42 of the ‘169 patent; claims 1 and 2 of the ‘233 patent; claims 1 and 2 of the ‘661 patent; claims 1–3 of the ‘432 patent; claims 1, 2, and 14 of the ‘378 patent; claims 1 and 2 of the ‘291 patent; claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, and 15 of the ‘771 patent; claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 22, and 24 of the ‘015 patent; claims 1–3 and 28 of the ‘876 patent; claim 1 of the ‘692 patent; claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 of the ‘031 patent; claims 1 and 6 of the ‘510 patent; claims 11, 12, and 14 of the ‘760 patent; and claims 1, 7, 14, and 15 of the ‘204 patent; and (2) CDOs directed to defaulting domestic respondents E-Toner, Alpha Image, Copy Tech, LTT, C&R, ACM, Ink Master, Direct Billing, Ink Tech, QCI, IJSS, Acecom, Ninestar Tech, Ziprint, Nano Pacific, and Nectron and defaulting foreign respondents Ninestar, Ninestar Image Int’l, and Seine Image.

The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in Section 337(d) and (f) (19 U.S.C. 1337(d), (f)) do not preclude issuance of the GEO and the CDOs. The Commission has determined that the bond for temporary importation during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)) shall be in the amount of 100 percent of the value of the imported articles that are subject to the order. The Commission’s orders were delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

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 210.42–50 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–50).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 27, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–25281 Filed 9–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–763]

In the Matter of Certain Radio Control Hobby Transmitters and Receivers and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Issuance of Limited Exclusion Order Against Infringing Products of Respondents Found In Default; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has terminated the above-captioned investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and has issued a limited exclusion order against infringing products of respondents previously found in default, Koko Technology, Ltd. (“Koko”) and Cyclone Toy & Hobby (“Cyclone”) of China.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clint Gerdine, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2310. 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 March 9, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Horizon Hobby, Inc. (“Horizon”) of Champaign, Illinois. 76 FR 12995–96 (March 9, 2011). The complaint, as amended, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 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 radio control hobby transmitters and receivers and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S.

Patent No. 7,391,320 (“the ‘320 patent”), U.S. Copyright Reg. No. TX-7-226-001 (“the ‘001 copyright”), and U.S. Trademark Reg. No. 3,080,770 (“the 770 mark”). The complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission’s notice of investigation named Koko and Cyclone as the only respondents. The complaint and notice of investigation were served on respondents on March 3, 2011. No responses were received.

On April 11, 2011, Horizon moved, pursuant to 19 CFR 210.16, for: (1) An order directing respondents Koko and Cyclone to show cause why they should not be found in default for failure to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation as required by § 210.13; and (2) the issuance of an ID finding Koko and Cyclone in default upon their failure to show cause. Koko and Cyclone did not respond to the motion. On April 22, 2011, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued Order No. 5 which required Koko and Cyclone to show cause no later than May 12, 2011, as to why they should not be held in default and judgment rendered against them pursuant to § 210.16. No response was received from either Koko or Cyclone to the show cause order.

The ALJ issued an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 6) on May 16, 2011, finding both Koko and Cyclone in default, pursuant to §§ 210.13, 210.16, because both respondents did not respond to the complaint and notice of investigation, or to Order No. 5 to show cause. Also, on May 17, 2011, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 7) terminating the investigation because Koko and Cyclone are the only respondents in the investigation. On June 3, 2011, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ’s IDs finding Koko and Cyclone in default and terminating the investigation. 76 FR 33362–63 (June 8, 2011). In the same notice, the Commission requested written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding with respect to respondents found in default.

Horizon and the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) submitted briefing responsive to the Commission’s request on June 24, 2011, and the IA submitted a reply brief on July 1, 2011. Horizon requested both a limited exclusion order directed to Koko’s and Cyclone’s infringing products and a general exclusion order as well. The IA recommended a limited exclusion order and opposed Horizon’s request for a general exclusion order.

Having reviewed the record in the investigation, including the written

submissions of the parties, the Commission has made its determination on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. The Commission has determined to issue relief directed solely to the defaulting respondents pursuant to Section 337(g)(1). 19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1). The Commission found that the statutory requirements of section 337(g)(1)(A)–(E) (19 U.S.C.

1337(g)(1)(A)–(E)) were met with respect to the defaulting respondents. Pursuant to section 337(g)(1) and Commission Rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)), the Commission presumed the facts alleged in the complaint to be true. Based on the record in this investigation and the written submissions of the parties, the Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief is a limited exclusion order directed to the defaulting respondents prohibiting the unlicensed entry of radio control hobby transmitters and receivers and products containing same that are covered by one or more of claims 1–5 of the ‘320 patent, the ‘001 copyright, or the ‘770 mark, and that are manufactured abroad by or on behalf of, or are imported by or on behalf of, Koko or Cyclone, or any of their affiliated companies, parents, subsidiaries, licensees, contractors, or other related business entities, or its successors or assigns. 19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1). The Commission has determined not to issue a general exclusion order because Horizon did not establish the evidentiary showing required by 19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(2) and it did not declare that it sought a general exclusion order under Commission rule 210.16(c)(2) (19 CFR 210.16(c)(2)).

The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) do not preclude issuance of the limited exclusion order. Finally, the Commission has determined that a bond of 100 percent of the entered value of the covered products is required during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)). The Commission’s order was delivered to the President and to the United States Trade Representative on the day of its issuance.

The Commission has terminated this investigation. 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 210.16(c) and 210.41 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.16(c) and 210.41).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 27, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–25280 Filed 9–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 10–69]

Jeffery M. Freeseemann, M.D.; Decision and Order

On January 24, 2011, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) John J. Mulrooney, II, issued the attached recommended decision. The Respondent did not file exceptions to the decision.

Having considered the ALJ’s decision and the record in light of the parties’ post-hearing briefs, I have decided to adopt the ALJ’s rulings, findings of fact, and conclusions of law.¹ Accordingly, I also adopt the ALJ’s recommended Order.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(2) & (4), as well 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration, BF4089125, issued to Jeffery M. Freeseemann, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. This Order is effective October 31, 2011.

Dated: September 19, 2011.

Michele M. Leonhart,
Administrator.

Christine M. Menendez, Esq., for the Government.
Dennis R. Thelen, Esq., for the Respondent.

¹ The ALJ made extensive findings under the public interest factors. See ALJ Slip Op. at 32–40. While the Government cited both 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(2) & (4) as the legal authority for the proposed revocation, the factual basis—as alleged—was limited to Respondent’s convictions (and the circumstances surrounding them) for a felony offense that falls within 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(2). See ALJ Ex. 1; see also ALJ Slip op. at 32. Moreover, there was no application pending at the time of the proceeding and Respondent’s conviction was no longer subject to appeal.

Because a conviction for a felony offense that falls within section 824(a)(2) provides an independent and adequate ground for revoking a registration, and there was no pending appeal of the conviction or pending application for a new registration, the ALJ was not required to make findings under the public interest factors. While such a conviction satisfies the Government’s *prima facie* burden, it is not a *per se* bar to registration. Cf. *The Lawsons*, 72 FR334, 74338 (2007). Accordingly, in a case brought under section 824(a)(2), the ALJ is still required (as he did here) to make findings as to whether the registrant has accepted responsibility for his misconduct and demonstrated that he will not engage in future misconduct. Cf. *Ronald Lynch, M.D.*, 75 FR 78745, 78749 (2010).