

(Authority: 43 C.F.R. 2711.1–2(a) and (c))

Termination of Portions of R&PP Classification—SNPLMA Withdrawal

A portion of the following lease granted under the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, 43 U.S.C. 869 et. seq.) has been relinquished: N–63336 (68FR47929). The Notice officially terminates the R&PP classification and segregation of a portion of that parcel. A portion of R&PP application, N–78724 has been withdrawn by the applicant. This notice serves to inform you that land previously leased and previously requested for R&PP purposes is no longer required and is now part of this sale. It does not serve as an opening order because those parcels are within the disposal boundary set by Congress in SNPLMA. Pursuant to section 4(c) of SNPLMA, these parcels are withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, from entry and appropriation under the public land laws, location and entry under the mining laws and from operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, until such time as the Secretary of the Interior terminates the withdrawal or the lands are conveyed.

Dated: March 15, 2006.

Juan Palma,

Field Manager.

[FR Doc. 06–3773 Filed 4–17–06; 11:42 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–355 and 731–TA–659 and 660 (Second Review)]

Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel from Italy and Japan

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of five-year reviews.

SUMMARY: The subject five-year reviews were initiated in February 2006 to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty order on grain-oriented silicon electrical steel from Italy and the antidumping duty orders on grain-oriented silicon electrical steel from Italy and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. On March 28, 2006, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the orders effective March 14, 2006, “{b}ecause the domestic interested parties did not participate in these sunset reviews * * *” (71 FR 15376). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff

Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the subject reviews are terminated.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 14, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202–205–3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained 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>).

Authority: These reviews are being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission’s rules (19 CFR 207.69).

Issued: April 13, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 06–3711 Filed 4–18–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–551]

In the Matter of Certain Laser Bar Code Scanners and Scan Engines, Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant’s Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of 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 an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 9) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting complainant’s motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Walters, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. 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: This investigation was instituted on October 26, 2005, based on a complaint filed by Symbol Technologies Inc. (“Symbol”) of Holtsville, New York. The complaint alleges 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 laser bar code scanners or scan engines, components thereof, or products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 5,457,308 (“the ‘308 patent”), 5,545,889 (“the ‘889 patent”), 6,220,514 (“the ‘514 patent”), 5,262,627, and 5,917,173. 70 FR 61841 (Oct. 26, 2006). The complaint named two respondents: Metro Technologies Co., Ltd. of Suzhou, China, and Metrologic Instruments, Inc. of Blackwood, New Jersey (collectively, “Metrologic”).

On March 9, 2006, Symbol filed a motion for leave to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add claims 10 and 11 of the ‘308 patent, claims 8 and 11 of the ‘889 patent, and claims 3, 7, 9, and 10 of the ‘514 patent. Metrologic filed an opposition to Symbol’s motion, asserting that Symbol failed to show good cause for its amendment and that Metrologic would be unduly prejudiced by an amendment to the complaint just one month before the close of discovery. The Commission investigative attorney supported Symbol’s motion.

On March 22, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 9) granting Symbol’s motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation. The ALJ found that, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.14(b)(1) (19 CFR 210.14(b)(1)), there was good cause to add claims 10 and 11 of the ‘308 patent, claims 8 and 11 of the ‘889 patent, and claims 3, 7, 9, and 10 of the ‘514 patent to the complaint and notice of investigation. The ALJ found that Symbol had obtained new

information, justifying the addition of the newly-asserted claims of the '308 patent. The ALJ also found that adding the newly-asserted claims of the '889 patent and the '514 patent to the complaint did not prejudice the parties, because they had been notified that these claims were at issue early on in the investigation. Moreover, the ALJ noted that he had extended the target date by one month in order to alleviate any concerns regarding the amount of time remaining for discovery. No petitions for review of the ID were filed. Having examined the record of this investigation, the Commission has determined not to review the ALJ's 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 § 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 14, 2006.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-5887 Filed 4-18-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-533]

In the Matter of Certain Rubber Antidegradants, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination To Review a Final Initial Determination; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in its entirety the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on February 17, 2006, in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Herrington, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3090. Copies of the ALJ's 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. 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 section 337 investigation on March 29, 2005, based on a complaint filed by Flexsys America LP. 70 FR 15885 (March 29, 2005). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain rubber antidegradants, components thereof, and products containing same that infringe claims 30 and 61 of U.S. Patent No. 5,117,063 ("the '063 patent"), claims 7 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,111 ("the '111 patent"), and claims 1, 32, and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,538 ("the '538 patent"). The complaint and notice of investigation named five respondents. The investigation was subsequently terminated as to two respondents and as to the '538 patent.

On February 17, 2006, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), by respondents Sinorgchem Co., Shandong, and Sovereign Chemical Company, but finding no violation of section 337 by respondent Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd. The ALJ recommended that the Commission issue limited exclusion orders, but did not recommend that any bond be imposed for importations during the Presidential review period. All parties petitioned for review of various parts of the final ID.

Having examined the record in 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 its entirety. The Commission's review includes the issue of whether the ALJ properly determined that the issue of infringement by the P1 and P2 processes of Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd. was not before him, but that review is only for the purpose of making a correction to the final ID, *i.e.*, to substitute "Motion No. 533-61" for

"Motion No. 533-57" on page 96 of the final ID. The Commission has otherwise concluded that the ALJ was correct in his determination on this issue.

On review, the Commission requests briefing based on the evidentiary record. While the Commission has determined to review the final ID in its entirety, it is particularly interested in briefing on the issues of claim construction and indefiniteness, especially with respect to the term "controlled amount of protic material," which appears in all the asserted claims. In addressing the question of claim construction, each party should specifically identify those portions of the claim language, specification, and prosecution history (and other evidence, if appropriate) which support the construction it advocates. The Commission is also interested in receiving answers to the following questions:

1. With respect to the ID's construction of the term "controlled amount of protic material," what is the basis for including "the desired selectivity," given that col. 4, ll. 48-50 ('063 patent) states: "A 'controlled amount' of protic material is an amount up to that which inhibits the reaction of aniline with nitrobenzene * * *," a statement which does not contain the term "selectivity"?

2. Given that the '111 patent is based on a continuation-in-part application, what is the legal basis for using matter in the claims and specification of that patent not common to the disclosure of the '063 patent to construe the claims of the '063 patent? What is the legal basis for using the prosecution history of the '111 patent to construe the claims of the '063 patent?

3. Referring to the ALJ's definition of "controlled amount of protic material" in the ID at 78-79, what is the meaning of the terms "inhibited" and "desired selectivity"? How are these terms applied to determine infringement by the accused processes? With respect to the claim construction of "controlled amount of protic material" adopted in the ID, what is the evidence that the claims, specification, and prosecution history would provide a person of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of what constitutes "inhibition" and the "desired selectivity"?

4. With respect to the licensing issues raised by Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd., which are stated to be subject to Korean law, state the applicable Korean law and discuss how it applies.

5. With respect to the estoppel issue raised by Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd., state what law (Korean, U.S., or other) applies and how it applies.