

cert. denied, 486 U.S. 1014–15 (1988); *see also* *FTC v. Gem Merchandising Corp.*, 87 F.3d 466, 470 (11th Cir. 1996).

The Commission is sensitive to the interest in avoiding duplicative recoveries by injured persons or “excessive” multiple payments by defendants for the same injury. Thus, although a particular illegal practice may give rise both to monetary equitable remedies and to damages under the antitrust laws, when an injured person obtains damages sufficient to erase an injury, we do not believe that equity warrants restitution to that person. We will take pains to ensure that injured persons who recover losses through private damage actions under the Clayton Act not recover doubly for the same losses via FTC-obtained restitution. Similarly, in cases involving both disgorgement and restitution, we would apply any available disgorged funds toward restitution and credit any funds paid for restitution against the amount of disgorgement.

We do not, however, consider it appropriate to offset a civil penalty assessment against disgorgement or restitution. As noted above, disgorgement is an equitable remedy whose purpose is simply to remove the unjust gain of the violator. Penalties are intended to punish the violator and reflect a different, additional calculation of the amount that will serve society’s interest in optimal deterrence, retribution, and perhaps other interests. A penalty award would have no punitive effect if it were simply offset against these equitable remedies. It is not the Commission’s intent, therefore, to allow its monetary relief proceedings to dilute the effectiveness of a civil penalty.

When the same conduct gives rise to two different causes of action, moreover, the imposition of remedies for each cause of action does not necessarily mean the resulting sanctions are “excessive.” *See e.g., California v. ARC America Corp.*, 490 U.S. 93 (1989); *Loeb Industries, Inc. v. Sumitomo Corp.*, 306 F.3d 469, 492 (7th Cir. 2002), *cert. denied*, 123 S. Ct. 2247 (2003); *In Re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litigation*, MDL Dkt. No. 1290 (D.D.C.) (denial of motion to dismiss, July 2, 2001) Mem. Order at 15–16. Ultimately, we believe that courts considering equitable remedies have sufficient flexibility to craft orders to avoid unjust results.¹⁶ We have not yet encountered any such complications.

As a procedural matter, in the Commission’s two recent cases in which disgorgement was approved, claims administration procedures were being developed in parallel state and private litigation. To simplify the process and avoid any appearance of duplicative payments, in each of those cases the funds recovered by the Commission were combined with other recoveries and a single claims administration process handled the administration of all the funds. In future cases, the Commission could also consider the suggestion of several commentors to set up an escrow fund, to seek appointment of a special master or claims administrator to determine the appropriate allocation of funds collected, or to seek to coordinate parallel actions.

By direction of the Commission

Donal S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–19722 Filed 8–1–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

Notice of Intent To Extend an Information Collection

AGENCY: Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirements of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation [Foundation] will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or the forms of information technology.

(1997); *SEC v. Penn Cent. Co.*, 425 F. Supp. 593, 599 (E.D. Pa. 1976); *see also* *SEC v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.*, 446 F.2d 1301, 1307 (2d Cir.) (establishing escrow fund to prevent “double liability”), *cert denied*, 404 U.S. 1005 (1971).

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be received by October 3, 2003 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Contact Louis H. Blair, Executive Secretary, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, 712 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, DC 20006; telephone 202–395–4831; or send e-mail to lblair@truman.gov. You also may obtain a copy of the data collection instrument and instructions from Mr. Blair.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Truman Scholar Payment Request Form.

OMB Approval Number: 3200–0005.

Expiration Date of Approval:

September 30, 2003.

Type of Request: Intent to seek approval to extend an information collection for three years.

Proposed Project: The Foundation has been providing scholarships since 1977 in compliance with Public Law 93–642. This data collection instrument is used to collect essential information to enable the Truman Scholarship Foundation to determine the amount of financial support to which each Truman Scholar is eligible and then to make the payment. A total response rate of 100% was provided by the 315 Truman Scholars who received support in FY 2002.

Estimate of Burden: The Foundation estimates that, on average, 0.5 hours per Scholar applying for funds will be required to complete the Payment Request Form, for a total annual burden of 157.5 hours for all applicants.

Respondents: Individuals.

Estimated Number of Responses: 215.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 157.5 hours.

Dated: July 30, 2003.

Louis H. Blair,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–19777 Filed 8–1–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–AD–U

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[30Day–59–03]

Proposed Data Collections Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) publishes a list of information collection requests under review by the Office of Management and

¹⁶ Courts routinely allows “set-offs” and credits, for example, to avoid duplicative payments. *See, e.g., SEC v. First Jersey Sec., Inc.*, 101 F. 3d 1450, 1475 (2d Cir. 1996), *cert. denied*, 552 U.S. 812