

Commission that it will take extra caution to prevent a similar occurrence in the future and will not rely on the representations of co-counsel regarding the confidential nature of documents.

The Commission also issued warning letters to the remaining five attorneys at the third law firm who were not signatories to the original APO and who had signed the complaint in the new unrelated investigation. Two of the five attorneys participated in filing the complaint. The Commission stated that the actions of the two attorneys directly led to the disclosure of CBI, which was clearly marked as such, by including the CBI as public exhibits to a complaint in a Commission investigation unrelated to the original section 337 investigation. In issuing warning letters, the Commission noted the same mitigating factors mentioned above with regard to the lead attorney in the third firm who received a private letter of reprimand.

**Case 2:** The Commission determined that two attorneys breached the APO by filing a confidential version of an initial determination (“ID”) containing CBI, as part of the public appendix to a brief in district court litigation. The filing was made through the district court’s electronic-case-filing (“ECF”) system.

The confidential version of the ID was filed by a paralegal at the law firm under the supervision of the two attorneys, both of whom had subscribed to the APO. The law firm later discovered the disclosure and notified the opposing party. The CBI was publicly available for six weeks. The law firm requested the district court to restrict access to the electronic filing and the district court complied. The district court notified the law firm that the court did not track access to ECF documents and could not determine who, if anyone had accessed the ID electronically. The law firm conducted an inquiry into whether any of the employees of the party it represented in the district court litigation had accessed the ID. The opposing party also conducted an inquiry into whether any of its employees had accessed the ID. From these inquiries, the law firm is not aware of any unauthorized access to the CBI.

The Commission took into consideration the following mitigating factors: The breach was inadvertent; neither the attorneys at issue nor the law firm as a whole have breached a Commission APO in the past; the law firm discovered its own breach and took prompt steps to try to cure the breach; and the law firm implemented actions to improve internal procedures to make this type of breach less likely in the future. The Commission noted,

however, that the law firm was not able to demonstrate whether anyone improperly accessed the CBI while it was publicly available so the Commission presumes public access to the confidential documents. Thus, in accordance with past Commission practice, the Commission issued private letters of reprimand to the two attorneys.

**Case 3:** The Commission determined that an attorney breached an APO by filing public versions of certain documents, which contained the CBI of the opposing party.

Counsel for the opposing party contacted the Secretary to the Commission to notify the Secretary that public versions of certain documents, specifically the public versions of a response to a petition for review and summary of the response, filed by the attorney in question contained CBI. The Secretary’s office promptly removed the CBI documents from the public record. The attorney subsequently re-filed the public version documents without the CBI. An audit trail for the CBI documents showed that the documents were accessed by a non-party to the investigation.

The Commission issued a private letter of reprimand to the attorney for the APO breach. The Commission noted as mitigating factors that once the attorney was notified that the public version of the documents contained CBI the attorney moved quickly to cure the disclosure, the disclosure of the CBI was inadvertent, the attorney has not been involved in any alleged APO breach in the past two years, and the attorney had the ALJ’s instruction not to over-redact in mind while preparing the public versions of the brief. However, the Commission points out that the aggravating factors were that the breach was discovered by opposing counsel and not the alleged breaching attorney, unauthorized persons accessed the CBI at issue, and the attorney acted unilaterally in deciding that certain information did not constitute CBI without seeking guidance from the Commission.

**Case 4:** The Commission determined that the lead attorney and the lead attorney’s law firm did not breach the APO when documents containing CBI were stolen from the locked car trunk of a paralegal employed by the law firm.

The law firm had internal practices and procedures regarding the protection of CBI governed by an APO including policies regarding the maintenance and transport of CBI. In some cases, the law firm did let its personnel perform work at home involving CBI as long as they used and kept the CBI in a locked

facility, which could not be accessed by others. The paralegal had such an arrangement in his home.

The provisions of the APO did not specifically prohibit the transport of documents containing CBI to a home office or require personal custody and maintenance of the CBI in a locked facility of the home office after such transport. The lead attorney promptly notified the proper authorities after learning of the theft.

The Commission issued a letter to the lead attorney notifying the attorney that the Commission does not consider the law firm or lead attorney to have breached the APO, but the letter does recommend that the law firm review its procedures regarding the protection of CBI, and the law firm’s enforcement of such procedures.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 7, 2015.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2015–00299 Filed 1–12–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1103–0102]

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection COPS Office Progress Report

**AGENCY:** Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice (DOJ), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, 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. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** at 79 FR 66405, November 7, 2014, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

**DATES:** Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional days until February 12, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or

additional information, please contact Kimberly J. Brummett, Program Specialist, Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530 (phone: 202-353-9769). Written comments and/or suggestions can also be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20530 or sent to [OIRA\\_submissions@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

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

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and/or

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Overview of this information collection:*

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* COPS Office Progress Report.

3. *The agency form number:* N/A.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Under the Violent Crime and Control Act of 1994, the U.S. Department of Justice COPS Office would require the completion of the COPS Progress Report by recipients of COPS hiring and non-hiring grants. Grant recipients must complete this report in order to inform COPS of their activities with their awarded grant funding.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated 1,200 grantees will be required to submit an active

progress report each quarter. The estimated range of burden for respondents is expected to be between 20 minutes to 25 minutes for each quarterly completion.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:*

The estimated public burden associated with this collection is 2000 hours. It is estimated that respondents will take up to 25 minutes each quarter to complete the quarterly progress report. The burden hours for collecting respondent data sum to 2000 hours (1200 respondents  $\times$  .4167 hours  $\times$  4 times annually = 2000 hours).

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: January 7, 2015.

**Jerri Murray,**  
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S.  
Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2015-00274 Filed 1-12-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-AT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On January 7, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. ARG Corporation*, Civil Action No. 10-cv-311.

In August 2010, the United States filed suit against ARG Corporation ("ARG") and Norbert Toubes under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA") for the recovery of response costs incurred at the South Bend Lathe Superfund Site (the "Site"), in South Bend, Indiana. The Consent Decree resolves ARG's and Mr. Toubes' CERCLA liability for past response costs at the Site for a total of \$500,000. ARG and Mr. Toubes are required to pay \$250,000 on February 1, 2015 and \$250,000 on August 1, 2015.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to

*United States v. ARG Corporation*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-11-3-09441. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By e-mail .....	<a href="mailto:pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov">pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov</a>
By mail .....	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ConsentDecrees.html>. We will provide a paper copy of the proposed Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$4.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

**Randall M. Stone,**

Acting Assistant Section Chief,  
Environmental Enforcement Section,  
Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2015-00275 Filed 1-12-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-15-P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (14-132)]

### Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive License

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to grant exclusive license.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is issued in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 209(e) and 37 CFR 404.7(a)(1)(i). NASA hereby gives notice of its intent to grant an exclusive license in the United States to practice the inventions described and claimed in USPN 6,133,036, Preservation of Liquid Biological Samples, NASA Case No. MSC-22616-2 and USPN 6,716,392, Preservation of Liquid Biological Samples, NASA Case No. MSC-22616-3 to Coated Preservative Products, LLC, having its principal place of business in Warner Robins, GA. The patent rights in these inventions have been assigned to the United States of America as