

2. (a) As to the ALJ's infringement findings with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, 33, 34, 35, and 36 of the '867 patent that are under review, please address whether any of MStar's accused products satisfy the timing equality limitation ("maintain an equality of equal source and destination image frame periods" (ID at 148)) of the wherein clause of claim 1 under the Commission's claim construction. Cite supporting exhibits and testimony of record relevant to this issue, and identify where this specific argument and supporting evidence regarding infringement was presented to the ALJ with citations to previous briefing. (b) Are the ALJ's findings of fact FF 129, 130, and 132 sufficient to support a finding that any of MStar's accused products satisfy the timing equality limitation of the wherein clause of claim 1 under the Commission's claim construction, and infringe claims 1, 2, 9, 33, 34, 35, or 36 of the '867 patent? Cite supporting exhibits and testimony of record, and identify where this evidence and argument was presented to the ALJ with citations to previous briefing.

3. How should the language of claims 13 and 15 of the '361 patent that is under review be construed?

(a) In light of the expert testimony of Ferraro (Trans. at 1423, 1445–51; RDX–102 at 12–15), is it legally permissible to construe "according to" to mean "based upon" in claims 13 and 15 and to mean "consistent with" in claim 5? Please cite to any relevant case law. May the same phrase appearing in two claims of the same patent be construed differently in the two claims by using different definitions for the phrase in question?

(b) Assuming that the '361 patent teaches only "front-end," and not "back-end," vertical expansion (ID at 102–04), is it legally permissible to narrow the meaning of the broad term "an address" to mean "addresses other than the memory read addresses," based on the lack of disclosure of such an embodiment in the specification? Please cite to any relevant case law.

(c) Identify any finding of fact or conclusion of law with respect to infringement, domestic industry, or invalidity in the 491 Final ID rendered clearly erroneous or legally erroneous under the proposed interpretation of the claim limitations under review. Provide supporting citations to the record.

The written submissions should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the consolidated record in this investigation, including references to exhibits and testimony. Additionally, the parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any

other interested persons are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the ALJ's April 14, 2004, recommended determination on remedy and bonding issued in Display Controllers II, and the ALJ's October 20, 2003, recommended determination on remedy and bonding issued in Display Controllers I. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on July 16, 2004. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on July 23, 2004. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file with the Office of the Secretary the original and 14 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) 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 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment is granted by the Commission will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.42–.45 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–.45).

Issued: July 7, 2004.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–15737 Filed 7–9–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–501]

In the Matter of: Certain Encapsulated Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination That the Importation Requirements of 19 U.S.C. 1337(A)(1)(B) Have Been Met

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") of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") in the above-captioned investigation granting a motion for summary determination that the importation requirements of 19 U.S.C. 1337(A)(1)(B) have been met.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy P. Monaghan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3152. Copies of the public version of the ID and all 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. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. 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>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation, which concerns allegations of unfair acts in violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation and sale of certain encapsulated integrated circuit devices and products containing same thereof on December, 19, 2003, based on a complaint filed by Amkor Technology, Inc. ("Amkor") of West Chester, Pennsylvania. The respondents named in the notice of investigation are Carsem (M) Sdn Bhd, and Carsem

Semiconductor Sdh Bhd of Malaysia; Carsem, Inc., of City of Industry, CA (collectively "Carsem"). Amkor's complaint alleged that Carsem's products infringe claims of three different patents held by Amkor.

On June 1, 2004, complainant Amkor moved for a summary determination that the importation requirement of 19 U.S.C. 1337(A)(1)(B) has been satisfied in this investigation. Carsem filed a response in opposition and the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of Amkor's motion.

On June 1, 2004, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 61) granting complainant Amkor's motion for summary determination that the importation requirements of 19 U.S.C. 1337(A)(1)(B) have been met.

No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and section 210.42 of Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.42.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 6, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-15756 Filed 7-9-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-787 (Review)]

Extruded Rubber Thread From Indonesia

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of five-year review.

SUMMARY: The subject five-year review was initiated in April 2004 to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Indonesia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and of material injury to a domestic industry. On June 29, 2004, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the order effective May 21, 2004 because "the domestic interested parties did not participate in this sunset review." (69 FR 38879). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the subject review is terminated.

DATES: Effective Date: May 21, 2004.

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: This review is 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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 6, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-15673 Filed 7-9-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 701-TA-373 (Review)]

Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Italy

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of review.

SUMMARY: On June 29, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("Commerce") notified the Commission of its negative final determination of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of a countervailable subsidy in connection with the subject five-year review on stainless steel wire rod from Italy. On July 2, 2004, Commerce published notice in the FR of its determination (69 FR 40354). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the five-year review of the countervailing duty order concerning stainless steel wire rod from Italy (investigation No. 701-TA-373 (review)) is terminated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 29, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Corkran (202-205-3057), 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>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

Authority: This five-year review is 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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 7, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-15736 Filed 7-9-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Office of Small Business Programs Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a pre-clearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed continuation of the information collections contained in the Small Business Programs Information Management System. A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the employee listed below in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses section below on or before September 10, 2004.

ADDRESSEES: Send comments to Elaine B. Murrell, Small Business Advisor, U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Small Business Programs, Room C-