

settlements,” contrary to congressional intent. *Id.* at 1456. “The Tunney Act was not intended to create a disincentive to the use of the consent decree.” *Id.*

The United States’ predictions about the efficacy of the remedy are to be afforded deference by the Court. *See, e.g., Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (recognizing courts should give “due respect to the Justice Department’s . . . view of the nature of its case”); *United States v. Iron Mountain, Inc.*, 217 F. Supp. 3d 146, 152–53 (D.D.C. 2016) (“In evaluating objections to settlement agreements under the Tunney Act, a court must be mindful that [t]he government need not prove that the settlements will perfectly remedy the alleged antitrust harms[;] it need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.”) (internal citations omitted); *United States v. Republic Servs., Inc.*, 723 F. Supp. 2d 157, 160 (D.D.C. 2010) (noting “the deferential review to which the government’s proposed remedy is accorded”); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (“A district court must accord due respect to the government’s prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case.”). The ultimate question is whether “the remedies [obtained by the Final Judgment are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the ‘reaches of the public interest.’” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (quoting *W. Elec. Co.*, 900 F.2d at 309).

Moreover, the Court’s role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its complaint, and does not authorize the Court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75 (noting that the court must simply determine whether there is a factual foundation for the government’s decisions such that its conclusions regarding the proposed settlements are reasonable); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *20 (“[T]he ‘public interest’ is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged”). Because the “court’s authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government’s exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,”

and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60.

In its 2004 amendments to the APPA, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of using consent judgments proposed by the United States in antitrust enforcement, Public Law 108–237 § 221, and added the unambiguous instruction that “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(2); *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (indicating that a court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing or to permit intervenors as part of its review under the Tunney Act). This language explicitly wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it first enacted the Tunney Act in 1974. As Senator Tunney explained: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Sen. Tunney). “A court can make its public interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone.” *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (citing *Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d at 17).

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: May 28, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Jay D. Owen,
Assistant Chief.

*Defense, Industrials, and Aerospace Section,
Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of
Justice, 450 Fifth St. NW, Suite 8700,
Washington, DC 205, Telephone (202) 598–
2987, Facsimile (202) 514–9033,
jay.owen@usdoj.gov.*

[FR Doc. 2020–12289 Filed 6–5–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Petroleum Environmental Research Forum

Notice is hereby given that, on May 13, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Petroleum Environmental Research Forum (“PERF”) has filed written notifications simultaneously the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Suncor Energy Inc. and Tullow Oil Plc have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and PERF intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On February 10, 1986, PERF filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 14, 1986 (51 FR 8903).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 22, 2019. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(h) of the Act on March 08, 2019 (84 FR 8545).

Suzanne Morris,

*Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics,
Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2020–12305 Filed 6–5–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Automotive Cybersecurity Industry Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on May 29, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Automotive Cybersecurity Industry Consortium (“ACIC”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade

Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, General Motors, LLC, Detroit, MI and Mazda Motor of America, Inc., Irvine, CA have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and ACIC intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 11, 2017, ACIC filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 27, 2017 (82 FR 11942).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 23, 2017. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 29, 2017 (82 FR 45611).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-12295 Filed 6-5-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Border Security Technology Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on May 19, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Border Security Technology Consortium ("BSTC") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Syzygy Integration LLC, Philadelphia, PA; Rafael System Global Sustainment, LLC, Bethesda, MD; and Tsymmetry, Inc., Washington, DC have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Garud Technology Services, Inc., Ellicott City, MD; Megaray LLC, New York, NY; Intel Corporation, Santa Clara, CA; TigerSwan, Inc., Apex, NC;

Advanced Detection Technology, LLC, Mooresville, NC; Surface Optics Corporation, San Diego, CA; SecureInsights, LLC, Washington, DC; Synapse Technology Corporation, Palo Alto, CA; Rigaku Analytical Devices, Inc., Wilmington, DE; Tyto Athene, LLC, Herndon, VA; BlackSky Geospatial Solutions, Inc., Herndon, VA; Solute, Inc., San Diego, CA; TCOM, LP, Columbia, MD; Michael Baker Jr., Inc., Phoenix, AZ; CommDEX Consulting, LLC, Norcross, GA; Unmanned Solutions Technology, LLC, Beavercreek, OH; Irvine Sensors Corporation, Costa Mesa, CA; and ITI Solutions, Inc., San Antonio, TX have withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and BSTC intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 30, 2012, BSTC filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 18, 2012 (77 FR 36292).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 23, 2020. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on February 27, 2020 (85 FR 11396).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-12306 Filed 6-5-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—DVD Copy Control Association

Notice is hereby given that, on May 27, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), DVD Copy Control Association ("DVD CCA") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Ultra Source Trading Hong Kong Limited, New Territories, HONG KONG

SAR, has been added as a party to this venture.

Also, Visteon Corporation, Van Buren Charter Township, MI; Guangdong Creator & FlyAudio Ele & Tech Co., Ltd., Dongguan, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA; Lear Corporation, Detroit, MI; IMAGICA Lab Inc., Tokyo, JAPAN; Skypine Electronics (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., Shenzhen City, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA; and Shanghai Epic Music Manufacturing Operations, Shanghai, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and DVD CCA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 11, 2001, DVD CCA filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on August 3, 2001 (66 FR 40727).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 26, 2019. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on January 27, 2020 (85 FR 4705).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-12303 Filed 6-5-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA-2020-0046]

Public Interest Declassification Board; Revised Bylaws

AGENCY: Information Security Oversight Office, National Archives and Records Administration.

ACTION: Notice of revised Public Interest Declassification Board Bylaws.

SUMMARY: We are announcing revisions to the Bylaws of the Public Interest Declassification Board (PIDB). The members of the PIDB approved these revised Bylaws and we are publishing them with this notice, in accordance with requirements in the Bylaws. You may also find the Bylaws on the PIDB website.

DATES: The revised Bylaws are effective as of June 1, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You can see these Bylaws, as well as additional information about