

Commencement of Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the Department of Commerce ("Commerce") of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 703(b) or 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in those investigations under sections 705(a) or 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

Background

On January 29, 2016, the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, Pittsburgh, PA filed a petition with the Commission and Commerce, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of LTFV and subsidized imports of truck and bus tires from China. Accordingly, effective January 29, 2016, the Commission, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)), instituted countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-556 and antidumping duty investigation No. 731-TA-1311 (Preliminary).

K. Schmittlein determine that there is a reasonable indication that the domestic industry is materially injured by reason of subject imports.

³ Commissioner David S. Johanson determines that there is a reasonable indication that the domestic industry is threatened with material injury by reason of subject imports.

⁴ Chairman Meredith M. Broadbent and Commissioner F. Scott Kieff determine that there is no reasonable indication that a domestic industry is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of subject imports.

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of February 4, 2016 (81 FR 6042). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on February 19, 2016, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on March 14, 2016. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4601 (March 2016), entitled *Truck and Bus Tires from China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-556 and 731-TA-1311 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 15, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016-06122 Filed 3-17-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-990]

Certain Mobile Electronic Devices Incorporating Haptics (Including Smartphones and Smartwatches) and Components Thereof; Institution of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on February 11, 2016, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Immersion Corporation of San Jose, California. A supplement to the complaint was filed on February 24, 2016. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile electronic devices incorporating haptics (including smartphones and smartwatches) and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,773,356 ("the '356 patent");

U.S. Patent No. 8,619,051 ("the '051 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 8,659,571 ("the '571 patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, as supplemented, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. 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 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2015).

Scope of investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 14, 2016, *ordered that*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile electronic devices incorporating haptics (including smartphones and smartwatches) and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-13, 15, 17, 19-23, 25, and 26 of the '356 patent; claims 1-3 and 5-15 of the '051 patent; and claims 1-7, 12-18, and 23-29 of the '571 patent, and whether an industry in the United

States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties and other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:
Immersion Corporation, 50 Rio Robles, San Jose, CA 95134.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Apple Inc., 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, CA 95014.

AT&T Inc., 208 South Akard Street, Dallas, TX 75202.

AT&T Mobility LLC, 1025 Lenox Park Boulevard NE., Atlanta, GA 30319.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice

and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 14, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016-06112 Filed 3-17-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 16-5]

Kristen Lee Raines, A.P.R.N.; Decision and Order

On September 16, 2015, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Kristen Lee Raines, A.P.R.N. (hereinafter, Respondent), of Little Rock, Arkansas. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration MR1972632, pursuant to which she is authorized to dispense controlled substances in schedules III through V, as a mid-level practitioner, as well as the denial of any pending applications to renew or modify her registration, on the ground that she does not have authority to dispense controlled substances in Arkansas, the State in which she holds her registration. Show Cause Order at 1.

The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent's registration will not expire until April 30, 2018. *Id.* The Show Cause Order then alleged that the Arkansas State Board of Nursing had issued an Order, which summarily suspended Respondent's nursing and advance practice nursing licenses effective on June 19, 2015. *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus alleged that Respondent is "without authority to handle controlled substances in Arkansas," and as a consequence, her DEA registration is subject to revocation. *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f), and 824(a)(3)).

Following service of the Show Cause Order, Respondent, through her counsel, requested a hearing on the allegations. In her hearing request, Respondent did not dispute that her registration does not expire until April 30, 2018. Resp. Hearing Req., at 1. Nor did she dispute that the Arkansas State Board of Nursing had summarily

suspended her nursing and advance practice nursing licenses. *Id.* Instead, Respondent objected to the proposed action "on the grounds that the Show Cause Order and suspension of her Arkansas nursing license and advance practice nursing license stem from unfounded and unsubstantiated allegations that she violated . . . 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(e) by the U.S. Attorney in" a criminal case brought against her in the Eastern District of Arkansas. *Id.* Respondent further asserted that "she did not knowingly or intentionally distribute [h]ydrocodone and [a]lprazolam . . . without an effective prescription." *Id.* Respondent further stated that she has pled not guilty to the charges and believes that she will be acquitted. *Id.*

Thereafter, the matter was placed on the docket of the Office of Administrative Law Judges and assigned to Chief Administrative Law Judge John J. Mulrooney, II (hereinafter, CALJ). On October 20, 2015, the CALJ issued an order directing the Government to file evidence to support the allegation and any motion for summary disposition by October 30, 2015; the order also provided that Respondent should respond to the Government's expected motion no later than November 13, 2015.

On October 26, 2015, the Government filed its Motion for Summary Disposition. As support for the Motion, the Government attached a copy of the decision and order of the Arkansas State Board of Nursing, which summarily suspended Respondent's advance practice nursing license and nursing license effective June 19, 2015. Mot. for Summ. Disp., at Attachment 3, at 3 (Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order, at 3; *In re Kristen Lee Raines Plant Raines* (Ark. Bd. of Nursing, June 19, 2015) (hereinafter, Nursing Board Order). The Government also provided a printout from the Nursing Board's Web site (dated September 4, 2015) showing that both Respondent's RN and Certified Nurse Practitioner licenses were suspended. Mot. for Summ. Disp., at Attachment 4.

Respondent opposed the Government's Motion. In her opposition, Respondent asserted that she has been wrongly accused, and that the State Board's suspension of her licenses is the "result of her wrongful indictment." Resp. Reply to Govt's Mot. for Summ. Disp., at 3. She further argued that the DEA may exercise discretion in determining the appropriate sanction and that revocation of her registration "is an unjust and overly severe punishment given the circumstances, particularly that the