

Meridian, Nevada, was accepted June 26, 1998.

The supplemental plat, showing amended lottings in section 18, Township 36 North, Range 50 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, was accepted June 26, 1998.

The supplemental plat, showing amended lottings in section 30, Township 36 North, Range 50 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, was accepted June 26, 1998.

These supplemental plats were prepared at the request of Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Incorporated.

2. The above-listed plats are now the basic records for describing the lands for all authorized purposes. These plats have been placed in the open files in the BLM Nevada State Office and are available to the public as a matter of information. Copies of the plats may be furnished to the public upon payment of the appropriate fees.

Dated: June 30, 1998.

**Robert H. Thompson,**

*Acting Chief Cadastral Surveyor, Nevada.*

[FR Doc. 98-18263 Filed 7-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-M

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-395]

### Certain EPROM, EEPROM, Flash Memory, and Flash Microcontroller Semiconductor Devices, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Final Determination

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to find no violation of section 337 in the above-captioned investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John A. Wasleff, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-3094.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Commission instituted this investigation on March 18, 1997, based on a complaint filed by Atmel Corporation. 62 Fed. Reg. 13706. The complaint named five respondents: Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., Winbond Electronics Corporation and Winbond Electronics North America Corporation (collectively "Winbond"), Macronix International Co., Ltd. and Macronix America, Inc. (collectively "Macronix"). Silicon Storage Technology, Inc. ("SST") was permitted to intervene.

In its complaint, Atmel alleged that respondents violated section 337 by importing into the United States, selling for importation, and/or selling in the United States after importation electronic products and/or components that infringe one or more of claim 1 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,511,811, claim 1 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,673,829, claim 1 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,974,565 ("the '565 patent") and claims 1-9 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,451,903. The '565 patent was subsequently removed from the case. The presiding ALJ held an evidentiary hearing from December 8 to December 19, 1997.

On March 19, 1998, the ALJ issued his final ID finding that there was no violation of section 337. He found that neither claim 1 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,511,811 ("the '811 patent"), nor claim 1 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,673,829 ("the '829 patent"), nor claim 1 or claim 9 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,451,903 ("the '903 patent") was infringed by any product of the respondents or intervenor. He further found that the '903 patent was unenforceable because of waiver and implied license by legal estoppel, and that claims 2 through 8 of this patent are invalid for indefiniteness. He found that respondents and the intervenor had not demonstrated that any other claim at issue was invalid in view of any prior art before him, or that the '903 patent is void for failure to name a co-inventor. He found that complainant had not demonstrated that the '811 patent was entitled to an earlier date of invention than that appearing on the face of the patent. Finally, the ALJ found that there was a domestic industry with respect to all patents at issue.

On March 31, 1998, complainant Atmel filed a petition for review of the ALJ's final ID. On April 1, 1998, respondent Winbond filed a petition for review of the ALJ's ID. The other respondents and intervenor SST filed contingent petitions for review, raising issues to be considered in the event that the Commission determined to review certain of the ALJ's findings. In accordance with the Commission's directions, the parties filed their initial briefs on May 26, 1998, and their reply briefs on June 5, 1998. Complainant Atmel and respondent Winbond requested oral argument, which request is hereby denied.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ID, the review briefs, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined that there is no violation of section 337. More specifically, the Commission finds that the '811 and '829 patents are invalid because of the preclusive effect of a decision of the United States

District Court for the Northern District of California. The Commission also finds that the '903 patent is unenforceable for failure to name a co-inventor.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1337) and sections 210.42-45 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. §§ 210.42-45).

Copies of the public version of the ID, the Commission's opinion, and all other 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 S.W., Washington, D.C. 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>).

By order of the Commission.<sup>1</sup>

Issued: July 2, 1998.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-18268 Filed 7-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of Information Collection Under Review; Grantee Satisfaction Survey.

The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until September 8, 1998. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are requested. Comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) 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;

<sup>1</sup> Commissioner Miller did not participate in this investigation.