

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-419]

### Certain Excimer Laser Systems for Vision Correction Surgery and Components Thereof and Methods for Performing Such Surgery; Notice of Decision To Extend the Deadline for Determining Whether To Review an Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to extend by seven (7) days, or until January 28, 2000, the deadline for determining whether to review an initial determination (ID) finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in the above-captioned investigation.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy P. Monaghan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202-205-3152. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This investigation was instituted on March 1, 1999, based on a complaint by VISX, Inc. ("VISX"), 64 Fed. Reg. 10016-17. The respondents named in the investigation are Nidek Co., Ltd., Nidek Inc., and Nidek Technologies, Inc. Complainant alleges importation and sale of certain excimer laser systems for vision correction surgery that infringe claims of U.S. Letters Patent Nos. 4,718,418 and 5,711,762 ("the '762 patent"). An evidentiary hearing was held from August 18, 1999 to August 27, 1999.

On December 6, 1999, the presiding ALJ (Judge Debra Morriss) issued her final ID finding that complainant VISX failed to establish the required domestic industry, that there was no infringement of any claim at issue, and that the '762 patent was invalid and unenforceable.

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(h)(2) of the Commission's Rules

of Practice and Procedure, 19 C.F.R. 210.42(h)(2).

Copies of the public version of the ID, 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.

Issued: December 17, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-33479 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731-TA-385-386 (Review)]

### Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy and Japan

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin from Italy and Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>2</sup>

#### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on May 3, 1999 (64 FR 23677, May 3, 1999) and determined on August 5, 1999 that it would conduct expedited reviews (64 FR 44537, August 16, 1999).

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on December 21, 1999. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3260 (December 1999), entitled Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy and Japan: Investigations Nos. 731-TA-385-386 (Review).

Issued: December 14, 1999.

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> Commissioners Crawford and Askey dissenting.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-33477 Filed 12-23-99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 98-38]

#### Theodore Neujahr, D.V.M., Continuation of Registration

On July 16, 1998, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Theodore A. Neujahr, D.V.M. (Respondent) of Eatonville, Washington, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AN1015331, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4), and deny any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that his registration is inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated July 28, 1998, Respondent filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Tacoma, Washington on March 3, 1999, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, both parties submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and argument. On July 19, 1999, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision (Opinion), recommending that Respondent's registration be continued and any pending applications be granted. Neither party filed exceptions to Judge Bittner's Opinion, and on August 19, 1999, the record was transmitted to the Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, with one noted exception, the Opinion of the Administrative Law Judge. His adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.