

the case had been appealed to the Federal Circuit.

The Federal Circuit denied Winbond's petition for a writ of mandamus on April 16, 1999, and remanded Atmel's appeal to the Commission, stating that "[a]fter its proceedings are complete, the ITC shall issue a final determination encompassing Atmel's complaint regarding all three patents so that the parties may seek [judicial] review at that time." In *Re Winbond Electronics Corporation and Winbond Electronics North America Corporation*, Appeal No. 98-1580, Miscellaneous Docket No. 579 (Fed. Cir. April 16, 1999) (Mandate issued on June 7, 1999) at p. 4. As a result of this ruling, and the Federal Circuit's subsequent reversal of the U.S. district court decision in *Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices, Inc.*, all three Atmel patents at issue were before the Commission for final determination.

The U.S. district court decision (*Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices, Inc.*, No. C-95-1987-FMS, 1998 WL 184274 (N.D. Cal. April 14, 1998)) was appealed by Atmel to the Federal Circuit. On December 28, 1999, the Federal Circuit reversed and remanded the case to the district court. *Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices, Inc.*, 198 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

On April 3, 2000, the Commission issued an order allowing the parties to file main briefs and reply briefs setting forth their views on intervening developments in the law as they relate to the remaining issues in investigation concerning the '811 patent, the '829 patent, and the '903 patent (all issues other than inventorship).

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the briefs and the responses thereto, the Commission determined, as noted, that there is a violation of section 337. More specifically, the Commission found that the claims in issue of the '903 patent are valid, enforceable (no incorrect inventorship), and infringed by the imports from intervenor SST and respondents Sanyo and Winbond (but not respondent Macronix), and found a violation of section 337 with regard to the '903 patent as to SST, Sanyo, and Winbond. As to the '811 and '829 patents, the Commission found that the claims in issue of those patents are valid and enforceable, but not infringed by the imports of intervenor SST or respondents Sanyo and Winbond (Atmel did not allege that Macronix infringed the claims in issue of the '811 or '829 patents), and thus found no violation of section 337 with regard to the '811 and '829 patents. The Commission also determined to affirm

the result of ALJ Order No. 50, which ordered the production of certain Atmel documents. The Commission also reversed Order No. 69 to the extent that it placed the burden of proving that the certificate of correction of the '903 patent listed the correct inventors on Atmel and vacated the ALJ's determination in Order No. 69 that PTO rule 324 does not comport with its enabling statute.

The Commission also made determinations on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. The Commission determined that the appropriate form of relief is a limited exclusion order prohibiting the importation of EPROMs, EEPROMs, flash memories, and flash microcontroller semiconductor devices, and circuit boards containing such devices, that infringe claims 1 or 9 of the '903 patent manufactured by or on behalf of Sanyo and Winbond.

The Commission also determined that the public interest factors enumerated in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d) do not preclude the issuance of the limited exclusion and that the bond during the Presidential review period should be set at \$0.78 per device.

The authority for the Commission's determinations is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.45-210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.45-210.51).

Copies of the Commission order, the Commission opinion in support thereof, 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, 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>).

Issued: October 16, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-27056 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-434]

Certain Magnetic Resonance Injection Systems and Components Thereof; Notice of Decision To Extend the Deadline for Determining Whether To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination of Invalidity

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to extend by forty (40) days, or until December 6, 2000, the deadline for determining whether to review an initial determination (ID) (Order No. 16) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3104. 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>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on May 26, 2000, based on a complaint filed by Medrad, Inc. of Indianola, Pennsylvania. The complaint alleged a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 337 U.S.C. 1337, based on infringement of U.S. Letters Patent Re. 36,648, (the '648 patent) owned by complainant. The respondents named in the investigation are Nemoto Kyorindo Co., Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; Liebel-Flarshiem Co. of Cincinnati Ohio; and Mallinckrodt Inc., a New York corporation based in Hazelwood, Mo. 65 *Fed. Reg.* 34231. On September 26, 2000, the ALJ issued an ID finding the '648 patent invalid due to certain omissions that occurred during patent reissue proceedings at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

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)(3) of the Commission of Practice and Procedure, 19 C.F.R. 210.42(h)(3).

Copies of the nonconfidential 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 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 TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

Issued: October 16, 2000.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-27055 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to Sections 104 and 107 of CERCLA

Notice is hereby given that on September 22, 2000, the United States lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, in *United States of America v. Advanced Resin Systems, Inc.*, No. H-99-4357, pursuant to sections 104 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9604 and 9607. The proposed Consent Decree resolves civil claims of the United States against twenty-three separate parties in connection with the Archem Site, located in Houston, Texas. The settling parties will pay a total of \$1,070,000 to the United States in reimbursement of response costs incurred at the Site by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States of America v. Advanced Resin Systems, Inc.*, DJ No. 90-11-2-1328/1.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Texas, 515 Rusk, Ste. 3300, Houston, Texas 77002, and the Region VI Office of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas, 75202. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be

obtained by mail from the Department of Justice Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check for reproduction costs (at 25 cents per page) in the amount of \$10.25, payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Walker B. Smith,
Deputy Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 00-27008 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA")

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, 38 FR 19029, and 42 U.S.C. 9622(d)(2), notice is hereby given that on September 28, 2000, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. American Cyanamid Company, et al.*, Civil Action No. 00-Civ.-6015 (LMM), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims for past and future costs against John Giannattasio, the principal officer and shareholder of Haul-A-Way and J&G Refuse Company for the Sarney Farm Superfund Site under Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9607. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, the settler will pay \$482,000 to the United States as reimbursement for the costs the United States incurred or will incur at the Sarney Farm Superfund Site.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. American Cyanamid Company, et al.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-3-854/1.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at EPA Region II, Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 290 Broadway, New York, New York 10007-1866. A copy of the consent decree may also be obtained by mail from the Department of Justice Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC

20044. In requesting a copy, with the attachment, please enclose a check in the amount of \$11.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Bruce S. Gelber,
Deputy Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 00-27002 Filed 10-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that two Consent Decrees in *United States v. Baureis Realty Co., Inc., et al.*, Civil No. 95-2732 (D.N.J.), were lodged on October 6, 2000 with the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

The complaint in this action seeks to recover, pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9601, *et al.*, response costs incurred and to be incurred by EPA at the Caldwell Trucking Superfund Site located in the Fairfield, New Jersey ("Site").

One of the proposed Consent Decrees embodies an agreement with 76 potentially responsible parties ("PRPs") at the Site pursuant to section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607, to pay \$2.75 million in settlement of claims for EPA's past and future response costs at the Site.

The other proposed Consent Decree embodies an agreement with eight PRPs at the Site pursuant to Section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607, to pay, in aggregate, \$1.65 million in settlement of claims for EPA's past and future response costs at the Site.

The monies paid by the settling defendants under both decrees will be used to reimburse past costs incurred at the Site. Both Consent Decrees provide the settling defendants with releases for civil liability for EPA's past and future CERCLA response costs at the Site.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the two proposed Consent Decrees.

Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, D.C. 20044-