

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert Carpenter (202-205-3172), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

**Authority:** These reviews are being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.69).

Issued: November 25, 2002.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 02-30443 Filed 11-29-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigations Nos. 701-TA-430A and 430B and 731-TA-1019A and 1019B (Preliminary)]<sup>1</sup>**

### Durum and Hard Red Spring Wheat From Canada

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>2</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines,<sup>3</sup> pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)) (the Act), that there is a reasonable indication that industries in the United States are materially injured by reason of imports from Canada of durum and hard red spring wheat,

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the Commission's institution of these investigations, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) initiated separate countervailing duty investigations on durum wheat (C-122-846) and hard red spring wheat (C-122-848), and separate antidumping investigations on durum wheat (A-122-845) and hard red spring wheat (A-122-847). For consistency, the Commission is further delineating its investigation numbers for the duration of the investigations as follows: investigations Nos. 701-TA-430A and 731-TA-1019A will cover durum wheat and investigations Nos. 701-TA-430B and 731-TA-1019B will cover hard red spring wheat.

<sup>2</sup> The record is defined in section 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>3</sup> Commissioner Stephen Koplan dissenting.

provided for in subheadings 1001.10.00, 1001.90.10, and 1001.90.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be subsidized by the Government of Canada and sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

#### 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 Commerce of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 703(b) and 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) and 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 September 13, 2002, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by the North Dakota Wheat Commission (hard red spring wheat), Bismarck, ND; the Durum Growers Trade Action Committee (durum wheat), Bismarck, ND; and the U.S. Durum Growers Association (durum wheat), Bismarck, ND, alleging that industries in the United States are materially injured and are threatened with material injury by reason of subsidized and LTFV imports of durum and hard red spring wheat from Canada. Accordingly, effective September 13, 2002, the Commission instituted countervailing duty and antidumping

<sup>4</sup> In a petition supplement dated September 24, 2002, the petitioners informed Commerce that, with respect to the petition on durum wheat, the petitioners were replacing the North Dakota Wheat Commission with the Durum Growers Trade Action Committee.

duty investigations Nos. 701-TA-430 and 731-TA-1019 (Preliminary).

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 September 25, 2002 (67 FR 60256). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on October 4, 2002, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on November 25, 2002.

The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3563 (December 2002), entitled *Durum and Hard Red Spring Wheat from Canada: Investigations Nos. 701-TA-430A and 430B and 731-TA-1019A and 1019B (Preliminary)*.

Issued: November 25, 2002.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 02-30444 Filed 11-29-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Inv. No. 337-TA-456]**

### Certain Gel-Filled Wrist Rests and Products Containing Same; Notice of Final Determination of No Violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act OF 1930

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that there is no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, 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, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3152. Copies of all 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>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-ON-LINE) at <http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on May 17, 2001, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company (now called 3M Company) and 3M Innovative Properties Company (collectively complainants), both of St. Paul, Minnesota. 66 FR 27535 (2001). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale after importation of certain gel-filled wrist rests and products containing same that infringe certain claims of U.S. Letters Patent 5,713,544 ("the '544 patent"). The Commission named as respondents Velo Enterprise Co. Ltd., Taiwan; Aidma Enterprise Co. Ltd. ("Aidma"), Taiwan; Good Raise Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. ("Good Raise"), Taiwan; ACCO Brands, Inc., Lincolnshire, Illinois; Curtis Computer Products Inc. ("Curtis"), Provo, Utah; Allsop, Inc. ("Allsop"), Bellingham, Washington; American Covers Inc., Draper, Utah; and Gemini Industries ("Gemini"), Clifton, New Jersey. The complaint and notice of investigation were later amended to add Crown Vast Development Ltd. and Hornleon Company, Ltd. ("Hornleon") both of Taiwan as respondents. On October 22, 2001, the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") issued an initial determination ("ID"), Order No. 6, granting complainants' unopposed motion to terminate the investigation with respect to respondent Gemini on the basis of a consent order. On January 9, 2002, the ALJ issued an ID, Order No. 12, finding respondents Good Raise and Aidma in default. On May 15, 2002, the ALJ issued an ID, Order No. 15, granting complainants' unopposed motion to terminate the investigation with respect to respondent Curtis on the basis of a consent order. On May 21, 2002, the ALJ issued an ID, Order No. 16, granting complainants' unopposed motion to terminate the investigation with respect to respondent Allsop on the basis of a consent order. None of these IDs was reviewed by the Commission. The ALJ held an evidentiary hearing from January 14,

2002, to January 18, 2002. On July 24, 2002, the ALJ issued his final ID in which he found no infringement of the claims of the "544 patent at issue, and hence no violation of section 337. He also found that complainants had failed to demonstrate satisfaction of the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement of section 337 for the "544 patent, and that the claims in issue of the "544 patent are invalid due to obviousness and failure to disclose the best mode of practicing the invention. The ALJ also found that the claims in issue of the "544 patent are not invalid due to anticipation, indefiniteness, lack of a written description or the lack of enablement, or improper joinder or non-joinder of inventors; that the "544 patent is not unenforceable due to inequitable conduct before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; and that complainants are not barred from asserting the "544 patent due to equitable estoppel. The ALJ noted that respondent Hornleon did not respond to the complaint and notice of investigation or provide written discovery in this investigation, although a representative of the firm appeared and testified at a deposition. Hornleon neither appeared at the hearing nor filed briefs. However, complainants did not move to find Hornleon in default. The ALJ thus found no violation of section 337 with respect to Hornleon, and no party contested that finding. All parties filed petitions for review and subsequently responded to each other's petitions. On September 9, 2002, the Commission determined to review: (1) The ID's construction of the asserted claims of the "544 patent; (2) the ID's infringement conclusions; (3) the ID's validity conclusions with regard to obviousness and failure to disclose best mode of practice; and (4) the ID's conclusion with respect to the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement.

The Commission determined not to review the remainder of the ID. In accordance with the Commission's instructions, the parties filed their main briefs on September 23, 2002, and reply briefs on September 30, 2002. Having examined the record in this investigation, including the briefs and the responses thereto, the Commission determined that there is no violation of section 337. More specifically, the Commission found that the domestic products of complainants do not practice any claim of the "544 patent, and thus the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement of section 337 is not met in this investigation. The Commission also

found that the accused imported wrist rests, except the Jelly Mouse product, infringe the asserted claims of the "544 patent, and that the "544 patent is not invalid due to obviousness or failure to disclose the best mode of practicing the invention. This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and sections 210.45-210.51 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 19 CFR 210.45-210.51.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 25, 2002.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 02-30372 Filed 11-29-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of the Secretary

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

November 20, 2002.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor. To obtain documentation contact Darrin King on 202-693-4129 or E-Mail: [King-Darrin@dol.gov](mailto:King-Darrin@dol.gov).

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for ETA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202-395-7316), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- 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;
- evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who