

consummating an exchange. BLM is announcing that the Draft Environmental Analysis (EA) is available for public review and that a public hearing will be held to elicit comments from any affected parties concerning the EA or the exchange in general.

DATES: The draft EA will be available for review and comment for 30 calendar days from the date this notice is published in the **Federal Register**. On April 11, 2006, the BLM will host a public hearing at 7 p.m. at the Clarion Hotel and Convention Center, 2009 South Douglas Highway, Gillette, Wyoming. At the public hearing, the public is invited to submit comments and resource information, and identify issues or concerns to be considered in the exchange process.

Announcements will be made through local news media and the Casper Field Office's Web site, which is: <http://www.wy.blm.gov/cfo>.

ADDRESSES: Please submit written comments or concerns to the BLM Casper Field Office, Attn: Steven Wright, 2987 Prospector Drive, Casper, Wyoming 82604. Written comments or resource information may also be hand-delivered to the BLM Casper Field Office or sent by facsimile to the attention of Steven Wright at 307-261-7587. Comments may be sent electronically to casper_wymail@blm.gov; please put GMDX Tract/Steven Wright in the subject line.

Members of the public may examine documents pertinent to this proposal by visiting the Casper Field Office during its business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Your response is important and will be considered in the EA process. If you do respond, we will keep you informed of the availability of environmental documents that address impacts that might occur from this proposal. Please note that comments and information submitted regarding this project including names, electronic mail addresses, and street addresses of the respondents will be available for public review and disclosure at the Casper Field Office. Individuals may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name, electronic mail address, or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, or from individuals identifying themselves as

representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Wright or Mike Karbs, BLM Casper Field Office, 2987 Prospector Drive, Casper, Wyoming 82604. Mr. Wright or Mr. Karbs may also be reached by telephone at 307-261-7600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An application to exchange Federal coal leases adjacent to the Caballo Mine was filed on July, 24, 2003, by PRCC. The Powder River Regional Coal Team reviewed this lease exchange proposal at a public meeting held on April 27, 2005, in Gillette, Wyoming, and concurred with the further processing of the application.

As currently filed, the application includes approximately 67 million tons of in-place Federal coal underlying the following lands in Campbell County, Wyoming:

- T. 48 N., R. 70 W., 6th P.M., Wyoming Sec. 18: Lots 15-18;
- T. 48 N., R. 71 W., 6th P.M., Wyoming Sec. 11: Lot 16 (SE $\frac{1}{4}$); Sec. 12: Lots 13, 14, 15 (W $\frac{1}{2}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$); Sec. 13: Lots 1 (SW $\frac{1}{2}$), 2-8, 11-14; Sec. 14: Lots 1, 8 (E $\frac{1}{2}$); Sec. 24: Lots 1-3. Containing 921.6 acres more or less.

The surface estate overlying the Federal coal is privately owned. If the GMDX Tract is exchanged for a new Federal coal lease, the new lease must be incorporated into the existing mining and reclamation plan for the adjacent mine and the Secretary of the Interior must approve the revised Mineral Leasing Act (MLA) mining plan before the Federal coal in the tract can be mined. The Office of Surface Mining is the Federal agency that would be responsible for recommending approval, approval with conditions, or disapproval of the revised MLA mining plan to the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

Robert A. Bennett,

State Director.

[FR Doc. 06-2618 Filed 3-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-22-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-543]

In the Matter of Certain Baseband Processor Chips and Chipsets, Transmitter and Receiver (Radio) Chips, Power Control Chips, and Products Containing Same, Including Cellular Telephone Handsets; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting-In-Part Various Motions To Intervene and Extending the Target Date for Completion of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ's") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 27) granting-in-part various motions to intervene on the issues of remedy and bonding and extending the target date for completion of the above-captioned investigation from September 21, 2006, to December 21, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: 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 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'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) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 21, 2005, the Commission instituted an investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based on a complaint filed by Broadcom Corporation of Irvine, California ("Broadcom"), alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain

baseband processor chips and chipsets, transmitter and receiver (radio) chips, power control chips, and products containing same, including cellular telephone handsets by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,374,311 (“the ‘311 patent”), 6,714,983 (“the ‘983 patent”), 5,682,379 (“the ‘379 patent”), 6,359,872 (“the ‘872 patent”), and 6,583,675 (“the ‘675 patent”). The complainant named Qualcomm Incorporated (“Qualcomm”) of San Diego, California as the only respondent.

On December 23, 2005, Broadcom filed a motion for summary determination that Broadcom satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C) with respect to the ‘311, ‘983, ‘379, ‘872, and ‘675 patents. The Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) supported the motion. Respondent Qualcomm took no position with regard to the motion. On January 24, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 19) granting the motion for summary determination. No petitions for review of the ID were filed. On February 16, 2006, the Commission determined not to review Order No. 19. On January 31, 2006, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Verizon”) filed a motion to intervene in the investigation. On February 2, 2006, LG Electronics Mobilecomm U.S.A., Inc. (“LG”) filed a motion to intervene. On February 3, 2006, Motorola, Inc. (“Motorola”) and Kyocera Wireless Corp. (“Kyocera”) each filed motions to intervene. On February 8, 2006, Sprint Nextel Corporation (“Sprint”) filed a motion to intervene. On February 10, 2006, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung”) filed a motion to intervene for the limited purpose of presenting evidence relating to remedy.

On February 21, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 27) granting the motions of Verizon, LG, Kyocera, Motorola, Sprint, and Samsung to intervene for the limited purpose of presenting evidence related to remedy and bonding. The ALJ also extended the target date for completion of the investigation from September 21, 2006, to December 21, 2006. No party filed a petition for review of Order No. 27.

The Commission has determined not to review Order No. 27.

The authority for the Commission’s determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in section 210.42 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 16, 2006.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-4125 Filed 3-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-506]

In the Matter of Certain Optical Disk Controller Chips and Chipsets and Products Containing Same, Including DVD Players And PC Optical Storage Devices; Notice of Commission Determination To Rescind Remedial Orders

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to rescind the remedial orders issued in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clara Kuehn, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3012. Copies of the Commission orders, 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.

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://edis.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: The Commission instituted this investigation on April 14, 2004, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Zoran Corporation (“Zoran”) and Oak Technology, Inc. (“Oak”) both of Sunnyvale, California (collectively “complainants”). 69 *FR* 19876. The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation,

and the sale within the United States after importation of certain optical disk controller chips and chipsets and products containing same, including DVD players and PC optical storage devices, by reason of infringement of claims 1–12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,736 (“the ‘736 patent”), claims 1–3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,527 (“the ‘527 patent”), and claims 1–35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,440 (“the ‘440 patent”). *Id.*

The notice of investigation identified 12 respondents. 69 *FR* 19876. On June 7, 2004, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 5) terminating the investigation as to two respondents on the basis of a consent order and settlement agreement. On June 22, 2004, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 7) granting complainants’ motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add nine additional respondents. Those IDs were not reviewed by the Commission.

On December 22, 2004, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 33) granting complainants’ motion to terminate the investigation in part with respect to claims 2–6 and 8–11 of the ‘736 patent and claims 2–4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15–18, 20, and 22–35 of the ‘440 patent. On January 28, 2005, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 37) granting complainants’ motion to terminate the investigation in part with respect to claim 12 of the ‘736 patent. Neither ID was reviewed by the Commission. Thus, at the time that Order No. 37 issued, the claims remaining for determination on the merits were claims 1 and 7 of the ‘736 patent; claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 19, and 21 of the ‘440 patent; and claims 1–3 of the ‘527 patent.

An eight-day evidentiary hearing was held on February 7–12, and 14–15, 2005.

On May 16, 2005, the ALJ issued his final ID, findings of fact and conclusions of law, and recommended determination on remedy and bonding. The ALJ concluded that there was a violation of section 337 based on his findings that: (a) The accused products infringe claim 3 of the ‘527 patent, (b) the ‘527 patent is not unenforceable, (c) claim 3 of the ‘527 patent is not invalid, and (d) complainants have satisfied the domestic industry requirement with respect to the ‘527 patent. Although the ALJ found that the other asserted claims of the ‘527 patent (claims 1 and 2) are not invalid, he found that the accused products do not infringe those claims. The ALJ found no violation with respect to the other patents in issue. He found that the accused products do not infringe any asserted claim of the ‘440 or ‘736 patents and that complainants