

(August 11, 2005). The complaint alleged violations section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 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 tissue converting machinery, including rewinders, tail sealers, trim removers, and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 1, 3, 6–8, and 13–15 of U.S. Patent No. 5,979,818, claims 1–5 of U.S. Patent No. Re. 35,729, and claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,917. The complaint and notice of investigation named Chan Li Machinery, Co., Ltd. of Taipei Hsien, Taiwan as the respondent.

The Commission determined not to review ALJ Order No. 10, adding to this investigation claims 7, 12, 15 and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,948,677, and ALJ Order No. 11, adding Fabio Perini S.p.A. (of Italy) as a complainant. *See Certain Tissue Converting Machinery, Including Rewinders, Tail Sealers, Trim Removers, and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337–TA–548, Notice of Commission Decision Not to Review, 71 FR 10065 (February 28, 2006). On February 22, 2006, the ALJ issued Order No. 13 staying the proceedings in view of settlement negotiations.

On February 27, 2006, Fabio Perini North America, Inc., Fabio Perini S.p.A., and Chan Li Machinery Co. Ltd. filed a “Joint Motion to Terminate Investigation Based Upon Settlement Agreement.” On March 6, 2006, the Commission Investigative Attorney filed a motion in support of the joint motion to terminate, noting that it was unaware of any information indicating that the basis of the settlement agreement would be contrary to the public interest.

On March 13, 2006, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 14) terminating the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. The ALJ

found no indication that termination of the investigation on the basis of the settlement agreement would adversely affect the public interest, and that the procedural requirements for terminating the investigation had been met. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 CFR 210.42.

Issued: April 12, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6–5786 Filed 4–17–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of the Secretary

#### Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

April 12, 2006.

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 contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or email: [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 the Employment Standards Administration

(ESA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, 202–395–7316 (this is not a toll-free number), 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 are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Agency:* Employment Standards Administration.

*Type of Review:* Extension of currently approved collection.

*Title:* Application to Employ Homeworkers Piece Rate Measurements, Homeworker Handbooks.

*OMB Number:* 1215–0013.

*Form Numbers:* WH–46 and WH–75.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Type of Response:* Recordkeeping and Reporting.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profit; Individuals or households; and Not-for-profit institutions.

*Number of Respondents:* 377,531.

Collection of information	Annual responses	Average response time (hours)	Annual burden hours
Form WH–46 .....	25	0.50	13
Form WH–75 .....	1,208,020	0.50	604,010
Recordkeeping			
Piece-rate measurements .....	150	1.01	152
Homeworker Handbooks* .....	1,208,020	0.01	10,067
Total .....	1,208,195	.....	614,241

\* Not counted in total as separate responses.

*Total Annualized capital/startup costs:* \$0.

*Total Annual Costs (operating/maintaining systems or purchasing services):* \$10.50.

*Description:* Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) section 11(d), 29 U.S.C. 211(d),

authorizes the Secretary of Labor to regulate, restrict, or prohibit industrial homework as necessary to prevent evasion of the minimum wage requirements of the Act. The reporting and recordkeeping requirements for employers and employees in industries

employing homeworkers are necessary

to insure employees are paid in compliance with FLSA.

**Darrin A. King,**  
*Acting Departmental Clearance Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. E6-5771 Filed 4-17-06; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-27-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-59,024]

#### Agilent Technologies, Inc., Global Infrastructure Organization, Palo Alto, CA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on March 14, 2006 in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of workers at Agilent Technologies, Inc., Global Infrastructure Organization, headquartered in Palo Alto, California. The workers were employed as information technology specialists, telecommuting from their homes, but reporting to different facilities.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. Petitioners do not constitute a valid worker group of three or more associated workers working at the same facility. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 6th day of April 2006.

**Richard Church,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*  
 [FR Doc. E6-5769 Filed 4-17-06; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,620]

#### Bankers Trust Services A/K/A Deutsche Bank Services Tennessee, Inc., Nashville, TN; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated February 22, 2006 a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of Bankers Trust Services,

a/k/a Deutsche Bank Services Tennessee, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee was signed on January 26, 2006 and published in the **Federal Register** on February 10, 2006 (71 FR 7077).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at Bankers Trust Services, a/k/a Deutsche Bank Services Tennessee, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee were engaged in providing general banking and financial services to the public and were denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Act.

The petitioner contends that the Department erred in its interpretation of work performed at the subject facility as providing a service and further conveys that workers of the subject firm "produced individualized billing models with separate tangible file folders". The petitioner further states that "billing would have been impossible without the production of these individualized billing models".

A company official was contacted for clarification in regard to the nature of the work performed at the subject facility. The official stated that the subject firm does not manufacture products that are sold on the open market. The official further clarified that workers of the subject firm entered account information into an in-house billing system for the purpose of billing external clients. The copies of the work that was entered into the system was kept in a tangible file folder at the subject firm for reference purposes.

The sophistication of the work involved is not an issue in ascertaining whether the petitioning workers are eligible for trade adjustment assistance, but whether they produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Entering accounting information into the billing system and making copies of the billing financial data for filing purposes is not considered production of an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act. Petitioning workers do not produce an "article"

within the meaning of the Trade Act of 1974.

The investigation on reconsideration supported the findings of the primary investigation that the petitioning group of workers does not produce an article. Furthermore, workers of the subject firm did not support production of an article at any affiliated facility.

The petitioner further alleges that because workers lost their jobs due to a transfer of job functions to India, petitioning workers should be considered import impacted.

The company official stated that such functions as entry of accounting information into a Deutsche Bank billing system for the purpose of billing external clients were shifted to India.

Your petition allegation of jobs transferred to a foreign country might be relevant if all other worker group eligibility requirements for trade adjustment assistance were met. However, workers of the subject firm are engaged in data entry of the account information into the in-house billing system and do not meet the requirement of producing an article as established in section 222 of the Trade Act. Thus, the workers in this case do not meet the worker group eligibility requirements of TAA.

Service workers can be certified only if worker separations are caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article domestically who meet the eligibility requirements, or if the group of workers are leased workers who perform their duties at a facility that meet the eligibility requirements.

## Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 11th day of April, 2006.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**  
*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*  
 [FR Doc. E6-5764 Filed 4-17-06; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**