

Haines Block ACEC. Establishment of an ACEC would require an RMP amendment. In the interim, the lands will be managed as they are currently.

All other portions of the Approved RMP are identical to those set forth in July 2006.

No inconsistencies with State or local plans, policies, or programs were identified during the Governor's consistency review of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Dated: January 18, 2008.

Thomas P. Lonnie,
State Director.

[FR Doc. E8-5646 Filed 3-20-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-569]

In the Matter of Certain Endoscopic Probes for Use in Argon Plasma Coagulation Systems; Notice of Commission Decision To Review in Part an Initial Determination and on Review To Affirm the Administrative Law Judge's Determination That There is No Violation of Section 337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part an initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") determining that there is no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the portions of the ALJ's determination relating to construction of the claim term "predetermined minimum safety distance" and associated findings on infringement and domestic industry. On review, the Commission has determined to take no position with respect to these issues, and to affirm the ALJ's determination of no violation of section 337.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan J. Engler, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3112. Copies of the public version of the ID and 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) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This investigation was instituted by the Commission based on a complaint filed by ERBE Elektromedizin GmbH and ERBE USA, Inc. (collectively, "ERBE"). 71 FR 29386 (May 16, 2006). The complaint alleged violations of 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 endoscopic probes for use in argon plasma coagulation systems by reason of infringement of 10 claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,720,745 ("the '745 patent") and infringement of U.S. Supplemental Trademark Registration No. 2,637,630 ("the '630 registration"). The complaint also alleged that a domestic industry exists and/or is in the process of being established, with regard to the '745 patent and the '630 registration under subsection (a)(2). The notice of investigation named Canady Technology, LLC of Hampton, Virginia ("Canady USA"); Canady Technology Germany GmbH of Germany ("Canady GmbH"); and KLS Martin as the respondents. The complaint requested that the Commission institute an investigation pursuant to Section 337 and, after the investigation, issue a permanent exclusion order and a permanent cease and desist order. The investigation has been terminated as to KLS Martin on the basis of a settlement agreement.

On January 16, 2008 the administrative law judge issued a final ID finding no violation of section 337 in this investigation. The ALJ found no violation of section 337 through the importation or sale for importation of argon plasma probes sold by the Canady in the United States. In particular, the ID found that the Canady probes do not directly infringe the '745 patent; that even if there were direct infringement there is no contributory infringement or inducement to infringe the '745 patent by Canady; that ERBE has not shown that there is a domestic industry with respect to the '745 patent because the ERBE products are not used to practice

its claims; and that the '745 patent is not invalid.

On January 28, 2008, ERBE filed its petition for review of the ID, challenging the ALJ's findings with respect to no infringement of the '745 patent and the absence of a domestic industry. Canady filed its Contingent Petition for review of the ID on January 29, 2008.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID and the submissions of the parties, the Commission has determined to review the portions of the ALJ's determination relating to the construction of the phrase "predetermined minimum safety distance" the associated findings on infringement and domestic industry. On review, the Commission has determined to take no position with respect to these issues, and to affirm the ALJ's determination of no violation of section 337.

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.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 17, 2008.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8-5762 Filed 3-20-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of a Consent Decree

Under the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby given that on March 14, 2008, a proposed Consent Decree ("Decree") in *United States & Commonwealth of Kentucky v. Lexington Fayette Urban County Government*, Civil Action No. 5:06-cv-00386-KSF, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division.

The proposed Consent Decree would resolve claims against the Lexington Fayette Urban County Government ("LFUCG") for the Clean Water Act violations involving the municipal separate storm sewer system and the sanitary sewer system alleged in the complaint filed in November 2006 by the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The proposed Consent Decree provides for LFUCG to perform injunctive measures as described in the Consent Decree, to pay a civil penalty of \$425,000 to the United States, and to perform federal Supplemental Environmental Projects

valued at \$1.23 million, and state environmental projects valued at \$1.5 million.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either e-mailed to pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States & Commonwealth of Kentucky v. Lexington Fayette Urban County Government*, Civil Action No. 5:06-cv-00386-KSF, D.J. Ref. 90-5-1-1-08858.

The Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, 260 West Vine Street, Lexington, KY 40507, and at the Region 4 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA 30303. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, to: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611 or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood (tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree exclusive of appendices from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$24.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address. To obtain copies of the appendices to the Consent Decree, which are approximately 1,800 pages, please contact Tonia Fleetwood regarding the total cost of copying appendices, at 25 cents per page.

Henry S. Friedman,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. E8-5671 Filed 3-20-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. The Thomson Corp. & Reuters Group PLC; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America v. The Thomson Corp.* and Reuters Group PLC, Civil Action No. 1:08-cv-00262. On February 19, 2008, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition by The Thomson Corporation of Reuters Group PLC would violate section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed the same time as the Complaint, requires The Thomson Corporation to divest a copy of its WorldScope fundamentals product, along with certain other assets, and requires Reuters Group PLC to divest copies of its Estimates and Aftermarket (Embargoed) Research Database product, along with certain other assets.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 325 7th Street, NW., Room 215, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to James Tierney, Chief, Networks and Technology Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 600 E. Street NW., Suite 9500,

Washington, DC 20530, (telephone: 202-307-6200).

Patricia A. Brink,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 600 E Street NW., Suite 9500, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. The Thomson Corporation, Metro Center, I Station Place, Stamford, CT 06902, and Reuters Group, PLC, The Reuters Building, Canary Wharf, London E14 5EP, United Kingdom, Defendants.

Case: 1:08-cv-002 2.

Assigned To: Hogan, Thomas F.

Assign. Date: 0211912008.

Description: Antitrust.

Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against The Thomson Corporation ("Thomson") and Reuters Group PLC ("Reuters") to obtain equitable relief to prevent Thomson's proposed acquisition of Reuters, and to obtain other relief as appropriate. The United States alleges as follows:

I. Nature of the Action

1. On May 15, 2007, Thomson and Reuters signed an agreement to combine the two companies, with Thomson to control approximately 70% of the combined businesses. The cash and stock transaction valued Reuters at \$17.2 billion.

2. Thomson and Reuters both create and distribute financial news and data, including fundamentals data, earnings estimates data, and aftermarket research reports. Thomson and Reuters are two of the three largest providers of financial data worldwide to institutions such as investment banks and trading firms. More particularly, Thomson and Reuters are two of the four largest suppliers of fundamentals data to institutions worldwide, two of the three largest suppliers of earnings estimates data to institutions worldwide, and the two largest distributors of aftermarket research reports worldwide.

3. The United States brings this action to prevent the proposed acquisition of Reuters by Thomson because it would substantially lessen competition in the distribution and sale of fundamentals data, earnings estimates data, and aftermarket research reports in violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18.