The area described contains 878.34 acres, more or less.

The 1986 BLM Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan identifies these parcels of public land as suitable for disposal. The sale meets the disposal qualification of Section 205 of the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of July 25, 2000, 43 U.S.C. 2304. The sale will be subject to the provisions of FLPMA and applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, and will contain the reservation to the United States of a right-of-way thereon for ditches or canals constructed by the authority of the United States, Act of August 30, 1890 (43 U.S.C. 945). Conveyance of the identified public land will be subject to valid existing rights and encumbrances of record, including but not limited to, rights-of-way for roads and public utilities. Conveyance of any mineral interests pursuant to Section 209 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1719) will be analyzed during processing of the proposed sale.

On publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, the described land will be segregated from appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, except the sale provisions of the FLPMA. On segregation, the BLM will no longer accept land use applications affecting the identified public land, except applications for the amendment of previously filed right-of-way applications or existing authorizations to increase the term of the grants in accordance with 43 CFR 2807.15 and 2886.15. The segregative effect will terminate upon issuance of a patent, publication in the **Federal Register** of a termination of the segregation, or two years after the date of publication of this notice, unless extended by the BLM Nevada State Director in accordance with 43 CFR 2711.1–2(d) prior to the termination date.

Interested parties and the general public may submit in writing any comments concerning the land being considered for sale, including notification of any encumbrances or other claims relating to the identified land to Field Manager, BLM Battle Mountain Field Office.

Only written comments submitted by postal service or overnight mail to the Field Manager, BLM Battle Mountain District Office will be considered properly filed. Facsimiles, telephone calls, and electronic mails are unacceptable means of notification. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. If you wish to have your name or address withheld from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Any determination by the BLM to release or withhold the names and/or addresses of those who comment will be made on a case-by-case basis. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. The BLM will make available for public review, in their entirety, all comments submitted by businesses or organizations, including comments by individuals in their capacity as an official or representative of a business or organization.

Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the BLM Nevada State Director who may sustain, vacate, or modify this realty action. In the absence of any adverse comments, this realty action will become the final determination of the Department of the Interior.

(Authority: 43 CFR 2711.1–2)

Dated: September 30, 2008.

Stephen C. Drummond,

Acting Field Manager, Mount Lewis Field Office.

[FR Doc. E8–24386 Filed 10–14–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–648]

In the Matter of Certain Semiconductor Integration Circuits Using Tungsten Metallization and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of 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 an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 13) of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') granting a joint motion to amend the complaint and the notice of investigation in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clint Gerdine, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2310. Copies of non-confidential 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 at *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.* 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 May 21, 2008 based on a complaint filed on April 18, 2008 by LSI Corporation of Milpitas, California and Agere Systems Inc. of Allentown, Pennsylvania. 73 FR 29534–35 (May 21, 2008). The complaint alleges 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 semiconductor integrated circuits using tungsten metallization and products containing same by reason of infringement of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,227,335. The complaint named numerous respondents including NXP B.V. of the Netherlands and Micronas Semiconductor Holding AG (''Micronas AG'') of Switzerland. The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

On September 2, 2008, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID granting the motion of complainants, NXP B.V. and proposed respondent NXP Semiconductors USA, Inc. (''NXP Semiconductors'') of San Jose, California to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to substitute NXP Semiconductors for NXP B.V. 73 FR 52064–65 (Sept. 9, 2008).

On July 23, 2008, complainants, Micronas AG, and proposed respondent Micronas GmbH of Germany moved to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to substitute Micronas GmbH for Micronas AG. No party opposed the motion.

On September 17, 2008, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the joint motion to amend. No party petitioned for review of the ID. The Commission has determined not to review this ID.

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 sections 210.14 and 210.42(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.14, 210.42(c).

Issued: October 8, 2008

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8–24555 Filed 10–14–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–602]

In the Matter of Certain GPS Devices and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Determination on Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest and Bonding

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 the final initial determination (''ID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on August 8, 2008, regarding whether there is a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel E. Valencia, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–1999. Copies of non-confidential 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 at *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*. 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 May 7, 2007, based on a complaint filed by Global Locate, Inc. (''Global Locate''). 72 *FR* 25777 (May 7, 2007). 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 GPS (Global Positioning System) devices and products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,417,801 (''the '801 patent''); 6,606,346 (''the '346 patent''); 6,651,000 (''the '000 patent''); 6,704,651 (''the '651 patent''); 6,937,187 (''the '187 patent''); and 7,158,080 (''the '080 patent''). The complaint named five respondents: SiRF Technology, Inc. (''SiRF''); Pharos Science & Applications, Inc. (''Pharos''); MiTAC International Corp. (''MiTAC''); Mio Technology Ltd., USA (''Mio''); and E-TEN Information Systems Co., Ltd. (''E-TEN'') (collectively, ''respondents''). The notice of investigation was subsequently amended to add Broadcom Corporation (''Broadcom'') as a complainant inasmuch as Broadcom acquired Global Locate.

On August 8, 2008, the ALJ issued his final ID, and on August 22, 2008, he issued his recommended determination on remedy and bonding. In his ID, the ALJ found a violation of section 337 in the importation and the sale after importation of certain GPS devices and products containing the same, in connection with the asserted claims of each of the six patents at issue. Respondents and the Commission investigative attorney (IA) each filed petitions for review on August 25, 2008. On September 5, 2008, Complainants and the IA each filed responses to the petitions for review.

On September 16, 2008, Respondents filed a motion for leave to reply in support of their petition for review of the ID. On September 22, 2008, Complainants opposed the motion.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review (1) ALJ's finding that Global Locate has standing to assert the '346 patent; (2) the ALJ's finding that SiRF directly infringes claim 1 of the '651 patent through its commercial activities; and (3) the ALJ's finding that SiRF directly infringes claim 1 of the '000 patent through its commercial activities. The Commission has determined not to review the remaining issues raised by the petitions for review, and has denied Respondents' motion for leave to file a reply.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the issues under review with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record. In connection with its review, the Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

1. Please address the issue of whether Global Locate has standing to assert the '346 patent in light of provision 2.1 in RX–286. Please cite record evidence and/or relevant legal precedent to support your position.

2. Does SiRF practice the element ''processing satellite signals * * *'' of the method of claim 1 of the '651 patent vicariously through end users of the accused products? *See BMC Resources, Inc.* v. *Paymentech, L.P.*, 498 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2007) and *Muniauction, Inc.* v. *Thomson Corp.*, 532 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Please cite record evidence and relevant legal authority to support your position.

3. Does SiRF practice the third element (''at the remote receiver, representing said formatted data in a second format supported by the remote receiver'') of the method of claim 1 of the '000 patent vicariously through end users of the accused products? S*ee BMC Resources, Inc.* v. *Paymentech, L.P.*, 498 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2007) and *Muniauction, Inc.* v. *Thomson Corp.*, 532 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Please cite record evidence and any relevant legal authority to support your position.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent(s) being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, *see In the Matter of Certain*