

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-634]

In the Matter of: Certain Liquid Crystal Display Modules, Products Containing Same, and Methods Using the Same; Notice of Commission Determination to Rescind a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist 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 limited exclusion order issued in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clint A. Gerdine, 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 (<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 March 4, 2008, based on a complaint filed by Sharp Corporation ("Sharp") of Japan. 73 FR 11678. The complaint, as amended and 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 liquid crystal display devices, products containing same, and methods for using the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,879,364 ("the '364 patent"); 6,952,192 ("the '192 patent"); 7,304,703 ("the '703 patent"); and 7,304,626 ("the '626 patent"). The complaint further alleged the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission's notice of investigation named the following respondents:

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Korea; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; and Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. of San Jose, California (collectively, "Samsung").

On June 12, 2009, the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") issued his final initial determination ("ID") finding a violation of section 337 by Samsung with respect to all four patents at issue and his recommendations on remedy and bonding. On June 29, 2009, Samsung and the Commission investigative attorney ("IA") filed petitions for review of the final ID. The IA and Sharp filed responses to the petitions on July 7, 2009. On September 9, 2009, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ's final ID and requested written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding from the parties and interested non-parties. 74 FR 47616-17 (Sept. 16, 2009).

On September 16 and 23, 2009, respectively, complainant Sharp, the Samsung respondents, and the IA filed briefs and reply briefs on the issues for which the Commission requested written submissions. On September 21, 2009, Samsung filed a petition for reconsideration of the Commission's determination not to review certain portions of the final ID. On October 19, 2009, the Commission issued an order denying the petition for reconsideration.

On October 30, 2009, Samsung filed a supplemental submission on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. On November 2 and 3, 2009, respectively, Sharp and the IA filed a response to Samsung's supplemental submission.

On November 9, 2009, the Commission issued notice of its determination to terminate the investigation with a finding of a violation of section 337, and issued: (1) A limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed entry of LCD devices, including display panels and modules, and products containing the same that infringe one or more of (i) claims 5-7 of the '364 patent; (ii) claims 1 and 4 of the '192 patent; (iii) claims 1-2, 6-8, 13-14, and 16-17 of the '703 patent; and (iv) claims 10, 17, and 20 of the '626 patent, where the infringing LCD devices are manufactured abroad by or on behalf of, or are imported by or on behalf of, Samsung, or any of its affiliated companies, parents, subsidiaries, licensees, contractors, or other related business entities, or successors or assigns; and (2) cease and desist orders prohibiting Samsung Electronics America, Inc. and Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. from conducting

any of the following activities in the United States: importing, selling, marketing, advertising, distributing, offering for sale, transferring (except for exportation), and soliciting U.S. agents or distributors for, LCD devices, including display panels and modules, and products containing the same that infringe one or more of (i) claims 5-7 of the '364 patent; (ii) claims 1 and 4 of the '192 patent; (iii) claims 1-2, 6-8, 13-14, and 16-17 of the '703 patent; and (iv) claims 10, 17, and 20 of the '626 patent. 74 FR 58978-79 (November 16, 2009).

On February 12, 2010, complainant Sharp and respondent Samsung filed a joint petition to rescind the remedial orders under Commission Rule 210.76(a)(1) on the basis of a settlement agreement between the parties. The parties asserted that their settlement agreement constitutes "changed conditions of fact or law" sufficient to justify rescission of the order under Commission Rule 210.76(a)(1), 19 CFR 210.76(a)(1). The IA did not oppose the joint petition.

Having reviewed the parties' submissions, the Commission has determined that the settlement agreement satisfies the requirement of Commission Rule 210.76(a)(1), 19 CFR 210.76(a)(1), that there be changed conditions of fact or law. The Commission therefore has issued an order rescinding the limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders previously issued in this investigation.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) and section 210.76(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.76(a)(1)).

Issued: March 1, 2010.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-4556 Filed 3-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

[OMB Number 1121-0166]

Bureau of Justice Assistance; Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

ACTION: 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review Extension of currently approved collection. Bureau of Justice Assistance Application Form:

Public Safety Officers' Disability Benefits.

The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, will be submitting the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for "sixty days" until May 3, 2010. If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact M. Berry at 202-616-6500/1-866-268-0079, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20531 via facsimile at 202-305-1367 or by e-mail at M.A.Berry@ojp.usdoj.gov.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- 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.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of information collection:* Extension of currently approved collection.

(2) *The title of the form/collection:* OJP FORM 3650/7 Public Safety Officers Disability Benefits.

(3) The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection: None. Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Dependents of public safety officers who were killed or permanently and totally disabled in the line of duty.

Abstract: BJA's Public Safety Officers' Benefits (PSOB) division will use the PSOE Application information to confirm the eligibility of applicants to receive PSOE benefits. Eligibility is dependent on several factors, including the applicant having received or being eligible to receive a portion of the PSOB Death Benefit, or having a family member who received the PSOB Disability Benefit. Also considered are the applicant's age and the schools being attended. In addition, information to help BJA identify an individual is collected, such as Social Security number and contact numbers and e-mail addresses. The changes to the application form have been made in an effort to streamline the application process and eliminate requests for information that is either irrelevant or already being collected by other means.

Others: None.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time needed for an average respondent to respond is as follows:* It is estimated that no more than 75 respondents will apply a year. Each application takes approximately 120 minutes to complete.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* Total Annual Reporting Burden: 75×120 minutes per application = 9,000 minutes/by 60 minutes per hour = 150 hours.

If additional information is required, please contact Lynn Bryant, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC., 20530.

March 1, 2010.

Lynn Bryant,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2010-4536 Filed 3-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Bemis Company, Inc., et al.; 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, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States v. Bemis Co. et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:10-cv-00295. On February 24, 2010, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition by Bemis Company, Inc. ("Bemis") of the Alcan Packaging Food Americas business of Rio Tinto plc would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18, by substantially lessening competition in the markets for flexible-packaging rollstock for chunk and sliced natural cheese packaged for retail sale, flexible-packaging rollstock for shredded natural cheese packaged for retail sale, and flexible-packaging shrink bags for fresh meat. The proposed Final Judgment, filed the same time as the Complaint, requires Bemis to divest the assets of Alcan Packaging Food Americas related to those markets, including production plants and assets located in Menasha, Wisconsin and Catoosa, Oklahoma, as well as certain other tangible and intangible assets. The proposed Final Judgment also permits Bemis temporarily to occupy certain portions of the Menasha facility while unrelated operations are relocated and allows for short-term supply agreements between Bemis and the entity that acquires the divested assets in order to ensure that customers continue to receive a reliable supply of the affected products.

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, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 1010, 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 Maribeth Petrizzi, Chief, Litigation II Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice,