112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 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.


Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on May 25, 2010, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine:

(a) Whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain lighting products by reason of infringement of U.S. Patent No. D570,038, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(b) whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain lighting products by reason of infringement of U.S. Copyright Registration No. VA 1–399–618 or U.S. Copyright Registration No. VA 1–415–353, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(c) whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(C) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain lighting products by reason of infringement of U.S. Trademark Registration Nos. 3,703,710; 3,703,711; 3,700,479; or 3,700,480, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337; and

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: Blumberg Industries, Inc. d/b/a Fine Art Lamps, 5770 Miami Lakes Drive East, Miami Lakes, Florida 33014.

(b) The respondent is the following entity alleged to be in violation of section 337, and is the party upon which the complaint is to be served: Lights & More, Inc., 170 F.D. Roosevelt Avenue, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00918.

(c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Anne Goalwin, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern, Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of the respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 26, 2010.

William R. Bishop,
Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–13212 Filed 6–1–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–394–A & 399–A (Second Review) (Third Remand)]

Ball Bearings From Japan and the United Kingdom


ACTION: Notice of remand proceedings.

SUMMARY: The U.S. International Trade Commission ("Commission") hereby gives notice of its third remand proceedings with respect to its affirmative determinations in the five-year reviews of the antidumping orders on ball bearings from Japan and the United Kingdom. For further information concerning the conduct of this proceeding and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subpart A (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: Effective Date: March 27, 2010.


General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

In NSK IV, the Court affirmed the Commission’s vulnerability analysis, concluding that “the Commission has provided the rational connection missing from its previous determinations, and [therefore] the court sustains the agency’s vulnerability finding.” Slip Op. at 10–11. However, the Court remanded the issue of U.K. cumulation, concluding that the Commission had failed to “demonstrate that some incentive likely would draw a discernible amount of the subject United Kingdom goods specifically to the United States in the absence of the order.” Id. at 18. The Court further explained that it “does not believe that the existing record, taken as a whole, can support an affirmative discernible adverse impact finding,” and stated that the “Commission may reopen the record and obtain additional data on this issue in the next remand proceeding, if it so chooses.” Id. at 16. Finally, on the issues of likely impact and causation, the Court stated that the Commission’s analysis of the two remaining issues “nearly resembles the kind of substantial evidence needed for the court to sustain an agency determination.” Slip Op. at 18. Nevertheless, the Court directed the Commission on remand to address the issue of whether “non-subject imports may prevent the subject imports from achieving the requisite level of causation and, therefore, serve as an impenetrable barrier that precludes the agency from affirmatively finding injury in this sunset review.” Id. at 17.

Under the remand schedule ordered by the Court, the Commission was required to file by May 12, 2010, a status report advising the Court as to whether it will reopen the record on the U.K. cumulation issue. The Court also directed the parties to file a joint scheduling order by May 12, 2010.

On May 12, 2010, the Commission filed the requested status report with the Court, advising the Court that it will not be reopening the record on the issue of the discernible adverse impact of the subject imports from the United Kingdom. On May 12, 2010, the parties also submitted a proposed joint scheduling order. Under the remand schedule ordered by the court, the Commission must file its third remand determination by August 25, 2010. The Court has directed the Plaintiffs, Plaintiff-Intervenors, and Defendant-Intervenors to file their comments on the remand by September 29, 2010.

**Participation in the proceeding.**—Only those persons who were interested parties to the reviews (i.e., persons listed on the Commission Secretary’s service list) and parties to the appeal may participate in the remand proceeding. Such persons need not make any additional filings with the Commission to participate in the remand proceeding, unless they are adding new individuals to the list of persons entitled to receive business proprietary information under administrative protective order.

Business proprietary information (“BPI”) referred to during the remand proceeding will be governed, as appropriate, by the administrative protective order issued in the reviews.

**Written submissions.**—The Commission is not re-opening the record in this remand proceeding. The Commission will permit the parties to file comments pertaining to the specific issues that are the subject of the Court’s remand instructions. Comments should be limited to no more than fifteen (15) double-spaced and single-sided pages of textual material. No appendices or other attachments are allowed. The parties may not themselves submit any new factual information in their comments and may not address any issue other than those that are the subject of the Court’s remand instructions. Any such comments must be filed with the Commission no later than June 15, 2010.

All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules, as amended, 67 FR 88036 (Nov. 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, each document filed by a party to the investigation must be served on all other parties to the investigation (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Parties are also advised to consult with the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subpart A (19 CFR part 207) for provisions of general applicability concerning written submissions to the Commission.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 27, 2010.

William R. Bishop,
Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–13217 Filed 6–1–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

[OMB Number 1105–0086]

**Justice Management Division; Office of Attorney Recruitment and Management; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested**

**ACTION:** 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Applications for the Attorney Student Loan Repayment Program.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Office of Attorney Recruitment and Management (OARM), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until August 2, 2010. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC, 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to 202–395–7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Suite 1600, 601 D Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

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:

1. 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;
2. Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
3. Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
4. Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the