patent"). The complaint in the underlying investigation named as respondents SiRF Technology, Inc. ("SiRF"), E–TEN Corp. ("E–TEN"), Pharos Science & Applications, Inc. ("Pharos"), MiTAC International Corporation ("MiTAC"), and Mio Technology Limited ("Mio") (collectively, "Respondents").

On January 15, 2009, the Commission found a violation of section 337 by Respondents by reason of infringement of all six asserted patents. The Commission issued a limited exclusion and cease-and-desist orders against SiRF, Pharos, and Mio. The remedial orders are directed to GPS devices and products containing the same that infringe or are covered by certain claims of the '346, '651, '000, '080, '187, and/or '801 patents. Respondents subsequently appealed the Commission's final determination to the United States Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit ("Federal Circuit"). In a precedential opinion issued April 12, 2010, the Federal Circuit affirmed the Commission's Final Determination in all respects.

On August 16, 2010, the Commission instituted modification proceedings under 19 CFR 210.76 based on a petition for modification filed by Respondents. At the same time, the Commission denied a petition for modification filed by Broadcom. The modification proceedings are currently ongoing.

On October 7, 2010, Broadcom filed a complaint seeking institution of a formal enforcement proceeding to enforce the limited exclusion order and cease-and-desist orders against Respondents under Commission rule 210.75(b), 19 CFR 210.75(b). The enforcement complaint named SiRF, MiTAC, Mio, Pharos, E–TEN, MiTAC Digitial Corporation ("MiTAC Digital"), and CSR plc ("CSR") as proposed enforcement respondents. Shortly after the enforcement complaint was filed, Broadcom withdrew its allegations with respect to E–TEN.

On October 22, 2010, the proposed enforcement respondents filed a motion with the Commission requesting sanctions against Broadcom. The motion alleges, among other things, that Broadcom's enforcement complaint does not comply with Commission rule 210.4(c), 19 CFR 210.4(c), regarding representations made to the Commission. On November 3, 2010, Broadcom opposed the motion. On November 9, 2010, the proposed enforcement respondents filed a motion for leave to reply in support of their motion for sanctions. The Commission has denied the motion for sanctions and the motion for leave.

Having examined the complaint seeking a formal enforcement proceeding, and having found that the complaint complies with the requirements for institution of a formal enforcement proceeding contained in Commission rule 210.75, 19 CFR 210.75, the Commission has determined to institute a formal enforcement proceeding to determine whether the respondents are in violation of the Commission's limited exclusion order and cease-and-desist orders issued in the investigation, and what, if any, enforcement measures are appropriate.

The following entities are named as parties to the formal enforcement proceeding: (1) Complainant Broadcom, (2) respondents SiRF, MiTAC, MiTAC Digital, Mio, Pharos, and CSR; and (3) a Commission investigative attorney to be designated by the Director, Office of Unfair Import Investigations.

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 section 210.75 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.75).

By order of the Commission.
Issued: December 1, 2010.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–30617 Filed 12–6–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–376 and 563–564 (Third Review)]

Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Japan, Korea, and Taiwan

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of five-year reviews.

SUMMARY: The subject five-year reviews were initiated in September 2010 to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Japan, Korea, and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. On November 5, 2010, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the orders effective October 20, 2010, "{b}ecause no interested domestic party responded to the sunset review notice of initiation by the applicable deadline * * *" (75 FR 68324). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the subject reviews are terminated.

DATES: *Effective Date:* October 20, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202–205–3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. 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 *http://www.usitc.gov.*

Authority: These reviews are being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.69).

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

Issued: December 1, 2010.

[FR Doc. 2010–30611 Filed 12–6–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Pursuant to Department of Justice policy, notice is hereby given that on December 1, 2010 a proposed Consent Decree with Brown County and the City of Green Bay was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin in a case captioned *United States and the State of Wisconsin* v. *NCR Corp., et al.,* Case No. 10–C–910 (E.D. Wis.). The Complaint in that case alleges claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9601–75, against Brown County, the City of Green Bay, and twelve other defendants concerning polychlorinated biphenyl contamination at the Lower Fox River and Green Bay Superfund Site in northeastern Wisconsin (the "Site").

If approved by the Court after a public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree would resolve Brown County's and the City of Green Bay's potential liability for response costs, response actions, and natural resource damages associated with the Site, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Decree. The proposed Consent Decree also

would resolve the United States Government's potential liability for response costs, response actions, and natural resource damages associated with the Site under CERCLA. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Brown County, Green Bay, and the United States would pay a total of $5.2 million ($350,000 each from Brown County and Green Bay and $4.5 million from the United States). If the Decree is approved, the $5.2 million would be paid into a set of Site-specific special accounts for use in financing future cleanup and natural resource restoration work at the Site.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the Consent Decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and mailed either electronically to *pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov* or in hard copy to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611. Comments should refer to *United States and the State of Wisconsin* v. *NCR Corp., et al.,* Case No. 10–C–910 (E.D. Wis.) and D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–2–1045/3.

The Consent Decree may be examined at: (1) The offices of the United States Attorney, 517 E. Wisconsin Avenue, Room 530, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and (2) the offices of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, 14th Floor, Chicago, Illinois. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.* A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Department of Justice Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, 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 from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of $11.00 (44 pages at 25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Maureen M. Katz,

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

[FR Doc. 2010–30572 Filed 12–6–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Graftech International Ltd., 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, 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. *GrafTech International Ltd., et al.,* Civil Action No. 1:10–cv–02039. On November 29, 2010, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition by GrafTech International Ltd. ("GrafTech") of Seadrift Coke L.P. ("Seadrift") 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 that GrafTech and Seadrift modify an existing supply agreement with one of Seadrift's competitors in the provision of petroleum needle coke, ConocoPhillips Company ("Conoco"), to remove terms that might have facilitated the sharing of pricing and production information. In addition, future supply agreements between GrafTech and Conoco must not provide Seadrift the means with which to verify customer-specific competitor pricing or production. In order to ensure compliance with these provisions, GrafTech must provide to the United States: (1) All future agreements between Conoco and GrafTech for the provision of petroleum needle coke; and (2) Seadrift documents prepared in the ordinary course of business that demonstrate Seadrift's production, capacity and sales. GrafTech must also institute a firewall, which restricts the flow of competitively sensitive information to and from Conoco during GrafTech's supply negotiations with that company, as well as preventing the flow of any competitively sensitive information to GrafTech personnel that may be provided to Seadrift from its customers.

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, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–307–0924).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 5th Street, NW., Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530, *Plaintiff,*

v.

Graftech International Ltd., 2900 Snow Road, Parma, Ohio 44130, and

Seadrift Coke L.P., 8618 Highway 185 North, Port Lavaca, Texas 77979, *Defendants.*

Case No.: 1:10–Cv–02039
Judge: Rosemary M. Collyer
Deck Type: Antitrust
Date Stamp: November 29, 2010

Complaint

Plaintiff, the United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against defendants GrafTech International Ltd. ("GrafTech") and Seadrift Coke L.P. ("Seadrift") to obtain a permanent injunction and other relief to remedy the harm to competition caused by GrafTech's acquisition of Seadrift. Plaintiff alleges as follows:

I. Nature of the Action

1. GrafTech is one of the largest producers of graphite electrodes in the world. On April 1, 2010, GrafTech agreed to acquire the 81.1 percent of Seadrift that it does not already own for approximately $308.1 million. Seadrift produces petroleum needle coke, the primary input in the production of graphite electrodes.

2. Historically, GrafTech has sourced the majority of its petroleum needle coke from Seadrift's competitor, ConocoPhillips Company ("Conoco"). At various times, there have been constraints in the supply of needle coke. Beginning January 1, 2001, GrafTech and Conoco formalized their relationship by negotiating two, nearly-