either Koko or Cyclone to the show cause order.

The ALJ issued Order No. 6 on May 16, 2011, finding both Koko and Cyclone in default, pursuant to §210.13, 210.16, because neither respondent responded to the complaint and notice of investigation, or to Order No. 5 to show cause. On May 17, 2011, the ALJ issued Order No. 7 terminating the investigation because Koko and Cyclone are the only respondents in the investigation. No party petitioned for review of the IDs pursuant to 19 CFR 210.43(a), and the Commission found no basis for ordering a review on its own initiative pursuant to 19 CFR 210.44. The Commission has determined not to review the IDs.

Section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) and Commission Rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)) authorize the Commission to order limited relief against a respondent found in default, unless after consideration of the public interest factors in Section 337(g)(1)(B), it finds that relief should not issue. 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 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 are either adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines, Inv. No. 337–TA–360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist order would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission’s action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles may be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. The Commission requests submitters to file a response to the following question:

Does section 337(j)(3) (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)(3)) or any other statutory authority authorize the Commission to permit default respondents subject to an exclusion order under section 337(g)(1) to import infringing products under bond during the sixty (60) day Presidential period of review? Please cite any relevant statutory language and legislative history.

Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission’s consideration. Complainant is requested to state the date that the patent at issue expires and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on June 24, 2011. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on July 1, 2011. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission. Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless otherwise ordered by the Commission. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary. 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 210.16, 210.42(h), and 210.50 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.16, 210.42(h), and 210.50).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 3, 2011.

James R. Holbein,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–14077 Filed 6–7–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–775]

In the Matter of Certain Wireless Communication Devices and Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Institution of Investigation; Institution of Investigation Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on May 6, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Linex Technologies, Inc. of Palm Beach Gardens, Florida. A letter supplementing the complaint was filed on May 25, 2011. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain wireless communication devices and systems, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,322 (“the ’322 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. RE42,219 (“the ’219 patent”). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complaint requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 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 June 1, 2011, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine 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 wireless communication devices and systems, components thereof, and products containing same that infringe one or more of claims 9 and 10 of the ‘322 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by paragraph (2) of section 337;

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

(a) The complainant is: Linex Technologies, Inc., 13046 Redon Drive, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Hewlett-Packard Company, 3000 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304–1185.

Apple Inc., 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, CA 95014.

Aruba Networks, Inc., 1344 Grossman Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94089–1113.

Meru Networks, 894 Ross Drive, Sunnyvale, CA 94089.

Ruckus Wireless, 880 West Maude Avenue, Suite 101, Sunnyvale, CA 94085.

(c) The 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 respondents 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 a 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: June 2, 2011.

James R. Holbein,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 2011–14040 Filed 6–7–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Notice of Lodging of Two Consent Decrees Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on June 1, 2011, two proposed consent decrees in United States and State of Nebraska v. Union Pacific Corp., Union Pacific Railway Co., and Gould Electronics Inc., Civil Action No. 8:11–cv–00195, were lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.

In that lawsuit, the United States and State of Nebraska seek to recover response costs pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”) in connection with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s continuing cleanup of the Omaha Lead Superfund Site.

One of the proposed consent decrees will require Union Pacific Corp. and Union Pacific Railway Co. to expend $3.15 million performing community health education in Omaha about the health risks of lead exposure; pay $21,350,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund in partial reimbursement of the United States’ response costs; pay $100,000 to the United States Department of the Interior; and pay $400,000 to the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality.

The other proposed consent decree will require Gould Electronics Inc. to pay $1,104,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund in partial reimbursement of the United States’ response costs and pay $46,000 to the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality.

For 30 days after the date of this publication, the Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the two proposed consent decrees. 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, D.C. 20044–7611. Comments should refer to United States and State of Nebraska v. Union Pacific Corp., Union Pacific Railway Co., and Gould Electronics Inc., D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–07834/4.

The proposed consent decrees may be examined at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Region 7 office at 901 N. Fifth St., Kansas City, KS 66101 (contact Associate Regional Counsel Steven Sanders (913) 551–7578). During the public comment period, the proposed consent decrees may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A paper copy of the proposed consent decrees may be obtained by mailing a request to the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611. When requesting a paper copy by mail, please enclose a