

documents must also be filed in paper form, as specified in II(C) of the Commission's Handbook on Electronic Filing Procedures, 67 FR 68168, 68173 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (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.

Determination.—The Commission has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1675(c)(5)(B).

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 9, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-20544 Filed 8-11-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-797]

Certain Portable Electronic Devices and Related Software; Notice of Institution of Investigation; Institution of Investigation Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on July 8, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Apple Inc., f/k/a Apple Computer, Inc. of Cupertino, California. A supplement was filed on August 3, 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 portable electronic devices and related software by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,844,915 (“the ‘915 patent’”); U.S. Patent No. 7,469,381 (“the ‘381 patent’”); U.S. Patent No. 7,084,859 (“the ‘859 patent’”); U.S. Patent No. 7,920,129 (“the ‘129 patent’”); and U.S. Patent No. 6,956,564 (“the ‘564 patent’”). The complaint further alleges that an

industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

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

ADDRESSES: The complaint and supplement, except for any confidential information contained therein, are 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2011).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on August 5, 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 portable electronic devices and related software that infringe one or more of claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21 of the ‘915 patent; claims 1-20 of the ‘381 patent; claims 14-20, 25, and 28 of the ‘859 patent; claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-19, 21, 22, and 24-28 of the ‘129 patent; and claims 28 and 36 of the ‘564 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(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:
Apple Inc., f/k/a Apple Computer, Inc.,
1 Infinite Loop,
Cupertino, CA 95014.

(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:

HTC Corp.,
23 Xinghua Road, Taoyuan 330,
Taiwan.

HTC America, Inc.,
13920 SE. Eastgate Way, Suite 400,
Bellevue, WA 98005.

Exedea, Inc.,
5950 Corporate Drive,
Houston, TX 77036.

(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 Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge Charles E. Bullock, 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: August 8, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-20467 Filed 8-11-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA")

Notice is hereby given that on August 3, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States and Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. BIM Investment Corp. et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:11-cv-11382 was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

The Consent Decree resolves claims brought by the United States, on behalf of the United States Department of the Interior ("DOI"), acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("Commonwealth"), on behalf of the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs ("EEA"), against four parties ("Settling Defendants") under Section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607. In their respective complaints, filed concurrently with the Consent Decree, the United States and the Commonwealth sought damages in order to compensate for and restore natural resources injured by the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at or from the Blackburn and Union Privileges Superfund Site in Walpole, Massachusetts (the "Site"), along with the recovery of costs incurred in assessing such damages.

Under the Consent Decree, Settling Defendants Tyco Healthcare Group LP, W.R. Grace & Co.-Conn., BIM Investment Corporation, and Shaffer Realty Nominee Trust will pay \$1,000,000 for natural resource damages restoration projects to be conducted by DOI and EEA. The Consent Decree also requires the Settling Defendants to reimburse the United States and the Commonwealth for a combined \$94,169.56 in assessment costs.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Consent Decree. 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, DC

20044-7611, and should refer to *United States and Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. BIM Investment Corp. et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-11-3-09667/1.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, 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 \$6.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost), payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Ronald G. Gluck,

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

[FR Doc. 2011-20581 Filed 8-11-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Verifone Systems, Inc. and Hypercom Corporation; 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. Verifone Systems, Inc. and Hypercom Corporation*, Civil Action No. 1:11-cv-00887. On June 27, 2011, the United States filed an Amended Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition by Verifone Systems, Inc. of the business assets of Hypercom Corporation would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed on August 4, 2011, requires the Defendants to divest Hypercom's U.S. business, along with certain tangible and intangible assets.

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 James J. Tierney, Chief, Networks and Technology Enforcement Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (*telephone: 202-307-6200*).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

In the United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 7100, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. Verifone Systems, Inc., 2099 Gateway Place, Suite 600, San Jose, CA 95110, and Hypercom Corporation, 8888 East Raintree Drive, Suite 300, Scottsdale, AZ 85260, Defendants.

Case: 1:11-cv-00887.

Assigned to: Kessler, Gladys.

Assign. Date: 5/12/2011.

Description: Antitrust.

Amended Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil action against VeriFone Systems Inc. ("VeriFone"), and Hypercom Corporation ("Hypercom") pursuant to the antitrust laws of the United States to enjoin VeriFone's proposed acquisition of Hypercom, and to obtain such other equitable relief as the Court deems appropriate. The United States alleges as follows:

I. Nature of Action

1. Point of sale ("POS") terminals enable retailers and other firms to accept a wide range of non-cash payment types, such as credit cards and debit cards, at millions of locations nationwide. Given the increasing popularity of electronic payments, the vast majority of merchants need to accept such cards and use POS terminals to handle billions of dollars of on-site electronic payments daily. This complaint seeks to enjoin Defendants