

Commission has determined not to review the ID. Accordingly, this investigation is terminated.

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 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

Issued: September 19, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

**James R. Holbein,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2011-24382 Filed 9-21-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-779]

### In the Matter of Certain Flip-Top Vials and Products Using the Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 9) granting a joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 708-2532. 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, D.C. 20436, telephone (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>. 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 June 22, 2011, based on a complaint

filed by CSP Technologies, Inc. of Auburn, Alabama that named as respondents Süd-Chemie AG of Germany; Süd-Chemie, Inc. of Louisville, Kentucky; and Airsec S.A.S. of France. 76 FR 36576 (June 22, 2011). The complaint alleged a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain flip-top vials and products using the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,537,137.

On August 16, 2011, the private parties filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of withdrawal of the complaint. *See* 19 CFR 210.21(a)(1). The Commission investigative attorney did not oppose the motion, and on August 29, 2011, the ALJ granted the motion as an ID (Order No. 9).

No petitions for review of the ID were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

Issued: September 19, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

**James R. Holbein,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2011-24337 Filed 9-21-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-764]

### Certain Digital Televisions and Components Thereof, and Certain Electronic Devices Having a Blu-Ray Disc Player and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation Based on a Settlement Agreement; Termination of Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 13) granting a joint motion to terminate the investigation

based on a settlement agreement. The investigation is terminated.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Megan M. Valentine, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2301. 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 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>. 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 9, 2011, based on complaints filed by LG Electronics, Inc. of Seoul, Korea ("LGE"). 76 FR 12994-5 (Mar. 9, 2011). The complaints allege 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 digital televisions and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,785,906; RE 37,326; 5,533,071; and 5,923,711, and of certain electronic devices having a Blu-Ray disc player and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,701,835; 7,577,080; 7,619,961; and 7,756,398. The complaints further allege the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents Sony Corporation of Tokyo, Japan; Sony Corporation of America of New York, New York; Sony Electronics, Inc. of San Diego, California; Sony Computer Entertainment, Inc. of Tokyo, Japan; and Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC of Foster City, California (collectively "Sony").

On August 10, 2011, LGE and Sony filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on their having entered into a binding memorandum of understanding, which resolves all of LGE's claims against Sony. On August 22, 2011, the Commission investigative

attorney filed a response in support of the joint motion.

On August 23, 2011, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting the joint motion to terminate the investigation pursuant to Commission rules 210.21(a)(2) and (b)(1) (19 CFR 210.21(a)(2) and (b)(1)). No petitions for review of this ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

Issued: September 16, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

**James R. Holbein,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2011-24336 Filed 9-21-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-73,857]

#### **The Marlin Firearms Company, Inc., a Subsidiary of Remington Arms Company Including On-Site Leased Workers From Randstat, Reitman, and Hamilton Connections, North Haven, Connecticut; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand**

On June 8, 2011, the U.S. Court of International Trade (USCIT) granted the U.S. Department of Labor's (Department's) motion for voluntary remand for further investigation in *Former Employees of Marlin Firearms Company, Inc., a subsidiary of Remington Arms Company, North Haven, Connecticut v. United States*, Case No. 11-00060.

On April 6, 2010, a state workforce official filed a petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) on behalf of workers of Marlin Firearms Company, Inc. ("Marlin"), a subsidiary of Remington Arms Company, North Haven, Connecticut (hereafter referred to as the subject firm). The subject worker group includes on-site leased workers from Randstat, Reitman, and Hamilton Connections. (AR 394)

The subject worker group was engaged in activities related to the production of lever-action and bolt-action sporting rifles. (AR 376) The Department considered the following articles to be like or directly competitive with lever-action and bolt-action

sporting rifles: "over and under", "semi-auto", "over and under shotgun/rifle combo", "side by side", "semi-auto". (AR 805)

During the initial investigation, it was revealed that a significant number or proportion of workers at the subject firm were totally or partially separated from employment or were threatened to become totally or partially separated during the relevant period. (AR 14-15)

However, during the initial investigation, it was determined that imports of articles like or directly competitive with the articles produced by the subject firm have not increased and that there has not been a shift in production to a foreign country by the workers' firm, of like or directly competitive articles. (AR 10-84, 1322-1348)

During the initial investigation, the Department also conducted a customer survey; however, the survey revealed that during the relevant period, customers did not increase reliance on imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject worker group. (AR 270-283, 1322-1348)

The initial investigation also revealed that the subject worker group did not produce component parts or supply a service directly to a firm with a TAA-certified worker group. Further, the initial investigation revealed that the subject firm has not been identified in an affirmative finding of injury by the International Trade Commission. (AR 14-15)

A negative determination regarding the subject worker group's eligibility to apply for TAA was issued on December 17, 2010. The Department's Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on January 14, 2011 (76 FR 2716). (AR 293-306, 312)

Administrative reconsideration of the Departments' negative determination was not requested.

In the Complaint to the USCIT, dated March 15, 2011, the Plaintiff's Counsel claimed that the Plaintiff's separation occurred because Marlin experienced import competition due to increasing importation of sporting rifles. The Plaintiff's Counsel also claimed that the Department should take into account information related to the application of Marlin for the TAA for Firms program. The Plaintiff's Counsel also claimed that the Department should take into consideration information related to the certification of Marlin's subsidiary, Harrington & Richardson 1871 (TA-W-63,361).

The USCIT'S order granting voluntary remand, dated June 8, 2011, directed the Department to (1) Conduct additional

surveys of the subject firm's customers; (2) contact Plaintiff to solicit information relevant to his petition and review any submitted material; (3) request from the subject firm names and contact information for other separated workers and solicit from those workers information relevant to Plaintiff's complaint; (4) request from the subject firm any submissions to the U.S. Department of Commerce in connection with Marlin's certification under the TAA for Firms program and consider the contents of those submissions; (5) request from the U.S. Department of Commerce any documents related to Marlin's certification under the TAA for Firms program and consider the contents of those documents; and (6) consider the facts related to the certification of Harrington & Richardson 1871 (TA-W-63,361).

During the remand investigation, the Department: (1) Conducted an expanded customer survey; (2) contacted the Plaintiff to solicit information relevant to his petition and reviewed the submitted materials; (3) requested and received from the subject firm names and contact information for other separated workers and solicited from those workers information relevant to the Plaintiff's complaint; (4) requested and received from Marlin any submissions to the U.S. Department of Commerce in connection to Marlin's TAA for Firms petition and considered the contents of those documents; (5) requested from the U.S. Department of Commerce any documents related to Marlin's TAA for Firms petition and considered the contents of those documents; and (6) considered the facts related to the certification of TA-W-63,361. The Department also conducted industry analysis related to the articles produced by the subject firm, lever-action and bolt-action sporting rifles. (AR 1322-1348)

The Department fully reviewed all material received during the remand investigation, and considered the contents of each document and statement as they apply to the TAA for workers program in accordance with the statute, regulations, and other authority. (AR 1322-1348)

The group eligibility requirements for workers of a Firm under Section 222(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2272(a), are satisfied if the following criteria are met:

- (1) A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated; and
- (2)(A)(i) The sales or production, or both, of such firm have decreased absolutely; and