accessing its Internet server *(http://www.usitc.gov)*. The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On March 5, 2012, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (76 FR 74810, December 1, 2011) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.[1] Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act.

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on April 2, 2012, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,[2] and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before April 5, 2012 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by April 5, 2012. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. Please be aware that the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing have been amended. The amendments took effect on November 7, 2011. See 76 Fed. Reg. 61937 (Oct. 6, 2011) and the newly revised Commission's Handbook on E–Filing, available on the Commission's Web site at *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

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: March 8, 2012.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

WORK SCHEDULE

Investigation No. 731–TA–891 (Second Review)

FOUNDRY COKE FROM CHINA

Staff Assigned

Investigator	Angela Newell (708–5409).
Commodity-Industry Analyst	Cynthia Foreso (205–3348).
Attorney	Charles St. Charles (205–2782).
Supervisory Investigator	Elizabeth Haines (205–3200).

	DATE
Institution	December 1, 2011.
Report to the Commission:	
Draft to Supervisory Investigator	March 16, 2012.
Draft to Senior Review	March 26.
To the Commission	April 2.
Comments of Parties due[1]:	April 5.
Legal issues memorandum to the Commission	May 10.
Briefing and vote (suggested date)	May 16.
Determination and views to Commerce	May 29, 2012.

[1] If comments contain business proprietary information, a nonbusiness proprietary version is due the following business day.

[FR Doc. 2012–6065 Filed 3–13–12; 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

Notice is hereby given that on February 21, 2012, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *FMC Corporation,* Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-00699 (''*FMC*'') was lodged with the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama.

In *FMC,* the United States of America (''United States''), on behalf of the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA''), filed a complaint pursuant to Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9607, seeking reimbursement of response costs incurred between 2005 and 2007 stemming from an EPA emergency removal action cleaning up hazardous substances at the Performance Advantage Superfund Site in Coosa County, Alabama. In response, FMC filed a counterclaim against the United States.

The proposed Consent Decree resolves all claims and counterclaims in this action. Under the Consent Decree, Defendant FMC will pay a total of $300,000, plus interest, to the EPA's Hazardous Substance Superfund, and

[1] A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

[2] The Commission has found the responses submitted by ABC Coke, Erie Coke, Tonawanda Coke Corporation, and Walter Coke Co. to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (see 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

the United States will cause to be transferred a total of $71,000 from the Judgment Fund at the United States Treasury to the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed 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 this case: *United States* v. *FMC Corporation,* Civil Action No. 2:11–cv–00699, D.J. Ref. 90–11–2–09066/1.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.* A copy of the proposed 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 emailing a request to ''Consent Decree Copy'' (*EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov*), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation no. (202) 514–5271. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check payable to the ''U.S. Treasury'' or, if by email or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address, in the following amount (25 cents per page reproduction cost): $6.50 for the Consent Decree (with Exhibit A—Site Map).

Henry S. Friedman,

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

[FR Doc. 2012–6066 Filed 3–13–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Second Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Notice is hereby given that on March 6, 2012, a proposed Second Consent Decree in *United States and the State of Kansas* v. *Coffeyville Resources Refining & Marketing, LLC et. al.,* 04-cv-01064 (D. Kan. 2004), was lodged with the United States Court for the District of Kansas.

On June 13, 2004, the Court entered a Consent Decree in this action (Docket No. 8) that required Defendant Coffeyville Resources Refining & Marketing, L.L.C. (''CRRM'') to install certain air pollution controls to reduce emissions of oxides, sulfur dioxide and particulate matter at its oil refinery located in Coffeyville, Kansas. Under the proposed Second Consent Decree the United States and State grant CRRM an extension on installation of some of these controls. And CRRM has agreed to implement new and upgraded pollution controls; to comply with more stringent emission limits, and to follow more aggressive leak-detection and repair practices. These measures will reduce CRRM's emission of various nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), volatile organic compounds, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and other pollutants that affect air quality. CRRM will also pay approximately $970,000 in civil penalties under the Clean Air Act, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Second Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed 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 State of Kansas* v. *Coffeyville Resources Refining & Marketing, LLC et. al.,* 04-cv-01064 (D. Kan. 2004), D.J. Ref. 90–5–1–2–07459/1.

During the public comment period, the Second 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 Second 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 emailing a request to ''Consent Decree Copy'' (*EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov*), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–5271. If requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library by mail, please enclose a check in the amount of $52.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if requesting by email or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the address given above.

Robert E. Maher, Jr.,

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

[FR Doc. 2012–6044 Filed 3–13–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Morgan Stanley; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States* v. *Morgan Stanley,* Civil Action No. 1:11–CV–06875–WHP, which were filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on March 6, 2012, together with the response of the United States to the comments.

Copies of the comments and the response are available for inspection at the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at *http://www.justice.gov/atr,* and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, 500 Pearl Street, New York, New York 10007. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Plaintiff,* v. MORGAN STANLEY, *Defendant.*

Civil Action No.: 11–civ–6875 WHP

Hon. William Pauley III

RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)–(h) (''Tunney Act''), the United States files the public comments concerning the proposed Final Judgment in this case and the United States' response to those comments. After careful consideration, the United States continues to believe that the relief sought in the proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violation alleged in the Complaint. The United States will move the Court for entry of the proposed Final Judgment after the public comments and this Response have been published in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 16(d).