

Statutory Background

For more than two centuries, the Federal Government has recognized Indian tribes as domestic sovereigns that have unique government-to-government relationships with the United States. Congress has broad authority to legislate with respect to Indian tribes, however, and has exercised this authority to establish a complex jurisdictional scheme for the prosecution of crimes committed in Indian country. (The term "Indian country" is defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151.) Criminal jurisdiction in Indian country typically depends on several factors, including the nature of the crime; whether the alleged offender, the victim, or both are Indian; and whether a treaty, Federal statute, executive order, or judicial decision has conferred jurisdiction on a particular government.

The Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA) was enacted on July 29, 2010, as Title II of Public Law 111-211. The purpose of the TLOA is to help the Federal Government and tribal governments better address the unique public-safety challenges that confront tribal communities. Section 221(b) of the new law, now codified at 18 U.S.C. 1162(d), permits an Indian tribe with Indian country subject to State criminal jurisdiction under Public Law 280, P.L. 83-280, 67 Stat. 588 (1953) to request that the United States accept concurrent jurisdiction to prosecute violations of the General Crimes Act and the Major Crimes Act within that tribe's Indian country.

Department of Justice Regulation Implementing 18 U.S.C. 1162(d)

On December 6, 2011, 76 FR 76037 the Department published final regulations that established the framework and procedures for a mandatory Public Law 280 tribe to request the assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction within the Indian country of the tribe that is subject to Public Law 280. 28 CFR 50.25. Among other provisions, the regulations provide that upon receipt of a tribal request the Office of Tribal Justice shall publish a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking comments from the general public.

Request by the Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians

By a request dated January 8, 2012, the Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians located in the State of California requested the United States to assume concurrent Federal jurisdiction to prosecute violations of 18 U.S.C. 1152 (the General Crimes, or Indian Country Crimes, Act) and 18 U.S.C. 1153 (the

Major Crimes Act) within the Indian country of the tribe. This would allow the United States to assume concurrent criminal jurisdiction over offenses within the Indian country of the tribe without eliminating or affecting the State's existing criminal jurisdiction.

Solicitation of Comments

This notice solicits public comments on the above request.

Dated: April 17, 2012.

Tracy Toulou,

Director, Office of Tribal Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012-9730 Filed 4-23-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Docket No. OTJ 100]

Solicitation of Comments on Request for United States Assumption of Concurrent Federal Criminal Jurisdiction; Hoopa Valley Tribe

AGENCY: Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice solicits public comments on the Request for United States Assumption of Concurrent Federal Criminal Jurisdiction recently submitted to the Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice by the Hoopa Valley Tribe pursuant to the provisions of 28 CFR 50.25.

DATES: Written comments must be postmarked and electronic comments must be submitted on or before . Comments received by mail will be considered timely if they are postmarked on or before that date. The electronic Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) will accept comments until Midnight Eastern Time at the end of that day.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail or Hand Delivery/Courier:* submit written comments via regular or express mail to Mr. Tracy Toulou, Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 2310, Washington, DC 20530.

- *Fax:* submit comments to the attention of Mr. Tracy Toulou, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice, (202) 514-9078 (not a toll-free number).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Please contact Mr. Tracy Toulou, Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice, at (202) 514-8812

(not a toll-free number). To ensure proper handling of comments, please reference "Docket No. OTJ 100" on all electronic and written correspondence. The Department encourages all comments be submitted electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> using the electronic comment form provided on that site. An electronic copy of the request for United States assumption of concurrent federal criminal jurisdiction submitted by the Hoopa Valley Tribe is also available at the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site for easy reference. Paper comments that duplicate the electronic submission are not necessary as all comments submitted to <http://www.regulations.gov> will be posted for public review and are part of the official docket record.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Posting of Public Comments. Please note that all comments received are considered part of the public record and made available for public inspection online at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Such information includes personal identifying information (such as your name and address) voluntarily submitted by the commenter.

You are not required to submit personal identifying information in order to comment on this rule. Nevertheless, if you want to submit personal identifying information (such as your name and address) as part of your comment, but do not want it to be posted online, you must include the phrase "PERSONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION" in the first paragraph of your comment. You also must locate all the personal identifying information you do not want posted online in the first paragraph of your comment and identify what information you want redacted.

If you want to submit confidential business information as part of your comment but do not want it to be posted online, you must include the phrase "CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION" in the first paragraph of your comment. You also must prominently identify confidential business information to be redacted within the comment. If a comment has so much confidential business information that it cannot be effectively redacted, all or part of that comment may not be posted on <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Personal identifying information and confidential business information identified and located as set forth above will be placed in the agency's public docket file, but not posted online. If you wish to inspect the agency's public docket file in person by appointment,

please see the paragraph above entitled **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Statutory Background

For more than two centuries, the Federal Government has recognized Indian tribes as domestic sovereigns that have unique government-to-government relationships with the United States. Congress has broad authority to legislate with respect to Indian tribes, however, and has exercised this authority to establish a complex jurisdictional scheme for the prosecution of crimes committed in Indian country. (The term "Indian country" is defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151.) Criminal jurisdiction in Indian country typically depends on several factors, including the nature of the crime; whether the alleged offender, the victim, or both are Indian; and whether a treaty, Federal statute, executive order, or judicial decision has conferred jurisdiction on a particular government.

The Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA) was enacted on July 29, 2010, as Title II of Public Law 111–211. The purpose of the TLOA is to help the Federal Government and tribal governments better address the unique public-safety challenges that confront tribal communities. Section 221(b) of the new law, now codified at 18 U.S.C. 1162(d), permits an Indian tribe with Indian country subject to State criminal jurisdiction under Public Law 280, P.L. 83–280, 67 Stat. 588 (1953) to request that the United States accept concurrent jurisdiction to prosecute violations of the General Crimes Act and the Major Crimes Act within that tribe's Indian country.

Department of Justice Regulation Implementing 18 U.S.C. 1162(d)

On December 6, 2011, 76 FR 76037 the Department published final regulations that established the framework and procedures for a mandatory Public Law 280 tribe to request the assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction within the Indian country of the tribe that is subject to Public Law 280. 28 CFR 50.25. Among other provisions, the regulations provide that upon receipt of a tribal request the Office of Tribal Justice shall publish a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking comments from the general public.

Request by the Hoopa Valley Tribe

By a request dated January 17, 2012, the Hoopa Valley Tribe located in the State of California requested the United States to assume concurrent Federal jurisdiction to prosecute violations of 18 U.S.C. 1152 (the General Crimes, or Indian Country Crimes, Act) and 18

U.S.C. 1153 (the Major Crimes Act) within the Indian country of the tribe. This would allow the United States to assume concurrent criminal jurisdiction over offenses within the Indian country of the tribe without eliminating or affecting the State's existing criminal jurisdiction.

Solicitation of Comments

This notice solicits public comments on the above request.

Dated: April 17, 2012.

Tracy Toulou,

Director, Office of Tribal Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012–9731 Filed 4–23–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Apple, Inc., Hachette Book Group, Inc., HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., Verlagsgruppe Georg Von Holtzbrinck GmbH, Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC D/B/A Macmillan, The Penguin Group, a Division of Pearson PLC, Penguin Group (USA), Inc., and Simon & Schuster, Inc.; 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 Southern District of New York in *United States of America v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, Civil Action No. 12–CIV–2826. On April 11, 2012, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the defendants agreed to raise the retail price of e-books, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The proposed Final Judgment, submitted at the same time as the Complaint, requires the settling defendants—Hachette Book Group, Inc., HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., and Simon & Schuster, Inc.—to return pricing discretion to e-book retailers and comply with other obligations designed to end the anticompetitive effects of the conspiracy.

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., DC 20530, Suite 1010 (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. 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 John R. Read, Chief, Litigation III Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–307–0468).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Apple, Inc., Hachette Book Group, Inc., HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., Verlagsgruppe Georg Von Holtzbrinck GMBH, Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC D/B/A Macmillan, The Penguin Group, A Division of Pearson PLC, Penguin Group (USA), Inc., and Simon & Schuster, Inc., Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:12–cv–02826

Judge: Cote, Denise

Date Filed: 04/11/2012

Description: Antitrust

Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against Defendants Apple, Inc. ("Apple"); Hachette Book Group, Inc. ("Hachette"); HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C. ("HarperCollins"); Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH and Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan (collectively, "Macmillan"); The Penguin Group, a division of Pearson plc and Penguin Group (USA), Inc. (collectively, "Penguin"); and Simon & Schuster, Inc. ("Simon & Schuster"; collectively with Hachette, HarperCollins, Macmillan, and Penguin, "Publisher Defendants") to obtain equitable relief to prevent and remedy violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

Plaintiff alleges:

I. Introduction

1. Technology has brought revolutionary change to the business of publishing and selling books, including the dramatic explosion in sales of "e-books"—that is, books sold to consumers in electronic form and read on a variety of electronic devices, including dedicated e-readers (such as the Kindle or the Nook), multipurpose tablets, smartphones and personal