

concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Summary of Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* List of Responsible Persons.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: None. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households. Other: Business or other for-profit.

Need for Collection

All persons holding ATF explosives licenses or permits must report any change in responsible persons or employees authorized to possess explosive materials to ATF. Such report must be submitted within 30 days of the change and must include appropriate identifying information for each responsible person.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 50,000 respondents will take 1 hour to complete the report.

(6) *An estimate of the total burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 100,000 annual total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department

Clearance Officer, Policy and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Two Constitution Square, Room 2E-508, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: July 24, 2012.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012-18359 Filed 7-26-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140-0080]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: Notification of Change of Mailing or Premise Address

ACTION: 30-Day Notice of information collection under review.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 77, Number 99, page 30325 on May 22, 2012, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until August 27, 2012. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments concerning this information collection should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: DOJ Desk Officer. The best way to ensure your comments are received is to email them to oir_submission@omb.eop.gov or fax them to 202-395-7285. All comments should reference the eight digit OMB number or the title of the collection. If you have questions concerning the collection, contact Christopher.R.Reeves@usdoj.gov.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Summary of Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Notification of Change of Mailing or Premise Address.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: None. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Not-for-profit Institutions. Other: Business or other for-profit.

Need for Collection

Licensees and permittees whose mailing address will change must notify the Chief, Federal Explosives Licensing Center, at least 10 days before the change. The information is used by ATF to identify correct locations of storage of explosives licensees/permittees and location of storage of explosive materials for purposes of inspection, as well as to notify permittee/licensees of any change in regulations or laws that may affect their business activities.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that 1,000 respondents will take 10 minutes to respond via letter to the Federal Explosives Licensing Center.

(6) *An estimate of the total burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 170 annual total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, Policy and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Two Constitution Square, Room 2E-508, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: July 24, 2012.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2012-18360 Filed 7-26-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

Public Comments on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 12-CV-2826 (DLC), which was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on July 23, 2012, together with copies of the 868 comments received by the United States.

Pursuant to the Court's June 11, 2012 order, comments were published electronically and are available to be viewed and downloaded at the Antitrust Division's Web site, at: <http://www.justice.gov/atr/cases/apple/index.html>. A copy of the United States' Response to Comments is also available at the same location.

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), and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan

United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, New York, NY 10007-1312. Copies of any of these materials may also be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

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., Civil Action No. 12-CV-2826 (DLC) 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.

Response of Plaintiff United States to Public Comments on the Proposed Final Judgment*

July 23, 2012.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	
Preliminary Statement	7
I. Introduction	9
II. The Complaint and the E-Book Industry	13
III. Standard of Judicial Review	16
A. The United States Is Entitled to Substantial Deference in Crafting a Settlement	16
B. The Court's "Public Interest" Inquiry Should Focus on the Relationship Between the Harm Alleged and the Remedy Selected	18
IV. The Proposed Final Judgment	20
A. Ending Collusion by Settling Defendants	20
B. Restoring Competition for E-Books With Respect to Settling Defendants	21
C. Compliance and Enforcement	24
V. Summary of Public Comments and the United States' Response	25
A. Prominent Themes in Industry Comments	27
1. A Window for Retail Discounting Eliminates Terms That Facilitated Collusion Without Imposing a Business Model on the Industry	27
2. Consumers, the Victims of the Conspiracy, Will Benefit as Limits on Retail Discounting are Lifted	28
3. Collusion Is Not Acceptable, Even in Response to Perceived Anticompetitive Conduct	31
4. Protection From Aggressive Competition Does Not Justify Keeping Collusive Agreements Intact	36
5. The Proposed Final Judgment Is Neither Too Regulatory Nor Too Ambiguous for Enforcement	37
B. Individual Responses to Detailed Comments	39
1. Barnes & Noble, Inc	40
2. Consumer Federation of America	47
3. Independent Book Publishers	50
4. American Booksellers Association and Members	52
5. Authors Guild and Members	53
C. Additional Responses to Comments With Unique Perspectives	58
1. Brian DeFiore, Literary Agent	58
2. Bob Kohn, CEO of Royalty Share	59
3. Steerads, Inc	61
4. National Association of College Stores	62
5. American Specialty Toy Retailing Association	63
D. Apple, Inc	63
1. The Proposed Final Judgment Reasonably Requires the Termination of the Apple Agency Agreements	64
2. The Proposed Final Judgment Does Not "Impose a Business Model"	66
3. The Proposed Final Judgment Will Help To Restore Competition, Not End It	67
4. Apple Misstates the Standard of Review Under the Tunney Act	69
5. Apple's Suggested Changes to the Proposed Final Judgment Are Self-Serving and Contrary to the Public Interest	70
VI. Conclusion	71

Table of Authorities

Cases:

* Public Comments are available at <http://www.justice.gov/atr/cases/apple/index.html>.