

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 (<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 May 4, 2011, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Kaneka Corporation of Osaka, Japan ("Kaneka"). 76 FR 25373 (May 4, 2011). The complaint alleges violations of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the sale for importation, importation, or sale after importation of certain polyimide films, products containing same, and related methods by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1-3 and 9-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,264,866 ("the '866 patent"); claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,746,639 ("the '639 patent"); claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,018,704 ("the '704 patent"); and claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,691,961 ("the '961 patent"). The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents SKC Kolon PI, Inc. of Gyeonggi-do, South Korea and SKC Corporation of Covington, Georgia ("collectively, "SKC").

On February 23, 2012, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID (Order No. 26) that Kaneka has satisfied the importation requirement with respect to all versions of the following SKC products: IN30 (75 um), IN70 (19um), IN 70 (25um), IN70 (50um), IF30 (7.5um), IF70 (12.5um), LV100, LV200, and LV300.

On February 27, 2012, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID (Order No. 25) terminating the investigation with respect to claims 4-5 of the '704 patent and claims 4, 11, 16, 17, and 20 of the '961 patent.

An evidentiary hearing was held from March 12, 2012, to March 16, 2012.

On May 10, 2012, the ALJ issued a final ID finding no violation of section 337 in the above-identified investigation. Specifically, the ALJ found that there was no violation with respect to the '866 patent, the '639 patent, the '704 patent, or the '961 patent by SKC. The ALJ also issued a recommended determination on remedy and bonding.

On May 22, 2012, Kaneka filed a petition for review of the final ID and on May 23, 2012, SKC filed a contingent petition for review. On May 30, 2012, SKC filed a response to Kaneka's petition, and on May 31, 2012, Kaneka filed a response to SKC's contingent petition.

Having examined the final ID, the petitions for review, the responses thereto, and the relevant portions of the record in this investigation, the Commission has determined to partially review the final ID as follows. With respect to the '866 patent, the Commission has determined to review the finding that Kaneka does not satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement. With respect to the '704 patent, the Commission has determined to review and vacate as moot the ALJ's alternative findings that the accused products do not infringe, that claim 1 is not invalid for anticipation or obviousness, and that Kaneka does not satisfy the technical prong or the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. The Commission has determined not to review the ALJ's conclusion that the asserted claims of the '704 patent are invalid for indefiniteness. With respect to the '961 patent, the Commission has determined to review the ALJ's finding that certain of the accused products infringe and certain of the accused products do not infringe claim 9. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the ID.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on only the following questions, with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record:

With respect to the '866 patent, would a complainant satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement if the products offered to satisfy the requirement met the elements of the asserted claims only intermittently or occasionally? See ID at 302.

(1) With respect to claim 9 of the '961 patent, would a person of ordinary skill in the art require all replicates to be within the claimed range? Is there any evidence of record to indicate how a person of ordinary skill in the art would use confidence intervals or other statistical methods of working with variance to compare replicates with a claimed range?

The Commission does not request briefing on remedy, the public interest, and bonding at this time.

**Written Submissions:** The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues under review. The submissions should be

concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation, including references to exhibits and testimony. The written submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on August 15, 2012. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on August 22, 2012. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must do so in accordance with Commission rule 210.4(f), 19 CFR 210.4(f), which requires electronic filing. The original document and eight true copies thereof must also be filed on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment is granted by the Commission will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and under Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 2, 2012.

**William R. Bishop,**

*Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.*

[FR Doc. 2012-19218 Filed 8-6-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1105-0085]

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Collection; Comments Requested; Application for Approval as a Provider of a Personal Financial Management Instructional Course

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice of application under review.

---

The Department of Justice, Executive Office for United States Trustees, has submitted the following application to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork

Reduction Act of 1995. The application is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This application was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 77, Number 106, page 32671, on June 1, 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 September 6, 2012. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of

Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to (202) 395-7285.

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

1. Evaluate whether the application is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. 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.

**Overview of the Information**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Type of information collection: .....   | Application form.   |
| The title of the form/collection: .....   | Application for Approval as a Provider of a Personal Financial Management Instructional Course.   |
| The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the department sponsoring the collection:                   | No form number.<br>Executive Office for United States Trustees, Department of Justice.  |
| Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:                                      | Primary: Individuals who wish to offer instructional courses to student debtors concerning personal financial management.<br>Other: None.<br>Congress passed a bankruptcy law that requires individuals who file for bankruptcy to complete an approved personal financial management instructional course as a condition of receiving a discharge. |
| An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply: | It is estimated that 275 respondents will complete the application in approximately five (5) hours.   |
| An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:   | The estimated total annual public burden associated with this application is 1,375 hours.   |

If additional information is required, contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: August 1, 2012.

**Jerri Murray,**

*Department Clearance Officer, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 2012-19227 Filed 8-6-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-40-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Notice of Lodging of First Amendment to Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**

Notice is hereby given that on July 26, 2012, a proposed first amendment to consent decree with Schlumberger Technology Corporation ("Consent Decree Amendment") in *United States vs. Schlumberger Industries, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 91-cv-04222 was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

In this action, the United States sought injunctive relief and cost recovery claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9675, against Schlumberger Industries Inc. Schlumberger Technology Corporation ("STC") was subsequently substituted as Defendant and real party in interest. Under the Consent Decree Amendment, STC will perform the selected remedy under a May 2007 Record of Decision Amendment to address chlorinated volatile organic compound contaminated groundwater for areas known as Plume 1 and Plume 3 at the PCBs Operable Unit of the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Williamson, Jackson, Union, and Johnson Counties, Illinois. This work is valued at \$6,236,400 and is subject to a cost-sharing agreement between STC and the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of 30 days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Consent Decree Amendment. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to [pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov](mailto: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 v. Schlumberger Industries, Inc.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-3-643.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree Amendment may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, [http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html). A copy of the Consent Decree Amendment 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" ([EESDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov](mailto:EESDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-0097. If requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library by mail, please enclose a check in the amount of \$35.00 (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. In requesting a copy exclusive of exhibits and defendants' signatures, please enclose a check in the amount of \$2.00 (25 cents