of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 24, 2013.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–12892 Filed 5–30–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–894 (Review)]

Certain Ammonium Nitrate From Ukraine

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain ammonium nitrate from Ukraine would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on June 1, 2012 (77 FR 32669) and determined on October 17, 2012 that it would conduct a full review (77 FR 65015, October 24, 2012). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's review and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on October 24, 2012 (77 FR 65015).[2] The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on April 4, 2013, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on May 24, 2013. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4396 (May 2013), entitled *Certain Ammonium Nitrate from Ukraine: Investigation No. 731–TA–894 (Second Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 24, 2013.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–12894 Filed 5–30–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] The Commission published a revised schedule on December 11, 2012 (77 FR 73674).

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–752]

Certain Gaming and Entertainment Consoles, Related Software, and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review a Final Initial Remand Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Affirmance of Original Initial Determination as to Remaining Patent as Modified by the Remand Initial Determination; Termination of the 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 final initial remand determination (''RID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on March 22, 2013. The Commission affirms the ALJ's final initial determination (''ID'') issued on April 23, 2012, as to the remaining patent as modified by the RID.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3042. 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 December 23, 2010, based on a complaint filed by Motorola Mobility, Inc. of Libertyville, Illinois and General Instrument Corporation of Horsham, Pennsylvania (collectively ''Motorola''). 75 FR 80843 (Dec. 23, 2010). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 gaming and entertainment consoles, related software, and components thereof by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,069,896 (''the '896 patent''); 7,162,094 (''the '094 patent''); 6,980,596 (''the '596 patent''); 5,357,571 (''the '571 patent''); and 5,319,712 (''the '712 patent''). The notice of investigation named Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington (''Microsoft'') as the sole respondent. The notice of investigation also named the Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') as a party in the investigation. *See* 75 FR 80843 (Dec. 23, 2010). OUII, however, withdrew from participation in accordance with the Commission's Strategic Human Capital Plan. *See* 75 FR 80843 (2010); Letter from OUII to the Administrative Law Judge (Mar. 3, 2011).

On April 23, 2012, the ALJ issued his final ID, finding a violation of section 337 by Microsoft. Specifically, the ALJ found that the Commission has subject matter jurisdiction, *in rem jurisdiction* over the accused products and *in personam* jurisdiction over the respondent. The ALJ also found that the importation requirement of section 337 (19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)(B)) has been satisfied. Regarding infringement, the ALJ found that Microsoft's accused products directly infringe claims 1 and 12 of the '896 patent; claims 7, 8, and 10 of the '094 patent; claim 2 of the '596 patent; and claims 12 and 13 of the '571 patent. *Id.* at 330. The ALJ, however, found that the accused products do not infringe asserted claims 6, 8, and 17, of the '712 patent. With respect to invalidity, the ALJ found that the asserted claims of the '896, '094, '571, '712 patents and claim 2 of the '596 patent were not invalid. However, he found asserted claim 1 of the '596 patent invalid for anticipation. He also found that Microsoft failed to prevail on any of its equitable defenses and that Microsoft failed to establish that Motorola's alleged obligation to provide a license on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms (''RAND'') precluded a finding of violation of