infringement of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,691, claims 1 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,935,337, claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,159,587, claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 18–20, 35, and 36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,487,772, claims 1–7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,614,398, claims 59, 60, 63, and 72–75 of U.S. Patent No. 7,743,767, and claims 17, 21–24, 29, and 32–37 of U.S. Patent No. 7,997,267. The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents Apex Medical Corp. of New Taipei City, Taiwan and Apex Medical USA Corp. of Brea, California (collectively, ''Apex'') and Medical Depot Inc., d/b/a Drive Medical Design & Manufacturing of Port Washington, New York. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations participated in the investigation.

Medical Depot Inc. and Apex were previously terminated from the investigation on the basis of consent orders. Order Nos. 8 (unreviewed by the Commission, July 18, 2013) and 11 (unreviewed by the Commission, Aug. 8, 2013).

On September 23, 2013, Apex filed a request with the Commission asking for institution of an advisory opinion proceeding to declare that their redesigned sleep-disordered breathing treatment systems are not covered by the consent order. Apex also requests that the proceeding be conducted expeditiously. ResMed filed a response on October 18, 2013 opposing Apex's request.

The Commission has determined that Apex's request complies with the requirements for institution of an advisory opinion proceeding under Commission rule 210.79. Accordingly, the Commission has determined to institute an advisory opinion proceeding and referred Apex's request to the Chief Administrative Law Judge to designate a presiding administrative law judge. The following entities are named as parties to the proceeding: (1) Complainant ResMed; (2) respondent Apex; (3) the Office of Unfair Import Investigations.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 11, 2013.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013–29887 Filed 12–16–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–503–504 and 731–TA–1229–1230 (Preliminary)]

Monosodium Glutamate From China and Indonesia

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)) (the Act), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from China and Indonesia of monosodium glutamate, provided for in subheading 2922.42.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV) and subsidized by the Governments of China and Indonesia.

Commencement of Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the Department of Commerce (Commerce) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 703(b) or 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in those investigations under sections 705(a) or 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

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

Background

On September 16, 2013, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by Ajinomoto North America Inc. (''AJINA''), Itasca, Illinois, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of LTFV imports of monosodium glutamate from China and Indonesia that are subsidized by the Governments of China and Indonesia. Accordingly, effective September 16, 2013, the Commission instituted countervailing duty investigation Nos. 701–TA–503–504 and antidumping duty investigation Nos. 731–TA–1229–1230 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference 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** of September 20, 2013 (78 FR 57881). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on October 23, 2013, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on November 18, 2013. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4437 (November 2013), entitled *Monosodium Glutamate from China and Indonesia: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–503–504 and 731–TA–1229–1230 (Preliminary).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 19, 2013.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013–29882 Filed 12–16–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–13–038]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: December 17, 2013 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: None
2. Minutes

3. Ratification List
4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–405, 406, and 408 and 731–TA–899–901 and 906–908 (Third Review) (Hot-Rolled Steel Products from China, India, Indonesia, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views on or before January 14, 2014.
5. Outstanding action jackets: None

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting. Earlier notification of this meeting was not possible.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 13, 2013.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–30058 Filed 12–13–13; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–0036]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: FFL Out-of-Business Records Request

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will submit 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. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for ''sixty days'' until February 18, 2014 This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Tracey Robertson, *Tracey.Robertson@atf.gov* or (304) 616–4647, Chief, Federal Firearms Licensing Center, 244 Needy Road, Martinsburg, WV 25405. 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 Information Collection

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

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* FFL Out-of-Business Records Request.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: ATF F 5300.3A. 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: Business or other for-profit. Other: None.

Need for Collection: Firearms licensees are required to keep records of acquisition and disposition. These records remain with the licensee as long as they are in business. The ATF F 5300.3A, FFL Out-of-Business Records Request is used by ATF to notify licensees who go out of business. When discontinuance of the business is absolute, such records shall be delivered within thirty days following the business discontinuance to the ATF Out-of-Business Records Center.

(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 1,924 respondents will take approximately 5 minutes to complete the form.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 160.3 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, Department of Justice, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Room 3W–1407B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 11, 2013.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2013–29885 Filed 12–16–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Thomas Neuschatz, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 2, 2013, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, issued an Order to Show Cause to Thomas Neuschatz, M.D. (hereinafter, Applicant), of Marysville, California. GX 9. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Applicant's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, on the ground that his ''registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.'' *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)).

The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that on April 29, 2011, Applicant had surrendered his DEA registration, and that on May 30, 2011, Applicant applied for a new registration as a practitioner. *Id.* Next, the Order alleged that a DEA investigation had found that Applicant ''prescribed and dispensed inordinate amounts of controlled substances . . . under circumstances where [he] knew or should have known the prescriptions were not for legitimate medical purposes.'' *Id.*

Next, the Show Cause Order alleged that a medical Expert had reviewed the medical records of three of Applicant's patients (E.G., R.E., and J.G.) and concluded that he ''prescribed controlled substances to those patients without a legitimate medical purpose and/or outside the usual course of professional practice.'' *Id.* at 1–2. More specifically, with respect to E.G., the Order alleged that over the course of E.G's first five visits, Applicant escalated the daily dose of medication from 22.5 mg of hydrocodone to 80 mg of hydrocodone and 320 mg of oxycodone. *Id.* at 2. The Order further alleged that ''[f]rom approximately January 4, 2011 through April 16, 2011, [Applicant] prescribed Dilaudid to E.G. without conducting an in-person physical examination'' and during this period, E.G. made a single office visit. *Id.* The Order then alleged that based on