

*Trade Comm'n.*, 690 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

On February 12, 2014, the Commission issued a Notice, Order, and Opinion deciding certain aspects of the investigation and remanding other aspects to the chief administrative law judge (“ALJ”). 79 FR 9277–79 (Feb. 18, 2014); *see also* Comm’n Op. Remanding Investigation (Feb. 12, 2014); Comm’n Order Remanding Investigation (Feb. 12, 2014). On February 24, 2014, Nokia petitioned for reconsideration of the Commission’s remand Order and Opinion. On March 24, 2014, the Commission granted in part the petition for reconsideration and issued a revised remand notice, order, and opinion. 79 FR 17571–73 (Mar. 28, 2014).

On May 21, 2014, respondents Nokia Corp. and Nokia Inc. and non-party MMO filed a motion to substitute MMO for Nokia Corp. as a result of MMO’s recent acquisition of Nokia’s Devices and Services business unit and to amend the Notice of Investigation (“NOI”). MMO also filed a motion to intervene for the limited purpose of filing the motion to substitute parties and amend the NOI. On May 30, 2014, the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) filed a response, supporting the request to amend the NOI and to add MMO as a respondent but opposing the request to terminate Nokia Corp. from the investigation. On June 2, 2014, complainants InterDigital filed a response likewise agreeing that the NOI should be amended to add MMO as a respondent but that Nokia Corp. should not be terminated from the investigation.

On June 18, 2014, the presiding ALJ issued the subject ID, granting MMO’s motion to intervene and granting in part Nokia’s and MMO’s motion to amend the NOI. Specifically, the ALJ granted the motion to add MMO as a respondent but denied the motion with respect to substituting MMO for Nokia Corp. and terminating Nokia Corp. from the investigation.

On June 26, 2014, Nokia and MMO filed a petition for review of the subject ID, arguing that the ALJ erred by granting relief not requested by either moving party and by failing to substitute MMO for Nokia Corp. and terminate Nokia Corp. from the investigation. On July 1, 2014, the IA filed a response to Nokia’s petition. On July 3, 2014, InterDigital filed a response to Nokia’s petition.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The Commission notes that pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(c), 19 CFR 210.21(c), Nokia Corp. may enter into a

consent order to terminate its participation in this investigation.

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).

Issued: July 18, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–17395 Filed 7–23–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993; Global Climate and Energy Project

Notice is hereby given that, on June 10, 2014, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Global Climate and Energy Project (“GCEP”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership, nature and objectives. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Bank of America, N.A., Charlotte, NC, has been added as a party to this venture. The change in its nature and objectives is that the members of GCEP have amended the agreement between them to update the list of project research that has been authorized by the members and to extend the termination of GCEP from August 31, 2015, to August 31, 2016.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and GCEP intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 12, 2003, GCEP filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 4, 2003 (68 FR 16552).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 22, 2013. A notice was published in the **Federal**

**Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 21, 2013 (78 FR 17430).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2014–17357 Filed 7–23–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employee Benefits Security Administration

#### Exemptions From Certain Prohibited Transaction Restrictions

**AGENCY:** Employee Benefits Security Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Grant of Individual Exemptions.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains exemptions issued by the Department of Labor (the Department) from certain of the prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA or the Act) and/or the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the Code). This notice includes the following: 2014–04, Northwestern Mutual Investment Services, Inc., D–11496; 2014–05, Liberty Media 401(k) Savings Plan, D–11756; 2014–06, AT&T Inc., D–11758; 2014–07, The Delaware County Bank and Trust Company Employee 401(k) Retirement Plan, D–11773; and 2014–08, The Home Savings and Loan Company 401(k) Savings Plan, D–11780.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice was published in the **Federal Register** of the pendency before the Department of a proposal to grant such exemption. The notice set forth a summary of facts and representations contained in the application for exemption and referred interested persons to the application for a complete statement of the facts and representations. The application has been available for public inspection at the Department in Washington, DC. The notice also invited interested persons to submit comments on the requested exemption to the Department. In addition the notice stated that any interested person might submit a written request that a public hearing be held (where appropriate). The applicant has represented that it has complied with the requirements of the notification to interested persons. No requests for a hearing were received by the Department. Public comments were received by the Department as described in the granted exemption.

The notice of proposed exemption was issued and the exemption is being granted solely by the Department