years depending on financial terms. Afterwards, electronic records are purged or deleted from the system when eligible to be destroyed using one of the methods described by the NIST SP 800–88 ''Guideline for media Sanitization'' (September 2006). Paper based records when eligible to be destroyed will be destroyed by shredding or burn. **Note:** Upon full implementation of new MFH ASAP system, paper copy records will no longer be produced. The paper copies that existed under the prior manual system process will have be uploaded into the new system format, and official documentation will have been archived to the designated facility and destroyed when eligible to be destroyed.

SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:

Daniel Sullivan, Deputy Director, Multifamily Housing Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 6148, Washington, DC 20410.

NOTIFICATION AND RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

For Information, assistance, or inquiries about the existence of records contact the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 4156, Washington, DC 20410. Verification of your identity must include original signature and be notarized. Written request must include the full name, Social Security Number, date of birth, current address, and telephone number of the individual making the request. The Department's rules for providing access to records to the individual concerned appear in 24 CFR Part 16.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

The Department's rules for contesting contents of records and appealing initial denials appear in 24 CFR Part 16. Procedures for the amendment or correction of records, and for applicants want to appeal initial agency determination appear in 24 CFR Part 16. If additional information is needed, contact:

(i) In relation to contesting contents of records, the Privacy Act Officer at HUD, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 4178 (Attention: Capitol View Building, 4th Floor), DC 20410;

(ii) In relation to appeals of initial denials, HUD, Departmental Privacy Appeals Officer, Office of General Counsel, 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

HUD Employees and contractors who gather and process HUD information related to Multifamily Housing or Healthcare projects; Mortgagees (HUD approved Multifamily MAP or Healthcare Lenders) who submit application package for these projects. Data will also be derived from various HUD required forms. Other data is electronically submitted by HUD sources systems: Integrated Real Estate Management System (iREMS), the Online Property Integrated Information Suite (OPIIS), and Subsidiary Ledger.

SYSTEMS EXEMPTED FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT:

For the Privacy Act, records are disclosed pursuant to routine use statements supplied under notice. For the Freedom of Information Act, records submitted to HUD by multifamily and healthcare mortgagors and mortgagee (lender), as well as information gathered by agency employees as part of this process are subject to FOIA and is presumptively releasable unless it is clearly exempt and withheld under FOIA Exemption, which protects (1) commercial or financial information (2) obtained from a person that is (3) confidential.

[FR Doc. 2014–22183 Filed 9–16–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–914]

Certain Sulfentrazone, Sulfentrazone Compositions, and Processes for Making Sulfentrazone; Notice of the Commission's Determination Denying Complainant's Motion for Temporary Relief

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to affirm with modifications the initial determination (''ID'') of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') denying the complainant's motion for temporary relief.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. 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 (*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 April 14, 2014, based on a complaint filed by FMC Corporation (''FMC'') on March 5, 2014. 79 *FR* 20907–08. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''section 337''), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain sulfentrazone active ingredient and formulated sulfentrazone compositions made by a process that infringes certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,169,952 (''the '952 patent''). The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents Beijing Nutrichem Science and Technology Stock Co., Ltd., of Beijing, China (''Beijing Nutrichem''); Summit Agro USA, LLC, of Cary, North Carolina; Summit Agro North America, Holding Corporation of New York, New York (together, ''Summit''); and Jiangxi Heyi Chemicals Co. Ltd. of Jiujiang City, China (''Heyi''). *Id.* at 20908. The ALJ later granted FMC's motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to replace Beijing Nutrichem with Nutrichem Co., Ltd. (''Nutrichem''). Order No. 9 (May 29, 2014), *not reviewed* June 23, 2014. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is also a party to the investigation.

FMC filed a motion for a temporary exclusion order and a temporary cease and desist order against Summit, Heyi, and Nutrichem (''Respondents'') along with its Complaint. On August 12, 2014, the ALJ issued an ID denying FMC's motion. The ALJ found that FMC had not shown that any of the temporary relief factors weighed in favor of granting temporary relief. The ALJ found that FMC had not shown that it was likely to succeed on the merits because FMC had not shown that it would likely succeed on the issues of invalidity, infringement, the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement, or the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. The ALJ also found that FMC had not shown

irreparable harm if temporary relief is not granted, that the balance of hardships favor granting temporary relief, or that the public interest favors granting temporary relief.

On August 22, 2014, FMC filed comments contending that the ALJ made numerous errors of law and fact in the ID. On August 26, 2014, Respondents and the Commission investigative attorney filed responses contending that the ALJ did not err.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's ID and the submissions from the parties, the Commission has determined that FMC has not proven that it is entitled to temporary relief. The Commission affirms the ALJ's findings with certain modified reasoning. A Commission Opinion will issue shortly.

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: September 11, 2014.

Jennifer D. Rohrbach,

Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2014–22137 Filed 9–16–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–882]

Certain Digital Media Devices, Including Televisions, Blu-Ray Disc Players, Home Theater Systems, Tablets and Mobile Phones, Components Thereof and Associated Software; Notice of a Commission Determination to Review in Part A Final Initial Determination Finding no Violation of Section 337, on Review to Modify-In-Part and Vacate-In-Part the Determination; Grant of Consent Motion To Terminate the Investigation as to Certain Respondents; 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 to review in part the final initial determination (''ID'') of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') finding no violation of section 337 by the following remaining respondents in the above-captioned investigation: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC of Richardson, Texas (collectively, ''Samsung''); LG Electronics, Inc. of Seoul, Republic of Korea; LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc. of San Diego, California (collectively, ''LG''); Toshiba Corporation of Tokyo, Japan; and Toshiba American Information Systems, Inc. of Irvine, California (collectively, ''Toshiba''). On review, the Commission has determined to modify-in-part and vacate-in-part the final ID. The Commission has also determined to grant the joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation as to respondents Panasonic Corporation of Osaka, Japan; Panasonic Corporation of North America of Secaucus, New Jersey (collectively, ''Panasonic'') based upon a settlement agreement. The Commission has terminated the investigation with a finding of no violation of section 337.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clint Gerdine, *Esq.,* Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2310. 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 June 18, 2013 based on a complaint filed on May 13, 2013, by Black Hills Media, LLC (''BHM'') of Wilmington, Delaware. 78 *FR* 36573–74. The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 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 digital media devices, including televisions, blu-ray disc players, home theater systems, tablets and mobile phones, components thereof and associated software by reason of infringement of certain claims of the following U.S. Patent Nos.: 8,028,323 (''the '323 patent''); 8,214,873 (''the '873 patent''); 8,230,099 (''the '099 patent''); 8,045,952 (''the '952 patent''); 8,050,652 (''the '652 patent''); and 6,618,593 (''the '593 patent''). The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. The complaint named the following respondents: Samsung; LG; Toshiba; Panasonic; Sharp Corporation of Osaka, Japan; and Sharp Electronics Corporation of Mahwah, New Jersey (collectively, ''Sharp'').

On September 10, 2013, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ's ID (Order No. 17) granting Google Inc.'s motion to intervene as a party to the investigation. On November 20, 2013, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ's ID (Order No. 23) terminating the investigation as to Sharp based on a settlement agreement. On January 7, February 11, and April 10, 2014, the Commission issued notice of its determinations not to review the ALJ's IDs (Order Nos. 32, 35, and 49–50) terminating the investigation as to the following: The '323 and '099 patents; claims 2, 6–8, 15–19, 22, 25–27, 31, 35–36, and 44 of the '873 patent; claims 3–4, 6–7, 10, 42–45, 47–50, 52, and 55 of the '652 patent; claims 1, 4, 10, 13–17, 19, and 20–21 of the '593 patent; and claims 1–4 and 10–12 of the '952 patent. On March 14, 2014, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ's ID (Order No. 47) terminating the investigation as to claims 1, 11, and 13 of the '652 patent and claim 27 of the '873 patent with respect to Panasonic. On July 3, 2014, BHM and Panasonic filed an unopposed joint motion to terminate the investigation as to Panasonic based on a settlement agreement. Therefore, the remaining respondents are LG, Samsung, and Toshiba.

On July 7, 2014, the ALJ issued the final ID finding no violation of section 337 by the remaining respondents. The ALJ found that: (1) There was no importation of ''articles that infringe'' under section 337(a)(1)(B)(i) as to any of respondents' accused products with respect to any asserted claim of the patents at issue; (2) none of the accused products of the remaining respondents infringe any asserted claim of the patents at issue; (3) the domestic industry requirement (both economic and technical prongs) had not been satisfied with respect to any asserted