

section X of Respondents' Petition for Review).

(5) The issue of whether Comcast's two alternative designs infringe the '263 and '413 patents (Issue 4 in Respondents' Petition for Review).

(6) The Final ID's claim construction of "cancel a function of the second tuner to permit the second tuner to perform the requested tuning operation" in the '512 patent, and the Final ID's infringement determinations as to that patent (Issue 26 in Respondents' Petition for Review).

(7) The Final ID's conclusion that the asserted claims of the '512 patent are invalid as obvious (the issue discussed in section VI.B.4 of Rovi's Petition for Review).

(8) The issue of whether the ARRIS-Rovi Agreement provides a defense to the allegations against the ARRIS respondents (the issue discussed in section XI of Respondents' Petition for Review).

(9) The Final ID's conclusion that Rovi did not establish the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement based on patent licensing (the issue discussed in section IV of Rovi's Petition for Review).

Id. at 38935. The Commission determined to not review the remainder of the Final ID. *Id.* The Commission additionally concluded that Respondents' petition of certain issues decided in the Final ID was improper, and therefore, those assignments of error were waived. *Id.* In the Notice of Review, the Commission also granted the motion to correct the corporate names of two of the respondents and determined to reopen the evidentiary record and accept the supplemental disclosure, response thereto, and reply to the response. *Id.* at 38934–35. The Commission requested briefing on some of the issues under review and also on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. *Id.* at 38935–36.

On August 23, 2017, Respondents filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the Commission's Determination of Waiver as to Certain Issues Specified in Respondents' Petition for Review or, Alternatively, Application of Waiver to Issues Raised in Rovi's Petition for Review. On August 30, 2017, Rovi filed a response thereto. The Commission has determined to deny that petition.

On August 24, 2017, Rovi and Respondents filed their written submissions on the issues under review and on remedy, public interest, and bonding, and on August 31, 2017, the parties filed their reply submissions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, the Commission has determined to affirm the Final ID's conclusion that Comcast has violated section 337 in connection with the asserted claims of the '263 and '413 patents.

The Commission has determined to affirm the Final ID in part, affirm the

Final ID with modifications in part, reverse the Final ID in part, vacate the Final ID in part, and take no position as to certain issues under review. More particularly, the Commission affirms the Final ID's determination that Comcast imports the accused X1 set-top boxes ("STBs"), and takes no position as to whether Comcast is an importer of the Legacy STBs. The Commission also takes no position on as to whether Comcast sells the accused products after importation.

The Commission concludes that there is no section 337 violation as to the Legacy STBs. Regarding the X1 STBs, the Commission affirms the Final ID's conclusion that Comcast's customers directly infringe the '263 and '413 patents. Thus, the Commission affirms the Final ID's conclusion that complainant Rovi has established a violation by Comcast as to those patents and the X1 STBs.

The Commission also takes the following actions. The Commission vacates the Final ID's conclusion that Comcast's two alternative designs infringe the '263 and '413 patents and instead concludes that those designs are too hypothetical to adjudicate at this time. The Commission modifies and affirms the Final ID's claim construction of the claim term "cancel a function of the second tuner to permit the second tuner to perform the requested tuning operation" in the '512 patent and affirms the Final ID's infringement determinations as to that patent. The Commission modifies and affirms the Final ID's conclusion that the asserted claims of the '512 patent are invalid as obvious. The Commission takes no position as to whether the ARRIS-Rovi Agreement provides a defense to the allegations against ARRIS, and as to whether Rovi established the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement based on patent licensing. The Commission adopts the remainder of the Final ID to the extent that it does not conflict with the Commission's opinion or to the extent it is not expressly addressed in the Commission's opinion.

Having found a violation of section 337 in this investigation by Comcast with respect to the '263 and '413 patents, the Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief is (1) a LEO, that subject to certain exceptions provided therein, prohibits the unlicensed entry of certain digital video receivers and hardware and software components thereof that infringe one or more of claims 1, 2, 14, and 17 of the '263 patent and claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, and 18 of the '413 patent that are manufactured by, or on behalf

of, or are imported by or on behalf of Comcast or any of its affiliated companies, parents, subsidiaries, agents, or other related business entities, or their successors or assigns; and (2) CDOs that, subject to certain exceptions provided therein, prohibit Comcast from conducting any of the following activities in the United States: importing, selling, offering for sale, leasing, offering for lease, renting, offering for rent, marketing, advertising, distributing, transferring (except for exportation), and soliciting U.S. agents or distributors for imported covered products; and aiding or abetting other entities in the importation, sale for importation, sale after importation, lease after importation, rent after importation, transfer, or distribution of covered products.

The Commission has also determined that the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(d) and (f) (19 U.S.C. 1337(d) and (f)) do not preclude issuance of the LEO or CDOs. Finally, the Commission has determined that the excluded digital video receivers and hardware and software components thereof may be imported and sold in the United States during the period of Presidential review with the posting of a bond in the amount of zero percent of the entered value of the infringing goods (*i.e.*, no bond). The Commission's orders and opinion were delivered to the President and to the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

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: November 21, 2017.

Katherine M. Hiner,
Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2017–25625 Filed 11–27–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Stipulation and Order Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On November 20, 2017, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Stipulation and Order with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York in the bankruptcy proceedings entitled *In re*

Hawker Beechcraft, Inc., et al., No. 12–11873 (SMB) (lead case).

The United States filed a proof of claim in the Chapter 11 bankruptcy case of Hawker Beechcraft Corporation, seeking, *inter alia*, the recovery of past costs under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601–9675 (“CERCLA”), incurred by the United States responding to contamination at the Tri-County Public Airport site (“TCPA Site”) in Morris County, Kansas. Under the proposed Stipulation and Order, Hawker Beechcraft Corporation and related and successor entities (the “Hawker Parties”) agree that the United States will have an allowed general unsecured claim of \$738,336.62 for response costs incurred prior to the petition date, to be paid at the rate provided in the confirmed Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, and further agree that any claim for costs incurred on or after the petition date at the TCPA Site and three other Kansas sites (the Raytheon Aircraft Company Main Facility in Wichita, Kansas; Hangar 1 at Newton City-County Municipal Airport near Newton, Kansas; and Liberal Mid-America Regional Airport in Liberal, Kansas) is not discharged or impaired. Additionally, the Hawker Parties agree that they will comply with CERCLA administrative orders relating to the TCPA Site. In return, the United States covenants not to sue the Hawker Parties under CERCLA for any pre-petition response costs at the four sites.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Stipulation and Order. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *In re Hawker Beechcraft, Inc.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–10751. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email	pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov .
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the Stipulation and Order may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. We will provide a paper copy of the

Stipulation and Order upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$6.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Susan M. Akers,

Assistant Section Chief, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2017–25636 Filed 11–27–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2007–0039]

Intertek Testing Services NA, Inc.: Grant of Expansion of Recognition

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this notice, OSHA announces its final decision to expand the scope of recognition for Intertek Testing Services NA, Inc., as a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL).

DATES: The expansion of the scope of recognition becomes effective on November 28, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Information regarding this notice is available from the following sources:

Press inquiries: Contact Mr. Frank Meilinger, Director, OSHA Office of Communications, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N–3647, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–1999; email: meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.

General and technical information: Contact Mr. Kevin Robinson, Director, Office of Technical Programs and Coordination Activities, Directorate of Technical Support and Emergency Management, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N–3655, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2110; email: robinson.kevin@dol.gov. OSHA’s Web page includes information about the NRTL Program (see <http://www.osha.gov/dts/otpca/nrtl/index.html>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Notice of Final Decision

OSHA hereby gives notice of the expansion of the scope of recognition of Intertek Testing Services NA, Inc. (ITSNA), as a NRTL. ITSNA’s expansion covers the addition of seven test standards to its scope of recognition.

OSHA recognition of a NRTL signifies that the organization meets the requirements specified by 29 CFR 1910.7. Recognition is an acknowledgment that the organization can perform independent safety testing and certification of the specific products covered within its scope of recognition and is not a delegation or grant of government authority. As a result of recognition, employers may use products properly approved by the NRTL to meet OSHA standards that require testing and certification of the products.

The Agency processes applications by a NRTL for initial recognition, or for expansion or renewal of this recognition, following requirements in Appendix A to 29 CFR 1910.7. This appendix requires that the Agency publish two notices in the **Federal Register** in processing an application. In the first notice, OSHA announces the application and provides its preliminary finding and, in the second notice, the Agency provides its final decision on the application. These notices set forth the NRTL’s scope of recognition or modifications of that scope. OSHA maintains an informational Web page for each NRTL that details its scope of recognition. These pages are available from the Agency’s Web site at <http://www.osha.gov/dts/otpca/nrtl/index.html>.

ITSNA submitted an application, dated April 21, 2015, (OSHA–2007–0039–0026) to expand its recognition to include seven additional test standards. OSHA staff conducted a detailed analysis of the application packet and reviewed other pertinent information. OSHA did not perform any on-site reviews in relation to this application.

OSHA published the preliminary notice announcing ITSNA’s expansion application in the **Federal Register** on August 30, 2017 (82 FR 41292). The Agency requested comments by September 15, 2017, but it received no comments in response to this notice. OSHA now is proceeding with this final notice to grant expansion of ITSNA’s scope of recognition.

To obtain or review copies of all public documents pertaining to ITSNA’s application, go to www.regulations.gov or contact the Docket Office, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of