

factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.” *SBC Commc’ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17.

Moreover, the court’s role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its complaint, and does not authorize the court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75 (noting that the court must simply determine whether there is a factual foundation for the government’s decisions such that its conclusions regarding the proposed settlements are reasonable); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at \*20 (“the ‘public interest’ is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged”). Because the “court’s authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government’s exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60.

In its 2004 amendments,<sup>2</sup> Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction that “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(2); *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (indicating that a court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing or to permit intervenors as part of its review under the Tunney Act). This language explicitly wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it first enacted the Tunney Act in 1974. As Senator Tunney explained: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973)

<sup>2</sup> The 2004 amendments substituted “shall” for “may” in directing relevant factors for a court to consider and amended the list of factors to focus on competitive considerations and to address potentially ambiguous judgment terms. *Compare* 15 U.S.C. § 16(e) (2004), with 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1) (2006); *see also SBC Commc’ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11 (concluding that the 2004 amendments “effected minimal changes” to Tunney Act review).

(statement of Sen. Tunney). Rather, the procedure for the public interest determination is left to the discretion of the court, with the recognition that the court’s “scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of Tunney Act proceedings.” *SBC Commc’ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11. A court can make its public interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone. *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76. *See also United States v. Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 17 (D.D.C. 2000) (noting that the “Tunney Act expressly allows the court to make its public interest determination on the basis of the competitive impact statement and response to comments alone”); S. Rep. No. 93–298 93d Cong., 1st Sess., at 6 (1973) (“Where the public interest can be meaningfully evaluated simply on the basis of briefs and oral arguments, that is the approach that should be utilized.”).

#### VIII. DETERMINATIVE DOCUMENTS

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: February 28, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly M. Schoolmeester  
(D.C. Bar # 1008354)

United States Department of Justice,  
Antitrust Division, Technology and Financial  
Services Section, 450 Fifth Street, N.W.,  
Washington, DC 20530, Phone: (202) 598–  
2693, Facsimile: (202) 616–8544, Email:  
[kelly.schoolmeester@usdoj.gov](mailto:kelly.schoolmeester@usdoj.gov).

[FR Doc. 2019–04293 Filed 3–8–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0335]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension, Without Change, of a Currently Approved Collection

**AGENCY:** National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS), Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, has submitted the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** The Department of Justice encourages public comment and will accept input until April 10, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Todd Brighton at 1–202–532–5105, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street NW, Washington, DC 20531 or by email at [Todd.Brighton@usdoj.gov](mailto:Todd.Brighton@usdoj.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** 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 National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS), 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;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; 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.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

1. Type of Information Collection: Extension of currently approved collection.
2. The Title of the Form/Collection: National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS).
3. The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection: None. Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.
4. Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:

*Primary:* Auto recyclers, junk yards and salvage yards are required to report information into NMVTIS. The Anti-Car

Theft Act, defines junk and salvage yards “as individuals or entities engaged in the business of acquiring or owning junk or salvage automobiles for resale in their entirety or as spare parts or for rebuilding, restoration, or crushing.” Included in this definition are scrap-vehicle shredders and scrap-metal processors, as well as “pull- or pick-apart yards,” salvage pools, salvage auctions, and other types of auctions, businesses, and individuals that handle salvage vehicles (including vehicles declared a “total loss”).

**Abstract:** Reporting information on junk and salvage vehicles to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS)—supported by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)—is required by federal law. Under federal law, junk and salvage yards must report certain information to NMVTIS on a monthly basis. This legal requirement has been in place since March 2009, following the promulgation of regulations (28 CFR part 25) to implement the junk- and salvage-yard reporting provisions of the Anti-Car Theft Act (codified at 49 U.S.C. 30501–30505). Accordingly, a junk or salvage yard within the United States must, on a monthly basis, provide an inventory to NMVTIS of the junk or salvage automobiles that it obtained (in whole or in part) in the prior month. 28 CFR 25.56(a).

An NMVTIS Reporting Entity includes any individual or entity that meets the federal definition, found in the NMVTIS regulations at 28 CFR 25.52, for a “junk yard” or “salvage yard.” According to those regulations, a junk yard is defined as “an individual or entity engaged in the business of acquiring or owning junk automobiles for—(1) Resale in their entirety or as spare parts; or (2) Rebuilding, restoration, or crushing.” The regulations define a salvage yard as “an individual or entity engaged in the business of acquiring or owning salvage automobiles for—(1) Resale in their entirety or as spare parts; or (2) Rebuilding, restoration, or crushing.” These definitions include vehicle remarketers and vehicle recyclers, including scrap vehicle shredders and scrap metal processors as well as “pull- or pick-apart yards,” salvage pools, salvage auctions, used automobile dealers, and other types of auctions handling salvage or junk vehicles (including vehicles declared by any insurance company to be a “total loss” regardless of any damage assessment). Businesses that operate on behalf of these entities or individual domestic or international salvage vehicle buyers, sometimes known as “brokers” may also

meet these regulatory definitions of salvage and junk yards. It is important to note that industries not specifically listed in the junk yard or salvage yard definition may still meet one of the definitions and, therefore, be subject to the NMVTIS reporting requirements.

An individual or entity meeting the junk yard or salvage yard definition is subject to the NMVTIS reporting requirements if that individual or entity handles 5 or more junk or salvage motor vehicles per year and is engaged in the business of acquiring or owning a junk automobile or a salvage automobile for—“(1) Resale in their entirety or as spare parts; or (2) Rebuilding, restoration, or crushing.” Reporting entities can determine whether a vehicle is junk or salvage by referring to the definitions provided in the NMVTIS regulations at 28 CFR 25.52. An NMVTIS Reporting Entity is required to report specific information to NMVTIS within one month of receiving such a vehicle, and failure to report may result in assessment of a civil penalty of \$1,000 per violation.

5. An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: There are currently approximately 8,000 businesses that report on a regular basis into NMVTIS. The estimate for the average amount of time for each business to report varies: 30–60 minutes (estimated). The states and insurance companies already are capturing most of the data needed to be reported, and the reporting consists of electronic, batch uploaded information. So, for those automated companies the reporting time is negligible. For smaller junk and salvage yard operators who would enter the data manually, it is estimated that it will take respondents an average of 30–60 minutes per month to respond.

6. An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection is 48,000 to 96,000 hours

*Total Annual Reporting Burden:*

8,000 × 30 minutes per month (12 times per year) = 48,000  
8,000 × 60 minutes per month (12 times per year) = 96,000

*If additional information is required contact:* Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: March 5, 2019.

**Melody Braswell,**

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

[FR Doc. 2019-04275 Filed 3-8-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-18-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

[OMB Number 1121-0259]

**Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension Without Change, of a Previously Approved Collection Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Justice Assistance, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, will be submitting 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.

**DATES:** Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 30 days until April 10, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments on the estimated burden to facilities covered by the standards to comply with the regulation’s reporting requirements, suggestions, or need additional information, please contact Gregory Joy, Program Analyst, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 810 Seventh Street NW, Washington, DC 20531.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** 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 Bureau of Justice Assistance, 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;
- Evaluate whether, and if so how, the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and/or
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of