The Sterno Group Companies, LLC, 1880 Compton Avenue, Suite 101, Corona, California 92881

Sterno Home Inc., 1 Burbidge Street, Suite 101, Coquitlam, BC V3K 7B2, Canada

(4) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

Shenzhen Liown Electronics Co. Ltd., No. 7, Gongye 3rd Road, Shekou, Nanshan District, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518067, China

Luminara Worldwide, LLC, 10911 Valley View Road, Eden Prairie, MN 55344

L & L Candle Company, LLC, 621 Lunar Avenue, Brea, California 92821

€ The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainant of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 12, 2020.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020–17933 Filed 8–14–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950

AGENCY: Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice of review of voluntary agreement.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (''DPA''), that the Attorney General finds, with respect to the Voluntary Agreement for the Manufacture and Distribution of Critical Healthcare Resources Necessary to Respond to a Pandemic (''Voluntary Agreement'') proposed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (''FEMA''), that the purposes of section 708(c)(1) of the DPA may not reasonably be achieved through a voluntary agreement having less anticompetitive effects or without any voluntary agreement. Given this finding, the proposed Voluntary Agreement may become effective following the publication of this notice. FEMA is publishing the text of the proposed Voluntary Agreement elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the DPA, FEMA may enter into agreements with representatives of private industry for the purpose of improving the efficiency with which private firms contribute to the national defense when conditions exist that may pose a direct threat to the national defense or its preparedness. Such arrangements are generally known as ''voluntary agreements.'' A defense to actions brought under the antitrust laws is available to each participant acting within the scope of a voluntary agreement that has come into force under the DPA.

The DPA requires that each proposed voluntary agreement be reviewed by the Attorney General prior to becoming effective. If, after consulting with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General finds that the purposes of the DPA's voluntary-agreements provision ''may not reasonably be achieved through a voluntary agreement . . . having less anticompetitive effects or without any voluntary agreement,'' the agreement may become effective. 50 U.S.C. 4558(f)(1)(B).

The purpose of the proposed Voluntary Agreement is to support Department of Homeland Security, Department of Health and Human Services (''HHS''), and FEMA contingency requirements to provide medical resources during times of pandemic through procedures agreed upon in advance. The proposed Voluntary Agreement establishes the terms, conditions and procedures under which participants agree voluntarily to contribute and facilitate medical resources production and distribution capacity as requested by FEMA, HHS, and other Federal Government entities. FEMA has certified that the proposed Voluntary Agreement is necessary to provide for the national defense in the event of a pandemic.

FEMA requested that the Attorney General issue a finding that the proposed Voluntary Agreement satisfies the statutory criteria set forth in 50 U.S.C. 4558(f)(1)(B). The Antitrust Division reviewed the proposed agreement, attended an open meeting of interested persons pursuant to the requirements of 44 CFR 332.2, and consulted with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission as to the competitive effect of the proposed agreement. On July 31, 2020, by letter to Peter Gaynor, FEMA Administrator, William P. Barr, Attorney General, issued a finding, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4558(f)(1)(B), that the purposes of the DPA's voluntary-agreements provision ''may not reasonably be achieved through a voluntary agreement . . . having less anticompetitive effects or without any voluntary agreement.''

David G.B. Lawrence,

Chief, Competition Policy & Advocacy Section.

[FR Doc. 2020–18006 Filed 8–14–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

On August 5, 2020, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado in the lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *Groendyke Transport Inc.,* Civil Action No. 1:20–cv–02311.

This civil action asserts claims for penalties against Groendyke Transport Inc. Groendyke, as the legal successor to Manweiler Transport Company (Transport), for violations of Section