would be likely to lead to continuation
of antidumping duty order on
tetrahydrofurfuryl alcohol from China
in USITC Publication 5129 (October
2018), entitled Tetrahydrofurfuryl
Alcohol from China: Investigation No.

By order of the Commission.
Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 2020–24161 Filed 10–30–20; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to issue a corrected general exclusion order ("GEO") in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Houda Morad, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–4716. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at https://edis.usitc.gov. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at https://www.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 October 16, 2017, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 ("section 337"), based on a complaint filed by Rockwell Automation, Inc. ("Complainant") of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. See 82 FR 48113–15 (Oct. 16, 2017). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 based on the infringement of certain registered trademarks and copyrights and on unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation or sale of certain industrial automation systems and components thereof including control systems, controllers, visualization hardware, motion and motor control systems, networking equipment, safety devices, and power supplies, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States. See id. The notice of investigation identified the following respondents: Can Electric Limited of Guangzhou, China ("Can Electric"); Capnii (HK) Company Limited of Hong Kong ("Capnii"); Fractioni (Hongkong) Ltd. of Shanghai, China ("Fractioni"); Fujian Dahong Trade Co. of Fujian, China ("Dahong"); GreySolution Limited d/b/a Fibica of Hong Kong ("GreySolution"); Huang Wei Feng d/b/a A–O–M Industry of Shenzhen, China ("Huang"); KBS Electronics Suzhou Co, Ltd. of Shanghai, China ("KBS"); PLC–VIP Shop d/b/a VIP Tech Limited of Hong Kong ("PLC–VIP"); Radwell International, Inc. d/b/a PLC Center of Willingboro, New Jersey ("Radwell"); Shanghai EuroSource Electronic Co., Ltd. of Shanghai, China ("EuroSource"); Shenzhen T-Tide Trading Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen, China ("T-Tide"); SoBuy Commercial (HK) Co. Limited of Hong Kong ("SoBuy"); Suzhou Yi Micro Optical Co., Ltd., d/b/a Suzhou Yiwei Guanxue Youxiangongsi, d/b/a Easy Microoptics Co. LTD. of Jiangsu, China ("Suzhou"); Wenzhou Sparker Group Co., Ltd., d/b/a Sparker Instruments of Wenzhou, China ("Sparker"); and Yastro Electronics (Shanghai) Co., Ltd. of Shanghai, China ("Yastro"). See id. In addition, the Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also a party in this investigation. See id.

Nine respondents were found in default, namely, Fractioni, GreySolution, KBS, EuroSource, T-Tide, SoBuy, Suzhou, Yastro, and Can Electric (collectively, “the Defaulted Respondents”). Furthermore, five
unserved respondents (Capnil, Dahong, Huang, PLC–VIP, and Sparker) were terminated from the investigation, and one respondent (Radwell) was terminated based on the entry of a consent order.

On October 23, 2018, the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued a final initial determination (“FID”) finding a violation of section 337 by the Defaulted Respondents and recommending that the Commission: (1) Issue a general exclusion order (“GEO”); and (2) issue a cease and desist order (“CDO”) against Defaulted Respondent Fractioni. The ALJ determined that the Defaulted Respondents infringed Complainant’s asserted trademarks, but that Complainant failed to establish its two other claims, namely, the infringement of Complainant’s asserted copyrights and tortious interference with Complainant’s contracts.

On December 20, 2018, the Commission issued a notice determining not to review the FID. See 83 FR 67334–48 (Dec. 28, 2018). On April 8, 2019, the Commission issued a notice determining that the appropriate remedy is a CDO prohibiting the unlicensed entry of certain industrial automation systems and components thereof including control systems, controllers, visualization hardware, motion and motor control systems, networking equipment, safety devices, and power supplies that infringe Complainant’s asserted trademarks, and a CDO directed to default respondent Fractioni. See 84 FR 14971–72 (Apr. 12, 2019). The CDO, however, inadvertently omits a provision requiring Complainant to file a yearly written statement with the Commission attesting that Complainant continues to use the asserted trademarks in commerce in the United States, that the asserted trademarks have not been abandoned, cancelled, or rendered invalid or unenforceable, and that Complainant continues to satisfy the domestic industry requirement.

The Commission has determined to issue a corrected CDO including the reporting requirement. The Commission’s vote on this determination took place on October 27, 2020.

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).

While temporary remote operating procedures are in place in response to COVID–19, the Office of the Secretary is not able to serve parties that have not retained counsel or otherwise provided a point of contact for electronic service. Accordingly, pursuant to Commission Rules 201.16[a] and 210.7[a](1) (19 CFR 201.16[a], 210.7[a](1)), the Commission orders that the Complainant(s) complete service for any party/parties without a method of electronic service noted on the attached Certificate of Service and shall file proof of service on the Electronic Document Information System (EDIS).


Lisa Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–526 and 731–TA–1262 (Review)]

Melamine From China; Institution of Five-Year Reviews


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), as amended, to determine whether revocation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on melamine from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission.

DATES: Instituted November 2, 2020. To be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is December 2, 2020. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by January 14, 2021.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background.—On December 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) issued antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of melamine from China (80 FR 80751). The Commission is conducting reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), to determine whether revocation of the orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Provisions concerning the conduct of this proceeding may be found in the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure at 19 CFR part 201, subparts A and B, and 19 CFR part 207, subparts A and F. The Commission will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct full or expedited reviews. The Commission’s determinations in any expedited reviews will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to these reviews:

(1) Subject Merchandise is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year reviews, as defined by Commerce.

(2) The Subject Country in these reviews is China.

(3) The Domestic Like Product is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the Subject Merchandise. In its original determinations, the Commission found a single Domestic Like Product consisting of melamine, coextensive with Commerce’s scope definition.

(4) The Domestic Industry is the U.S. producers as a whole of the Domestic Like Product, or those producers whose collective output of the Domestic Like Product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determinations, the Commission defined the Domestic Industry as all U.S. producers of the melamine products described by Commerce’s scope.

(5) The Order Date is the date that the antidumping and countervailing duty orders under review became effective. In these reviews, the Order Date is December 28, 2015.

(6) An Importer is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a...