1004–0185 is currently scheduled to expire on December 31, 2021. This request is for OMB to renew this OMB control number for an additional three years.

There are no program or policy changes proposed with this renewal request. However, the BLM is projecting that the estimated burden for this OMB control number will be adjusted downward. The BLM plans to request a reduction of approximately 5,241 annual burden hours (from 42,936 to 37,695) and $2,526,933 annual non-hour burden cost (from $3,278,348 to $751,415). These adjustments are a result of a projected reduction in the number of respondents to the collections of information under OMB control number 1004–0185 (from 19,711 to 9,131).

Title of Collection: Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing, and Drainage Protection (43 CFR parts 3100, 3120, and 3150, and et seq.).

OMB Control Number: 1004–0185.

Form Numbers: None.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents/Affected Public: Holders of onshore oil and gas lease and public lands and Indian lands (except on the Osage Reservation), operators of such leases, and holders of operating rights on such leases.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 9,131.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 9,132.

Estimated Completion Time per Response: Varies from 1 hour to 24 hours per response, depending on activity.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 37,695.

Respondent’s Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit. Frequency of Collection: ‘On occasion,’ except for the activity titled “Option statement,” which is required twice a year.

Total Estimated Annual Non-hour Burden Cost: $751,415.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The authority for this action is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

Darrin A. King.
Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2021–16875 Filed 8–6–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1194]

Certain High-Density Fiber Optic Equipment and Components Thereof; Commission’s Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a General Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of the Investigation


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has found a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in this investigation and has issued a general exclusion order prohibiting the importation of infringing high-density fiber optic equipment and components thereof and cease and desist orders directed against Respondents Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc. (“Leviton”), Panduit Corporation (“Panduit”), and FS.com Inc. (“FS”).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Cathy Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2392. 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 March 24, 2020, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Corning Optical Communications LLC (“Corning”) of Charlotte, North Carolina; Shenzhen Telecommunications Holdings LLC (“AFL Holdings”) of Duncan, South Carolina; Huber+Suhner AG of Herisau, Switzerland; Huber + Suhner, Inc. of Charlotte, North Carolina; Shenzhen Anfkom Telecom Co., Ltd. d/b/a Anfkon Telecom (“Anfkon”) of Shenzhen, China; Shanghai TARLUZ Telecom Tech. Co., Ltd. d/b/a TARLUZ (“TARLUZ”) of Shanghai, China; Wulei Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a Bonelinks (“Wulei Bonelinks”) of Shenzhen, China; FS of New Castle, Delaware; Leviton of Melville, New York; Panduit of Tinley, Illinois; The LAN Wirewerks Research Laboratories Inc. d/b/a Wirewerks (“Wirewerks”) of Quebec, Canada; and The Siemon Company (“Siemon”) of Watertown, Connecticut.

The complaint, as supplemented, 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 of certain high-density fiber optic equipment and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,020,320 (“the ’320 patent”); 10,120,153 (“the ’153 patent”); 8,712,206 (“the ’206 patent”); 10,094,996 (“the ’996 patent”); and 10,444,456 (“the ’456 patent”). Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The Commission’s notice of investigation named the following as respondents: Total Cable Solutions, Inc. (“TCS”) of Springboro, Ohio; Legrand North America, LLC (“Legrand”) of West Hartford, Connecticut; AFL Telecommunications Holdings LLC (“AFL Holdings”) of Duncan, South Carolina; Huber+Suhner AG of Herisau, Switzerland; Huber + Suhner, Inc. of Charlotte, North Carolina; Shenzhen Anfkom Telecom Co., Ltd. d/b/a Anfkon Telecom (“Anfkon”) of Shenzhen, China; Shanghai TARLUZ Telecom Tech. Co., Ltd. d/b/a TARLUZ (“TARLUZ”) of Shanghai, China; Wulei Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a Bonelinks (“Wulei Bonelinks”) of Shenzhen, China; FS of New Castle, Delaware; Leviton of Melville, New York; Panduit of Tinley, Illinois; The LAN Wirewerks Research Laboratories Inc. d/b/a Wirewerks (“Wirewerks”) of Quebec, Canada; and The Siemon Company (“Siemon”) of Watertown, Connecticut.

The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id. The complaint further alleged that a domestic industry exists. Id.

Accordingly, Respondents Panduit, Leviton, Siemon, FS, and Wirewerks (collectively, “Active
As a result of termination of all asserted claims of the ’906 patent and certain other asserted claims, see Order No. 11 (July 29, 2020), unreviewed by Comm’n Notice (Aug. 13, 2020); Order No. 18 (Sept. 14, 2020), unreviewed by Comm’n Notice (Oct. 14, 2020); and Order No. 19 (Oct. 2, 2020), unreviewed by Comm’n Notice (Oct. 27, 2020), claims 1 and 3 of the ’320 patent; claims 11, 12, 14–16, 19, 21, 27, and 28 of the ’456 patent; claims 9, 16, 23, and 26 of the ’153 patent; and claims 22 and 23 of the ’206 patent remain asserted in the investigation.

A prehearing conference and evidentiary hearing were held in this investigation from October 21–26, 2020.

On March 23, 2021, the administrative law judge (‘‘ALJ’’) issued a final initial determination (‘‘ID’’), finding a violation of section 337 with respect to claims 1 and 3 of the ’320 patent, claims 12, 14–16, 19, 21, 27, and 28 of the ’456 patent; claims 9, 16, 23, and 26 of the ’153 patent; and claims 22 and 23 of the ’206 patent. The ALJ also issued a Recommended Determination on Remedy and Bonding (‘‘RD’’). The RD recommends that should the Commission find a violation of section 337, that the Commission issue a general exclusion order, cease and desist orders, and impose a bond during the period of Presidential review.

On April 5, 2021, OUII and Respondent Leviton each filed a petition for review of the ID. That same day, Respondents FS, Panduit, Wirewerks, and Siemon (collectively, ‘‘Joint Respondents’’) also filed a joint petition for review. On April 13, 2021, OUII, Leviton, and Corning each filed a response to the petitions.

On May 24, 2021, the Commission determined to review the ID in part. Notice at 3–6 (May 24, 2021) (‘‘Notice of Review’’), published at 86 FR 28890–893 (May 28, 2021). Specifically, the Commission determined to review: (1) The ID’s finding that the importation requirement of section 337 is met with respect to the accused products of Respondents Leviton, Panduit, and Siemon; (2) the ID’s interpretation of the ‘‘width of the front side of [the] fiber optic module’’ limitation in the asserted claims of the ’456 patent, and the associated infringement findings; (3) the ID’s construction of ‘‘a front opening’’ in the asserted claims of the ’206 patent, and the associated infringement findings; (4) the ID’s finding that Leviton directly infringes the asserted claims of the ’320 and ’456 patents; (5) the ID’s findings on indirect infringement of the asserted claims of the ’320, ’456, and/or ’153 patents by Respondents Leviton, Panduit, FS, and Siemon; and (6) the ID’s finding that Corning has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(B) and (C). The Commission solicited briefing on remedy, the public interest, and bonding, as well as on specific issues concerning importation, infringement, and the domestic industry requirement.

On June 7, 2021, the parties filed initial submissions in response to the Commission’s Notice of Review. On June 14, 2021, the parties filed replies to each other’s submissions. In addition, the Commission received comments from the parties on the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4), 19 CFR 210.50(a)(4). The Commission also received comments from Defaulting Respondents Huber-Suhner AG and Huber + Suhner, Inc. in response to the Commission’s notice soliciting public interest comments, 86 FR 22067–68 (Apr. 26, 2021).

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the final ID and the parties’ submissions, the Commission has found a violation of section 337 as to claims 1 and 3 of the ’320 patent; claims 11, 12, 14–16, 19, 21, 27, and 28 of the ’456 patent; claims 9, 16, 23, and 26 of the ’153 patent; and claims 22 and 23 of the ’206 patent. The Commission affirms with modifications the ID’s finding that Respondents Leviton, Panduit, and Siemon satisfy the importation requirement. FS and Wirewerks did not contest importation before the ALJ. With regard to claim construction, the Commission determines to: (1) Adopt OUII’s proposed construction for the ‘‘width of the front side of [the] fiber optic module’’ limitation in claims 12 and 28 of the ’456 patent and find that the accused products meet this limitation under the proper construction; and (2) adopt Corning’s proposed construction for the ‘‘front opening’’ limitation in the asserted claims of the ’206 patent and find that the accused products meet this limitation under the proper construction. The Commission affirms with modifications the ID’s finding that the imported article(s) of Respondents Panduit, Siemon, and FS are respectively used by their customers to directly infringe the asserted claims of the ’320, ’456, and ’153 patents at their inducement, and the imported articles of Respondent Leviton are used by its customers to directly infringe the asserted claims of the ’320 and ’456 patents at Leviton’s inducement.

Further, the Commission affirms the ID’s finding of no contributory infringement by Respondents Leviton, Panduit, and Siemon, and takes no position on the ID’s finding of no contributory infringement by FS. Still further, the Commission takes no position on the ID’s finding that Leviton directly infringes the asserted claims of the ’320 and ’456 patents. Finally, the Commission affirms with modifications the ID’s finding that Corning has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3).

The Commission has determined that the appropriate remedy is: (1) A general exclusion order prohibiting the entry of infringing high-density fiber optic equipment and components thereof; and (2) cease and desist orders directed to Respondents Leviton, Panduit, and FS. The Commission has determined that the public interest factors do not preclude issuance of the general exclusion order or the cease and desist orders. The Commission has determined that a bond as set forth in the orders is required during the period of Presidential review. 19 U.S.C. 1337(j)(3).

The investigation is terminated. The Commission’s reasoning in support of its determinations is set forth more fully in its opinion. The Commission’s orders and opinion were delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on August 3, 2021.


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 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).

By order of the Commission.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140–NEW]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection of eComments Requested; New Information Collection; Authorization for Release of Information—ATF Form 8620.56

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), Department of Justice (DOJ) will submit 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 an additional 30 days until September 8, 2021.

ADDRESS: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function.

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 agency, 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

Type of Information Collection: New collection.

The Title of the Form/Collection: Authorization for Release of Information.

The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:

Form number: ATF Form 8620.56.

Component: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice.

Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:

Primary: Individuals or households.

Other: None.

Abstract: The Authorization for Release of Information—ATF Form 8620.56 will be used to determine if a candidate complies with personnel security requirements and is suitable for Federal or contractor employment at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF).

An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: An estimated 2,000 respondents will use the form annually, and it will take each respondent approximately 5 minutes to complete their responses.

An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 167 hours, which is equal to 2,000 (# of respondents) * .0083333 (5 minutes).

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, Mail Stop 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.


Melody Braswell,
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

On August 2, 2021, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed consent decree with the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania in the lawsuit entitled United States and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection v. Libertas Copper, LLC, d/b/a Hussey Copper, Civil Action No. 2:21–cv–01016–WSS.

This is a civil action brought by the United States, on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Environmental Protection (“PADEP”), against Defendant Libertas Copper, LLC, d/b/a Hussey Copper, alleging violations of the Clean Water Act, the Pennsylvania Clean Streams Law, and Defendant’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit.

The complaint alleges that, between 2011 and the present, Libertas Copper discharged wastewater and storm water that caused oil sheens and contained pollutants—including copper, chromium, nickel, oil and grease, lead, pH, total suspended solids, and zinc—from its Leetsdale, Pennsylvania, copper-smelting facility to the Ohio River in violation of federal and state law.

Under the proposed Consent Decree, Libertas Copper would be required to implement significant measures designed to prevent future violations. These include the development and implementation of operational documents and a maintenance program designed to ensure effective collection, pretreatment, and treatment of wastewater; a third-party environmental audit; ongoing internal environmental inspections; violation response requirements; training; and auditing and implementation of an environmental management system. In addition, Defendant will pay a civil penalty of $861,500, to be split evenly between the United States and PADEP.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to United States and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection v. Libertas Copper, LLC, d/b/a Hussey Copper, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–12068. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice.