

Bioscience Co. of Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China; Gannex Pharma Co. of Shanghai, China; and Jinzi Jason Wu of Seattle, Washington (all collectively, “the Ascleitis Respondents”). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigation is also participating in the investigation. *Id.*

On June 30, 2023, Viking filed an Omnibus Motion for Monetary and Non-Monetary Sanctions Against Respondents and their Counsel, alleging failure to cooperate during discovery, failure to cooperate during forensic examinations, and violations of the terms of certain orders.

On August 10, 2023, Foster, Murphy, Altman & Nickel, PC (“Foster Murphy”) moved to intervene in this investigation for the limited purpose of defending Foster Murphy and its attorneys’ interest in response to complainant Viking’s omnibus motion for sanctions. The motion was unopposed.

On August 28, 2023, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued the subject ID (Order No. 37) pursuant to Commission Rule 210.19 (19 CFR 210.19) granting Foster Murphy’s motion to intervene. Order No. 37 (Aug. 28, 2023). The ALJ states that the sanctions motion seeks joint and several liability between the Ascleitis Respondents and Foster Murphy for discovery abuse. *Id.* at 4–5. The ALJ finds that Viking’s sanctions motion makes specific allegations that implicate Foster Murphy and its attorneys. *Id.* at 5. The ALJ finds that, in view of these separate interests, the limited purpose of the intervention, and the lack of opposition, Foster Murphy’s motion to intervene is granted. *Id.* at 6.

No party filed a petition for review.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on September 22, 2023.

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: September 22, 2023.

Katherine Hiner,
Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2023–21140 Filed 9–27–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

On September 19, 2023, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree (the “Consent Decree”) with the District Court of the Southern District of New York in a lawsuit entitled *United States of America, et al. v. City of Mount Vernon*, Civil Action No. 18–5845.

In this action, the United States and State of New York seek injunctive relief compelling the City of Mount Vernon to comply with the Clean Water Act in its operation of a municipal separate storm sewer system. The lawsuit also seeks civil penalties for past violations.

The proposed Consent Decree resolves the United States’ and States’ civil claims. It imposes injunctive relief requiring Mount Vernon to take steps necessary to bring its municipal separate storm sewer system into compliance. It also requires Mount Vernon to pay a \$100,000 civil penalty to the United States and imposes (but suspends payment of) a \$100,000 civil penalty owed to the State of New York.

The publication of this notice opens the public comment on the proposed settlement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States of America, et al. v. City of Mount Vernon*, DJ # 90–5–1–1–11743. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
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 settlement may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. The Consent Decree has voluminous exhibits, so please specify in your request whether you wish the exhibits to be included. 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 \$11.75 (for the Consent Decree without exhibits) or \$189.00 (for the Consent Decree with exhibits) (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Henry S. Friedman,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2023–21124 Filed 9–27–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1123–0NEW]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; New Collection; Authorization for Release of Information

AGENCY: Office of the Pardon Attorney, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Pardon Attorney, Department of Justice (DOJ), 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 60 days until November 27, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Kira Gillespie, Deputy Pardon Attorney, Office of the Pardon Attorney, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Main Justice—RFK Building, Washington, DC 20530; kira.gillespie@usdoj.gov; (202) 616–6073.

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 Office of the Pardon Attorney, 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,