

alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain 3G wideband code division multiple access handsets and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,674,791; 6,693,579; 7,117,004; 7,190,966; and 7,286,847. The notice of investigation named Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; and Samsung Telecommunications America LLC of Richardson, Texas (collectively, "Samsung") as respondents.

On February 3, 2009, InterDigital and Samsung filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement. On February 4, 2009, the Commission Investigative Attorney filed a response in support of the joint motion.

On February 6, 2009, the ALJ granted the joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety. The ALJ found that the motion complied with the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21 (19 CFR 210.21). The ALJ also concluded that, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(2) (19 CFR 210.50(b)(2)), there is no evidence that termination of this investigation will prejudice the public interest. No petitions for review of this ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 section 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

Issued: February 24, 2009.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E9-4297 Filed 2-27-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-640]

In the Matter of: Certain Short-Wavelength Light Emitting Diodes, Laser Diodes and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant's Motion To Amend the Complaint and the Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 53) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting complainant's motion to amend the complaint and the notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3152. Copies of the ID and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 25, 2008, the Commission instituted an investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based on a complaint filed by Gertrude Neumark Rothschild of Hartsdale, New York, alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain short-wavelength light emitting diodes, laser diodes and products containing same that infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,252,499. 73 FR 1575 (March 25, 2008). The complainant named numerous entities as respondents.

On January 12, 2009, complainant Rothschild moved to amend the Second Amended Complaint and Notice of Investigation in order to seek to correct the names of respondents Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. (to Panasonic Corporation) and Uni-light Touchtek Corporation (to UniLite Corporation), and to remove references to a number of respondents which have been terminated from the investigation.

On January 30, 2009, the ALJ issued Order No. 53 granting complainant's motion. No party petitioned for review of the subject ID. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 section 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42(h)).

Issued: February 24, 2009.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E9-4296 Filed 2-27-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on February 11, 2009, a Consent Decree in *United States v. Northrop Grumman Space & Mission Systems Corp., et al.*, Civil Action No. 09-0866, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

The Consent Decree resolves claims brought by the United States, on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") under Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9607, and Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6973, related to the releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Puente Valley Operable Unit of the San Gabriel Valley Area 4 Superfund Site ("Site") in Los Angeles County, California.

The Consent Decree resolves the liability of Northrop Grumman Space & Mission Systems Corp. ("Northrop" or "Performing Settling Defendant") and 43 cashout parties associated with 17 source properties and their related

entities ("Contributing Settling Defendants") with respect to the groundwater contamination and its investigation and treatment as set forth in the Interim Record of Decision, as modified by the Explanation of Significant Differences. The Consent Decree requires the Performing Settling Defendant, on behalf of all of the Settling Defendants, to construct the intermediate zone remedy to address groundwater contamination and operate it for eight years from the operational and functional date of the groundwater treatment system for the intermediate zone at an estimated cost of \$21 million, pay \$465,420.90 to EPA for past costs, and pay \$90,000 to DTSC for past response costs. The Performing Settling Defendant represents that between 2002 and June 30, 2007, it incurred costs in excess of seven million dollars (\$7 million) to implement the intermediate zone remedial action in compliance with the Unilateral Administrative Order No. 2002-06 issued on March 21, 2002, pending negotiations of the Consent Decree. Settling Defendants who currently own source properties within the PVOU are required to provide access and all of the Settling Defendants are required to retain records and provide EPA access to information. The Consent Decree gives all Settling Defendants a covenant not to sue. The Consent Decree reserves the United States' right to sue the Settling Defendants for the final Record of Decision and is subject to standard reopeners and reservations of rights.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either e-mailed to pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Northrop Grumman Space & Mission Systems Corp.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-354/16. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The Consent Decree may be examined at U.S. EPA Region IX at 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, to http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library,

P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611 or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov, fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$95.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Henry Friedman,
Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. E9-4367 Filed 2-27-09; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(i), the Attorney General shall, prior to issuing a registration under this section to a bulk manufacturer of a controlled substance in schedule I or II, and prior to issuing a registration under 21 U.S.C. 952(a)(2), authorizing the importation of such a substance, provide manufacturers holding registrations for the bulk manufacture of the substance an opportunity for a hearing.

Therefore, in accordance with Title 21 Code of Federal Regulations 1301.34(a), this is notice that on December 22, 2008, Sigma Aldrich Manufacturing LLC., 3500 Dekalb Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63118, has made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as an importer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed in schedule I and II:

Drug	Schedule
Cathinone (1235)	I
Methcathinone (1237)	I
Aminorex (1585)	I
Gamma Hydroxybutyric Acid (2010). .	I
Methaqualone (2565)	I
Alpha-ethyltryptamine (7249)	I
Ibogaine (7260)	I
Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315)	I
Marijuana (7360)	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
Mescaline (7381)	I
4-Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7391)	I
4-Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyphenethylamine (7392)	I

Drug	Schedule
4-Methyl-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7395).	I
2,5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (7400).	I
N-Hydroxy-3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (7402).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymethylamphetamine (7404).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) (7405).	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411)	I
Bufofenine (7433)	I
Diethyltryptamine (7434)	I
Dimethyltryptamine (7435)	I
Psilocybin (7437)	I
Psilocyin (7438)	I
1-[1-(2-Thienyl)cyclohexyl]piperidine (7470).	I
N-Benzylpiperazine (BZP) (7493)	I
Heroin (9200)	I
Normorphine (9313)	I
Etonitazene (9624)	I
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methamphetamine (1105)	II
Methylphenidate (1724)	II
Amobarbital (2125)	II
Pentobarbital (2270)	II
Secobarbital (2315)	II
Glutethimide (2550)	II
Nabilone (7379)	II
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
Cocaine (9041)	II
Codeine (9050)	II
Diprenorphine (9058)	II
Oxycodone (9143)	II
Hydromorphone (9150)	II
Diphenoxylate (9170)	II
Egonine (9180)	II
Ethylmorphine (9190)	II
Hydrocodone (9193)	II
Levorphanol (9220)	II
Meperidine (9230)	II
Methadone (9250)	II
Morphine (9300)	II
Thebaine (9333)	II
Opium powdered (9639)	II
Levo-alphacetylmethadol (9648) ..	II
Oxymorphone (9652)	II
Fentanyl (9801)	II

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances for sale to research facilities for drug testing and analysis.

Any bulk manufacturer who is presently, or is applying to be, registered with DEA to manufacture such basic classes of controlled substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43, and in such form as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments or objections should be addressed, in quintuplicate,