Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of ResMed Corp., ResMed Inc., and ResMed Ltd. on July 19, 2013. The complaint alleges 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 sleep-disordered breathing treatment systems and components thereof. The complaint names as respondents BMC Medical Co., Ltd. of China; 3B Medical, Inc. of Florida; and 3B Products, LLC of Florida. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist order.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) Identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) Identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) Indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) Explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number (''Docket No. 2968'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures [4]). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202–205–2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.[5]

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

Issued: July 22, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013–17895 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[4] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf.*

[5] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–869]

Certain Robotic Toys and Components Thereof; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Joint Motion for Termination of the Investigation; Entry of Consent Orders; Termination of the 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 the administrative law judge's (''ALJ'') initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 11) granting a joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety and has entered consent orders.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jia 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 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. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at *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.* 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 February 11, 2013, based on a complaint filed by Innovation First International, Inc.; Innovation First, Inc.; and Innovation First Labs, Inc., all of Greenville, Texas. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) by reason of misappropriation of trade secrets. The respondents named in the notice of investigation are CVS Pharmacy Inc. of Woonsocket, Rhode Island; Zuru Inc. of Road Town, Tortola, British Virgin Islands; Zuru Ltd. of Kowloon, Hong Kong; and Zuru Toys Inc. of Cambridge, New Zealand.

On June 3, 2013, the complainants and respondents filed a joint motion to

terminate the investigation in its entirety based on the consent order stipulations, proposed consent orders, and settlement agreements attached to the motion. In the motion, the parties stated that there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied between the parties concerning the subject matter of the investigation.

On June 14, 2013, the Commission investigative attorney (''IA'') filed a response in conditional support of the joint motion, provided that the parties modify the proposed consent orders to specify the activities authorized by the settlement agreements between the parties. On June 21, 2013, complainants and respondents jointly moved for leave to file a reply to the IA's response to the joint motion. On June 24, 2013, the IA indicated to the ALJ that given the changes made to the consent orders submitted with the parties' reply, the IA does not oppose the joint motion to terminate.

On July 1, 2013, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the joint motion. The ALJ found that there is good cause for terminating the investigation, and that he is not aware of any extraordinary circumstances that would preclude granting the motion. The ALJ further found that entry of the proposed consent orders and termination of the investigation is in the public interest. On July 9, 2013, the ALJ issued a corrected version of the subject ID to include the revised versions of the consent orders. No petitions for review 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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 19, 2013.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013–17847 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

On July 18, 2013 the Department of Justice filed a Complaint and simultaneously lodged a proposed Consent Decree (''Decree'') with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado in the lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *Williams Four Corners LLC,* Civil Action No. 13-cv-1923. In its Complaint the United States seeks civil penalties and injunctive relief against Williams Four Corners, LLC (''Williams'') for violations of the permit issued pursuant to Part C of Subchapter I of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7475 (Prevention of Significant Deterioration or ''PSD'') and the regulations promulgated thereunder at 40 CFR 52.21, and the federal operating permit program set forth at Title V of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7661–7661f (''Title V'') and the regulations promulgated thereunder at 40 CFR part 71, at a facility known as PLA–9 Central Deliver Point, also known as PLA–9 CDP (the ''PLA–9 Facility''). The PLA–9 Facility is located approximately 18 miles southwest of Durango, Colorado, and within the exterior boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation. The PLA–9 Facility is now shut down. The Decree requires Williams pay a $63,000 civil penalty to settle the alleged violations. Should Williams restart any operations at PLA–9 within the next two years, the Decree requires Williams comply with the requirements of the PSD Permit applicable to any emitting units that may be restarted or replaced.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment. Comments should be addressed to the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States* v. *Williams Four Corners, LLC,* D.J. Ref. No. DOJ # 90–5–2–1–10120. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	*Send them to:*
By e-mail	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.*
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ–ENRD, PO Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: *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. 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 $7.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Robert Brook,

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

[FR Doc. 2013–17874 Filed 7–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 12–52]

George R. Smith, M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 5, 2013, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Gail A. Randall issued the attached Recommended Decision. Therein, the ALJ recommended that I deny Respondent's pending application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner. Respondent did not file exceptions to the Recommended Decision.

Having reviewed the entire record, I have decided to adopt the ALJ's Recommended Decision in its entirety. Accordingly, Respondent's application will be denied.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that the application of George R. Smith, M.D., for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective immediately.

Dated: July 16, 2013.

Michele M. Leonhart,

Administrator.

Krista Tongring, Esq., for the Government
Louis Leichter, Esq. and *Andre D'Souza, Esq.,* for the Respondent

Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge

I. Introduction

Gail A. Randall, Administrative Law Judge. This proceeding is an adjudication pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.,* to determine whether the Drug Enforcement Administration (''DEA'' or ''Government'') should deny a physician's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) (2006). Without such registration, the physician, George R. Smith, M.D. (''Respondent'' or ''Dr. Smith''), would be unable to lawfully