

*id.* at 13–15. In Docket No. C2004–3, pleadings addressed fee levels for Stamped Stationery. Although those arguments were not germane to the jurisdictional issue, they appear, at least at first blush, to be somewhat problematic. Consequently, in suggesting that a creative pricing approach may be appropriate, the Commission hopes to focus interested persons on the challenge at hand and perhaps to temper rote reliance on any preconceived fee structures.

The Commission's observations may also have the salutary effect of encouraging discussion among interested parties concerning an acceptable fee structure. With the threshold issue resolved, this possibility would not appear to be an unobtainable goal. It may, however, prove to be elusive. This guidance simply reflects the Commission's preliminary views. It is not intended to limit any interested persons' option, and participants remain free to present evidence and argument as they wish.

To facilitate discussions among interested persons the Commission will allow notices of intervention to be filed in this proceeding. Intervention, at this stage, will permit intervenors, including the Office of the Consumer Advocate, to participate in any pre-or post-filing conference the Postal Service may wish to convene. To the extent such conference(s) may be convened, any such discussions would be deemed privileged in any proceeding before the Commission.

*Sunset date.* To ensure this docket proceeds in an orderly fashion, the Commission establishes a due date for the filing of a request of February 26, 2007. Absent a request or other filing related thereto filed on or before that date, this docket will terminate and be considered withdrawn as of February 26, 2007.

*Representation of the general public.* In conformance with section 3624(a) of title 39, the Commission designates Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding. Pursuant to this designation, Ms. Dreifuss will direct the activities of Commission personnel assigned to assist her and, upon request, will supply their names for the record. Neither Ms. Dreifuss nor any of the assigned personnel will participate in or provide advice on any Commission decision in this proceeding.

#### Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. MC2006–7 for the purpose of receiving a request from the Postal Service for a recommended decision establishing a classification and fee schedule for Stamped Stationery.

2. The Commission will sit *en banc* in this proceeding.

3. Notices of intervention are due no later than 28 days following the submission of the Postal Service Request.

4. Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, is designated to represent the interests of the general public.

5. The due date for filing a request to establish the Stamped Stationery classification in this proceeding is February 26, 2007.

6. Absent a request or other filing related thereto filed on or before February 26, 2007, this docket will terminate and be considered withdrawn as of February 26, 2007.

7. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this document in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 25, 2006.

By the Commission.

**Steven W. Williams,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–14408 Filed 8–29–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

---

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

### No FEAR Act Notice

On May 15, 2002, Congress enacted the "Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002," which is now known as the No FEAR Act. One purpose of the Act is to "require that Federal agencies be accountable for violations of antidiscrimination and whistleblower protection laws." Public Law 107–174, Summary. In support of this purpose, Congress found that "agencies cannot be run effectively if those agencies practice or tolerate discrimination." Public Law 107–74, Title I, General Provisions, Section 101(1).

The Act also requires this agency to provide this notice to Federal employees, former Federal employees and applicants for Federal employment to inform you of the rights and protections available to you under Federal antidiscrimination, whistleblower protection and retaliation laws.

### Antidiscrimination Laws

A Federal agency cannot discriminate against an employee or applicant with

respect to the terms, conditions or privileges of employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, marital status or political affiliation. Discrimination on these bases is prohibited by one or more of the following statutes: 5 U.S.C. 2302(b)(1), 29 U.S.C. 206(d), 29 U.S.C. 631, 29 U.S.C. 633a, 29 U.S.C. 791 and 42 U.S.C. 2000e–16.

If you believe that you have been the victim of unlawful discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or disability, you must contact an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) counselor within 45 calendar days of the alleged discriminatory action, or, in the case of a personnel action, within 45 calendar days of the effective date of the action, before you can file a formal complaint of discrimination with your agency. See, e.g., 29 CFR 1614. If you believe that you have been the victim of unlawful discrimination on the basis of age, you must either contact an EEO counselor as noted above or give notice of intent to sue to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory action. If you are alleging discrimination based on marital status or political affiliation, you may file a written complaint with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel (OSC) (see contact information below). In the alternative (or in some cases, in addition), you may pursue a discrimination complaint by filing a grievance through your agency's administrative or negotiated grievance procedures, if such procedures apply and are available.

### Whistleblower Protection Laws

A Federal employee with authority to take, direct others to take, recommend or approve any personnel action must not use that authority to take or fail to take, or threaten to take or fail to take, a personnel action against an employee or applicant because of disclosure of information by that individual that is reasonably believed to evidence violations of law, rule or regulation; gross mismanagement, gross waste of funds; an abuse of authority; or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, unless disclosure of such information is specifically prohibited by law and such information is specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs.

Retaliation against an employee or applicant for making a protected disclosure is prohibited by 5 U.S.C. 2302(b)(8). If you believe that you have been the victim of whistleblower

retaliation, you may file a written complaint (Form OSC-11) with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel at 1730 M Street, NW., Suite 218, Washington, DC 20036-4505 or online through the OSC Web site <http://www.osc.gov>.

### Retaliation for Engaging in Protected Activity

A Federal agency cannot retaliate against an employee or applicant because that individual exercises his or her rights under any of the Federal antidiscrimination or whistleblower protections laws listed above. If you believe that you are the victim of retaliation for engaging in protected activity, you must follow, as appropriate, the procedures described in the Antidiscrimination Laws and Whistleblower Protection Laws sections or, if applicable, the administrative or negotiated grievance procedures in order to pursue any legal remedy.

### Disciplinary Actions

Under the existing laws, each agency retains the right, where appropriate, to discipline a Federal employee who has engaged in discriminatory or retaliatory conduct, up to and including removal. If OSC has initiated an investigation under 5 U.S.C. 1214, however, according to 5 U.S.C. 1214(f), agencies must seek approval from the Special Counsel to discipline employees for, among other activities, engaging in prohibited retaliation. Nothing in the No FEAR Act alters existing laws or permits an agency to take unfounded disciplinary action against a Federal employee or to violate the procedural rights of a Federal employee who has been accused of discrimination.

### Additional Information

For further information regarding the No FEAR Act regulations, refer to 5 CFR 724, as well as the appropriate offices within your agency (e.g., EEO/civil rights office, human resources office or legal office). Additional information regarding Federal antidiscrimination, whistleblower protection and retaliation laws can be found at the EEOC Web site—<http://www.eeoc.gov> and the OSC Web site—<http://www.osc.gov>.

### Existing Rights Unchanged

Pursuant to section 205 of the No FEAR Act, neither the Act nor this notice creates, expands or reduces any rights otherwise available to any employee, former employee or applicant under the laws of the United States, including the provisions of law specified in 5 U.S.C. 2302(d).

Dated: August 24, 2006.

**Beatrice Ezerski,**

*Secretary to the Board.*

[FR Doc. 06-7247 Filed 8-29-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905-01-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500-1]

### In the Matter of Amanda Company, Inc., American International Petroleum Corp., China Continental, Inc., Com21, Inc., Cycomm International, Inc., DeMarco Energy Systems of America, Inc., Eco Soil Systems, Inc., Edulink, Inc., H. Quotient, Inc., Healthtrac, Inc., Management Technologies, Inc., Metal Recovery Technologies, Inc., Paystar Corp., Royal Oak Mines, Inc., Rubber Technology International, Inc., Seven Seas Petroleum, Inc., Surebeam Corp., Synchronys Softcorp, Touch America Holdings, Inc., U.S. Plastic Lumber Corp., and Xcelera, Inc.; Order of Suspension of Trading

August 28, 2006.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Amanda Company, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2002.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of American International Petroleum Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2002.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of China Continental, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Com21, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended March 31, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Cycomm International, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2002.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of DeMarco

Energy Systems of America, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Eco Soil Systems, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended March 31, 2001.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Edulink, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of H Quotient, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Healthtrac, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended November 30, 2003.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Management Technologies, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended October 31, 1997.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Metal Recovery Technologies, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 1998.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Paystar Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2002.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Royal Oak Mines, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 1998.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Rubber Technology International, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended August 31, 2003.