

mockery of judicial power.” *SBC Commc’ns*, at *14.

In 2004, Congress amended the APPA to ensure that courts take into account the above-quoted list of relevant factors when making a public interest determination. Compare 15 U.S.C. 16(e) (2004) with 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(1) (2006) (substituting “shall” for “may” in directing relevant factors for court to consider and amending list of factors to focus on competitive considerations and to address potentially ambiguous judgment terms). These amendments, however, did not change the fundamental role of courts in reviewing proposed settlements. To the contrary, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. 16 (e)(2). This language codified the intent of the original 1974 statute, expressed by Senator Tunney in the legislative history: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Senator Tunney). Rather:

[a]bsent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should . . . carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances.

United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., 1977-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977).

This Court recently examined the role of the district court in reviewing proposed final judgments in light of the 2004 amendments, confirming that the amendments “effected minimal changes[] and that this Court’s scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of Tunney Act proceedings.” See *United States v. SBC Commc’ns, Inc.*, Nos. 05-2102 and 05-2103, 2007 WL 1020746, at *9 (D.D.C. Mar. 29, 2007). This Court concluded that the amendments did not alter the articulation of the public interest standard in *Microsoft, Id.* at *15.

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: April 18, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ _____
C. Scott Hataway Bar No. 473942,
U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust
Division, Lit II Section, 1401 H Street
NW., Washington, DC 20530 202-514-
8380.

[FR Doc. 07-2087 Filed 4-27-07; 8:45am]
BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importer of Controlled Substances
Notice of Application

This is notice that on October 18, 2006, Noramco Inc., 500 Swedes Landing Road, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as an importer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed in schedule II:

Drug	Schedule
Raw Opium (9600)	II
Concentrate of Poppy Straw (9670).	II

The company plans to import the listed controlled substances to manufacture other controlled substances.

As noted in a previous notice published in the **Federal Register** on September 23, 1975, (40 FR 43745), all applicants for registration to import a basic class of any controlled substances in schedule I or II are, and will continue to be, required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1301.34(b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: April 17, 2007.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of
Diversion Control Drug Enforcement
Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-8132 Filed 4-27-07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled
Substances Notice of Application

Pursuant to § 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on March 1, 2007, Organichem Corporation, 33 Riverside

Avenue, Rensselaer, New York 12144, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of Oxymorphone (9652), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans on manufacturing the listed controlled substance in bulk for sale to its customers.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such a substance may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.33(a).

Any such written comments or objections being sent via regular mail should be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Diversion Control, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (ODL), Washington, DC 20537, or any being sent via express mail should be sent to Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Diversion Control, Federal Register Representative (ODL), 2401 Jefferson-Davis Highway, Alexandria, Virginia 22301; and must be filed no later than June 29, 2007.

Dated: April 17, 2007.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of
Diversion Control Drug Enforcement
Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-8131 Filed 4-27-07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importer of Controlled Substances
Notice of Application

This is notice that on January 26, 2007, Stepan Company, Natural Products Department, 100 W. Hunter Avenue, Maywood, New Jersey 07607, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as an importer of Coca Leaves (9040), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to import the listed controlled substance for the manufacture of a bulk controlled substance for distribution to its customer.

As noted in a previous notice published in the **Federal Register** on September 23, 1975, (40 FR 43745), all applicants for registration to import a basic class of any controlled substances in schedule I or II are, and will continue to be, required to demonstrate to the