

the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma that this notice has been published.

Dated: November 14, 2007

Sherry Hutt,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. E7-24619 Filed 12-18-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-50-S

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-596]

In the Matter of Certain GPS Chips, Associated Software and Systems, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination not to Review ALJ Order; No. 22 Granting Complainant's Motion to Amend the Complaint and 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. 22) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting complainant's motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: 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 13, 2007, 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 SiRF Technology, Inc. of San Jose, California ("SiRF"), alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for

importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain GPS chips, associated software and systems, and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,304,216; 7,043,363; 7,091,904 ("the '904 patent"); and 7,132,980. 72 FR 11378 (Mar. 13, 2007). The complainant named Global Locate, Inc. of San Jose, California as respondent. The complaint and notice of investigation were later amended to include one additional claim of the '904 patent. Subsequently, the investigation was terminated with respect to the '904 patent and certain claims of the other patents.

On November 7, 2007, complainant SiRF moved for leave to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add Broadcom, Inc. as a respondent to the investigation.

On November 16, 2007, the ALJ issued Order No. 22 granting complainant's motion. No party petitioned for review of Order No. 22. 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: December 13, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7-24585 Filed 12-18-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-909 (Review)]

Low Enriched Uranium From France Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on low enriched uranium from France would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.²

¹ The record is defined in section 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² Commissioner Deana Tanner Okun did not participate in this review.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on January 3, 2007 (72 FR 144) and determined on April 9, 2007 that it would conduct a full review (72 FR 27151, May 14, 2007). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's review and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on May 31, 2007 (72 FR 30393). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on October 11, 2007, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on December 13, 2007. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3967 (December 2007), entitled *Low Enriched Uranium from France: Investigation No. 731-TA-909 (Review)*.

Issued: December 13, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7-24587 Filed 12-18-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-621]

In the Matter of Certain Probe Card Assemblies, Components Thereof and Certain Tested Dram and Nand Flash Memory Devices and Products Containing Same; Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on November 13, 2007, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of FormFactor, Inc. of Livermore, California. An amended complaint was filed on December 7, 2007. The complaint, as amended, alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain probe card assemblies, components thereof and certain tested DRAM and NAND flash

memory devices and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,994,152, 6,509,751, 6,615,485, 6,624,648, 7,168,162, and 7,225,538. The complaint, as amended, further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a permanent exclusion order and a permanent cease and desist order. **ADDRESSES:** The complaint, as amended, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Benjamin Levi, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2781.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2007).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, as amended, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on December 13, 2007, **ORDERED THAT—**

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain probe card assemblies, components thereof, or certain tested DRAM or NAND flash memory devices or products containing same by reason of infringement of one

or more of claims 1, 2, 4, 7-12, 15, 21-23, 27-30, 33-35, 51-54, and 59 of U.S. Patent No. 5,994,152; claims 1-3, 5-7, 12, 13, 24, and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,751; claims 1-11, 18, 19, 23-25, 29, 32, 33, 36-38, and 41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,485; claims 1-15, 18-22, 34, and 36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,624,648; claims 1-4, 13, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,168,162; and claims 1-9, 13-22, 27-33, 37-41, 44, 45, and 47-49 of U.S. Patent No. 7,225,538, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is—
FormFactor, Inc., 7005 SouthFront Street, Livermore, California 94551.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:
Micronics Japan Co., Ltd., 2-6-8 Kichijoji Hon-cho, Musashino-shi, Tokyo 180-8508, Japan.
MJC Electronics Corp., 2621 Ridgepoint Drive, Suite 110, Austin, Texas 78754.
Phicom Corporation, 60-29 Gasandong, Kumcheon-gu, Seoul, South Korea.
Phiam Corporation, 3003 North First Street #309, San Jose, California 95134.

(c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Benjamin Levi, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Theodore R. Essex is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.
Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the

allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a permanent exclusion order or cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

Issued: December 13, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7-24586 Filed 12-18-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 06-44]

Richard Carino, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On December 23, 2005, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Richard Carino, M.D. (Respondent), of Port Richey, Florida. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Respondent's DEA Certificates of Registration, BC5048043 and BC7752024, as a practitioner, on the ground that he had committed acts which rendered his registration "inconsistent with the public interest." Show Cause Order at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4)).

More specifically, the Show Cause Order alleged that between September 2003 and July 2004, Respondent, "while working for iPharmacy.MD," had issued between "100 to 2000 prescriptions per month over the internet, most" of which were for controlled substances. *Id.* at 5. The Show Cause Order alleged that Respondent "never saw the customers and * * * had no prior doctor-patient relationship with them," that he did not "conduct physical examinations of the customers and [that he] did not create or maintain patient records." *Id.* The Show Cause Order further alleged that "[t]he only information [Respondent] reviewed prior to issuing a prescription was a questionnaire completed by the customer, and [that he] never consulted with the customer's primary care physician or obtained prior medical records." *Id.* at 5-6. The Show Cause Order thus alleged that "[t]he controlled substance prescriptions issued by [Respondent] over the internet were not