The land will not be available for lease or conveyance until after the classification becomes effective.

(Authority: 43 CFR 2741.5)

Ruben A. Sánchez, Kingman Field Manager.

[FR Doc. 2010–12158 Filed 5–19–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–32–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLAZG01000.L14300000.FO0000.241A; AZPHX-080687 and AZPHX-080893]

Notice of Realty Action: Opening of Public Lands; Arizona

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Realty Action.

SUMMARY: This Notice opens 1,920 acres, more or less, of public land located in Cochise County, Arizona, to location and entry under the public land laws, including the general mining laws. **DATES:** *Effective Date:* May 20, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Bureau of Land Management Safford Field Office, 711 14th Avenue, Safford, Arizona 85546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Schnell, Assistant Field Manager for Nonrenewable Resources, at the above address or call 928–348–4420.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910, as amended (36 Stat. 557), upon Arizona statehood, the surface and subsurface interest in the subject lands became State lands. In 1947 and 1948, two separate land exchanges (PHX-080893 and PHX-080687) transferred these lands back to the United States pursuant to the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269). The Taylor Grazing Act allowed states to retain the mineral rights in such land exchanges, but only if the lands were "mineral in character." The subject lands were deemed "mineral in character" based on the presence of State oil and gas leases. Therefore, the State of Arizona retained the subsurface estate and transferred only the surface estate to the United States.

In the 1990s, UOP, a general partnership that was operating a mine on the lands involved, challenged the State's determination that the lands were mineral in character and the State's retention of minerals when the lands were exchanged to the United States. As a result, the Department of the Interior's Office of Hearings and Appeals (Interior Board of Land Appeals

or IBLA), required the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to prepare a mineral report to determine whether the subject lands were mineral in character at the time of the land exchanges. Based on the BLM's mineral report, the IBLA issued a Summary Decision on September 1, 1999 (IBLA 97-227) which held that because the subject lands were non-mineral in character at the time of the 1947 and 1948 exchanges, the reservation of minerals by the State of Arizona was void, and that those minerals transferred by operation of law to the United States in the land exchanges. This Notice opens the lands to the public land and mining, mineral leasing, and mineral materials laws as specified below.

The lands are described as follows:

Gila & Salt River Meridian

T. 12 S., R. 29 E.,

- Sec. 2, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, S¹/₂N¹/₂, and S¹/₂;
- Sec. 3, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, S1/2N1/2, and S1/2;

Sec. 11.

The area described contains 1,920 acres, more or less, in Cochise County.

1. Beginning at 9 a.m. on May 20, 2010, the lands described above shall be open to the operation of the public land laws generally, subject to valid existing rights, the provisions of existing withdrawals, other segregations of record, and the requirements of applicable law. All valid applications received at 9 a.m. on May 20, 2010, shall be considered as simultaneously filed at that time. Those received thereafter shall be considered in the order of filing.

2. At 9 a.m. on May 20, 2010, the lands described above shall be open to location and entry under the United States mining laws, and to the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws, subject to valid existing rights, the provisions of existing withdrawals, other segregations of record, and the requirements of applicable law. Appropriation of the lands under the general mining laws prior to the date and time of opening is unauthorized. Any such attempted appropriation, including attempted adverse possession under 30 U.S.C. 38 (2000) shall vest no rights against the United States.

Acts required to establish a location and to initiate a right of possession are governed by State law where not in conflict with Federal law.

Scott C. Cooke,

Safford Field Manager. [FR Doc. 2010–12146 Filed 5–19–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–32–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-698]

In the Matter of: Certain DC–DC Controllers and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review the Administrative Law Judge's Initial Determination Granting Complainants' 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 the presiding administrative law judge's initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 19) granting complainants' motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW. Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2532. 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 December 29, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Richtek Technology Corp. of Taiwan and Richtek USA, Inc. of San Jose, California ("Richtek"), alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain DC-DC controllers by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,315,190 ("the '190 patent"); 6,414,470; and 7,132,717, and by reason of trade secret misappropriation. 75 FR 446 (Jan. 5, 2010). The complaint named five respondents. On March 5, 2010, the ALJ granted Richtek's motion to allow Richtek to add three new respondents

and to correct the name of another; an ID issued. Order No. 6 (Mar. 5, 2010). On March 31, 2010, the Commission determined not to review that ID. 75 FR 17433–34 (Apr. 6, 2010).

On April 12, 2010, Richtek moved for leave to amend its complaint to assert dependent claims 8-11 of the '190 patent on the basis of newly discovered evidence produced by the respondents in this investigation. Independent claim 1 of the '190 patent (upon which claims 8-11 depend) had always been asserted in this investigation. On April 20, 2010, the respondents filed their opposition, arguing that Richtek's two-month delay in asserting these patent claims caused them prejudice. The next day, the Commission's investigative attorney filed a response indicating that she did not oppose the motion.

On April 22, 2010, the ALJ issued an ID granting Richtek's motion. Order No. 19 (Apr. 22, 2010). The ID found good cause for Richtek's delay and tacitly rejected the respondents' allegations of prejudice. *Id.* at 6–7.

No petitions for review of the 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).

By order of the Commission. Issued: May 14, 2010.

Marilyn R. Abbott, Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2010–12101 Filed 5–19–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-564]

In the Matter of: Certain Voltage Regulators, Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Enforcement Proceeding; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review the Enforcement Initial Determination; Schedule for Briefing on the Issues of Remedy, Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The United States International Trade Commission hereby provides notice that it has determined not to review the Enforcement Initial Determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on March 18, 2010 in the abovecaptioned investigation. Notice is further given that the Commission is requesting briefing on remedy, the public interest, and bonding with respect to the ID's findings and recommendations concerning enforcement measures.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul M. Bartkowski, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5432. Copies of all 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. 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/. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted the investigation underlying this enforcement proceeding on March 22, 2006, based on a complaint filed by Linear Technology Corporation ("Linear") of Milpitas, California. 71 FR 14545. The complaint, as supplemented, 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 voltage regulators, components thereof and products containing the same, by reason of infringement of certain claims of United States Patent No. 6,411,531 and of United States Patent No. 6,580,258 ("the '258 patent"). The complaint named Advanced Analogic Technologies, Inc. ("AATI") of Sunnyvale, California as the sole respondent. After Commission review of the administrative law judge's ("ALJ") final ID, the Commission determined that there was a violation of section 337 by AATI with respect to certain asserted claims of the '258 patent and issued a limited exclusion order ("LEO") consistent with its findings of violation. Subsequently, based on an enforcement complaint filed by Linear, the Commission instituted an enforcement

proceeding by notice in the **Federal Register** on October 10, 2008.

On March 18, 2010, the ALJ issued the subject ID, finding that, due to infringement of claims 2 and 34 of the '258 patent by the accused products, AATI violated the LEO. AATI filed a petition for review of certain aspects of the ID, and Linear filed a contingent petition for review of the ID. AATI and Linear filed responses to each others' petitions, and the Commission investigative attorney filed a joint response to the private parties' petitions. Having reviewed the record of the enforcement proceeding, including the petition for review and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined not to review the ID.

In connection with the final disposition of this proceeding, the Commission may (1) modify the LEO and/or (2) issue a cease-and-desist order that could result in the respondent being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of the subject articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. The Commission is particularly interested in receiving briefing regarding potential modifications to the LEO that ensure exclusion of the products for which a violation was found. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that a modified exclusion order and/or ceaseand-desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade