

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 (<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 voted to institute this investigation on December 16, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Knowles Electronics LLC of Itasca, Illinois ("Knowles"). 74 FR 68077 (Dec. 22, 2009). The complaint named as the sole respondent Analog Devices Inc. of Norwood, Massachusetts ("Analog"). The accused products are microphone packages. Knowles' complaint asserts one claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,781,231, and numerous claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,242,089.

Knowles also filed with its complaint a motion for temporary relief that requested that the Commission issue a temporary limited exclusion order and temporary cease and desist order. The ID at issue is the ALJ's denial of Knowles' motion. In that ID, the ALJ analyzed the four factors for preliminary relief: likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, balance of hardships, and public interest.

On the likelihood of success on the merits, the ALJ found that all but one of the asserted patent claims were likely anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,907 to Halteren. Some of these same claims were also likely anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,594,369 to Une. The remaining claim, while not invalid, was not likely infringed. There was no patent claim for which Knowles demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits (*i.e.*, as to both validity and infringement).

The ID also found that Knowles had not demonstrated irreparable harm. In particular, the ID found that Analog's sales of accused microphone packages had not caused Knowles lost sales, had not damaged Knowles' relationships with its customers, and otherwise had

no proven detrimental effect on Knowles. The ALJ found that these two factors (likelihood of success and irreparable harm) precluded temporary relief here. Nonetheless, the ALJ considered the remaining two factors (balance of hardships and the public interest). As to these remaining two factors, the ID found that the balance of hardships favored Knowles, and the ID also found that the public interest would not preclude preliminary relief.

On review to the Commission, the parties filed opening and reply comments, as authorized by 19 CFR 210.66(c) & (e)(1). These comments do not take issue with the ALJ's findings regarding the balance of hardships or the public interest. Instead, the comments principally deal with Knowles' likelihood of success on the merits, challenging various aspects of the ALJ's analyses of validity and infringement. The private parties also dispute whether the Commission should address at all the likelihood of success, as Knowles now concedes to the Commission that it has not suffered irreparable harm. Thus, Knowles believes that the question of likelihood of success is moot and urges the Commission not to reach likelihood of success. Analog has taken the position that Knowles' concession is inappropriate and that the Commission should decide likelihood of success.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's ID and the subsequent comments and reply comments, the Commission finds that even absent Knowles' concession, irreparable harm has not been demonstrated. It was Knowles' burden to demonstrate that such harm was likely absent temporary relief, and it failed to meet that burden. *Winter v. Natural Res. Defense Council, Inc.*, 129 S. Ct. 365, 375 (2008). The Commission notes, in addition to the reasons discussed in the ID, that Knowles did not seek temporary relief to exclude the only product it has identified that allegedly contains the accused microphone package. See Complaint of Knowles Elecs. LLC Under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, As Amended ¶¶ 6, 18, 48-49 (Nov. 12, 2009). The Commission has therefore determined not to review the ID's finding of lack of irreparable harm and the ID's denial of temporary relief. The parties have not sought the Commission's review as to the balance of hardships and public interest analyses, and the Commission has determined not to review the ID's findings on those issues.

Because irreparable harm is dispositive here, the Commission need not evaluate the likelihood of success on

the merits, and therefore, the Commission has determined to review the ID's finding on likelihood of success and to take no position on it. *See Beloit Corp. v. Valmet Oy*, 742 F.2d 1421 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Commission's decision enables the ALJ to assess the merits unburdened by Commission impressions that may have been formed on a limited temporary-relief record.

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 sections 210.52 and 210.66 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.52, 210.66).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 21, 2010.

William R. Bishop,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-12742 Filed 5-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-1084-1087 (Review)]

Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, Netherlands, and Sweden

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, Netherlands, and Sweden.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, Netherlands, and Sweden would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is July 1, 2010. Comments on

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117-0016/USITC No. 10-5-217, expiration date June 30, 2011. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 15 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436.

the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by August 16, 2010. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207), as most recently amended at 74 FR 2847 (January 16, 2009).

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 1, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Messer (202-205-3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On July 11, 2005, the Department of Commerce issued antidumping duty orders on imports of purified carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, Netherlands, and Sweden (70 FR 39734). The Commission is conducting reviews to determine whether revocation of the orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time. It will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct full or expedited reviews. The Commission's determinations in any expedited reviews will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to these reviews:

(1) *Subject Merchandise* is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year review, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The *Subject Countries* in these reviews are Finland, Mexico, Netherlands, and Sweden.

(3) The *Domestic Like Product* is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the

Subject Merchandise. In its original determinations, the Commission found one *Domestic Like Product* consisting of all forms of purified carboxymethylcellulose, as that term was defined by Commerce in the scope of the original investigations.²

(4) The *Domestic Industry* is the U.S. producers as a whole of the *Domestic Like Product*, or those producers whose collective output of the *Domestic Like Product* constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. Based on its finding that the *Domestic Like Product* consisted of all purified carboxymethylcellulose, the Commission found in its original determinations that the *Domestic Industry* consisted of Aqualon, the only domestic producer of purified carboxymethylcellulose at that time.

(5) The *Order Date* is the date that the antidumping duty orders under review became effective. In these reviews, the *Order Date* is July 11, 2005.

(6) An *Importer* is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the *Subject Merchandise* into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

Participation in the reviews and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the *Subject Merchandise* and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in the reviews as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11(b)(4) of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the reviews.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are advised that they may appear in a review even if they participated personally and substantially in the corresponding underlying original investigation. The Commission's designated agency ethics official has advised that a five-year review is not considered the "same particular matter" as the corresponding underlying original investigation for

² Commerce excluded three forms of carboxymethylcellulose from the scope of the original investigations: unpurified or crude carboxymethylcellulose (often called "technical carboxymethylcellulose"), carboxymethylcellulose in fluidized polymer suspension, and carboxymethylcellulose that is cross-linked through heat treatment.

purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees, and Commission rule 201.15(b)(19 CFR 201.15(b)), 73 FR 24609 (May 5, 2008). This advice was developed in consultation with the Office of Government Ethics.

Consequently, former employees are not required to seek Commission approval to appear in a review under Commission rule 19 CFR 201.15, even if the corresponding underlying original investigation was pending when they were Commission employees. For further ethics advice on this matter, contact Carol McCue Verratti, Deputy Agency Ethics Official, at 202-205-3088.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and APO service list.—Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI submitted in these reviews available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the reviews, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the reviews. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Certification.—Pursuant to section 207.3 of the Commission's rules, any person submitting information to the Commission in connection with these reviews must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter's knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will be deemed to consent, unless otherwise specified, for the Commission, its employees, and contract personnel to use the information provided in any other reviews or investigations of the same or comparable products which the Commission conducts under Title VII of the Act, or in internal audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Commission pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3.

Written submissions.—Pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules, each interested party response to this notice must provide the information specified below. The deadline for filing such responses is July 1, 2010. Pursuant to section 207.62(b) of the Commission's rules, eligible parties (as specified in Commission rule 207.62(b)(1)) may also file comments concerning the adequacy of responses to the notice of institution and whether the Commission should

conduct an expedited or full review. The deadline for filing such comments is August 16, 2010. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of sections 201.8 and 207.3 of the Commission's rules and any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6 and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002). Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or APO service list as appropriate), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the reviews you do not need to serve your response).

Inability to provide requested information.—Pursuant to section 207.61(c) of the Commission's rules, any interested party that cannot furnish the information requested by this notice in the requested form and manner shall notify the Commission at the earliest possible time, provide a full explanation of why it cannot provide the requested information, and indicate alternative forms in which it can provide equivalent information. If an interested party does not provide this notification (or the Commission finds the explanation provided in the notification inadequate) and fails to provide a complete response to this notice, the Commission may take an adverse inference against the party pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act in making its determinations in the reviews.

Information To Be Provided In Response To This Notice Of Institution: If you are a domestic producer, union/worker group, or trade/business association; import/export *Subject Merchandise* from more than one *Subject Country*; or produce *Subject Merchandise* in more than one *Subject Country*, you may file a single response. If you do so, please ensure that your response to each question includes the information requested for each pertinent *Subject Country*. As used below, the term "firm" includes any related firms.

(1) The name and address of your firm or entity (including World Wide Web address) and name, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the certifying official.

(2) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is a U.S. producer of the *Domestic Like Product*, a U.S. union

or worker group, a U.S. importer of the *Subject Merchandise*, a foreign producer or exporter of the *Subject Merchandise*, a U.S. or foreign trade or business association, or another interested party (including an explanation). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, identify the firms in which your workers are employed or which are members of your association.

(3) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is willing to participate in these reviews by providing information requested by the Commission.

(4) A statement of the likely effects of the revocation of the antidumping duty orders on the *Domestic Industry* in general and/or your firm/entity specifically. In your response, please discuss the various factors specified in section 752(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675a(a)) including the likely volume of subject imports, likely price effects of subject imports, and likely impact of imports of *Subject Merchandise* on the *Domestic Industry*.

(5) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. producers of the *Domestic Like Product*. Identify any known related parties and the nature of the relationship as defined in section 771(4)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677(4)(B)).

(6) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. importers of the *Subject Merchandise* and producers of the *Subject Merchandise* in each *Subject Country* that currently export or have exported *Subject Merchandise* to the United States or other countries since the *Order Date*.

(7) A list of 3–5 leading purchasers in the U.S. market for the *Domestic Like Product* and the *Subject Merchandise* (including street address, World Wide Web address, and the name, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of a responsible official at each firm).

(8) A list of known sources of information on national or regional prices for the *Domestic Like Product* or the *Subject Merchandise* in the U.S. or other markets.

(9) If you are a U.S. producer of the *Domestic Like Product*, provide the following information on your firm's operations on that product during calendar year 2009, except as noted (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant).

If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of

total U.S. production of the *Domestic Like Product* accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the *Domestic Like Product* (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix);

(c) The quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s);

(d) The quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s); and

(e) The value of (i) Net sales, (ii) cost of goods sold (COGS), (iii) gross profit, (iv) selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and (v) operating income of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s) (include both U.S. and export commercial sales, internal consumption, and company transfers) for your most recently completed fiscal year (identify the date on which your fiscal year ends).

(10) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country(ies)*, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2009 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of *Subject Merchandise* from each *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') imports;

(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of *Subject Merchandise* imported from each *Subject Country*; and

(c) The quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of *Subject Merchandise* imported from each *Subject Country*.

(11) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject*

Country(ies), provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2009 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping duties). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of *Subject Merchandise* in each *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the *Subject Merchandise* in each *Subject Country* (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix); and

(c) the quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* from each *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the *Domestic Like Product* that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the *Subject Merchandise* in each *Subject Country* since the *Order Date*, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the *Domestic Like Product* produced in the United States, *Subject Merchandise* produced in each *Subject Country*, and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (OPTIONAL) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the *Domestic Like Product*

and *Domestic Industry*; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 24, 2010.

William R. Bishop,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-12760 Filed 5-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-376 and 379 and 731-TA-788, 790-793 (Second Review)]

Stainless Steel Plate From Belgium, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of five-year reviews concerning the countervailing duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium and South Africa and the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium and South Africa and the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is July 1, 2010. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by August 16, 2010. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117-0016/USITC No. 10-5-218, expiration date June 30, 2011. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 15 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436.

and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207), as most recently amended at 74 FR 2847 (January 16, 2009).

DATES: *Effective Date:* June 1, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202-205-3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—May 11, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("Commerce") issued countervailing duty orders on imports of certain stainless steel plate from Belgium, Italy, and South Africa (64 FR 25288). On May 21, 1999, Commerce issued antidumping duty orders on imports of certain stainless steel plate from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan (64 FR 27756). On March 11, 2003, Commerce amended these antidumping and countervailing duty orders on imports of certain stainless steel plate to remove the original language that excluded cold-rolled stainless steel plate in coils (68 FR 11520 and 68 FR 11524). Following five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective July 18, 2005, Commerce issued a continuation of the countervailing duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium, Italy, and South Africa and the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan (70 FR 41202).² The Commission is now conducting second reviews of the countervailing duty orders on stainless steel plate from Belgium and South Africa³ and the antidumping duty orders on stainless

² Following the five-year reviews, Commerce revoked the antidumping duty order on stainless steel plate from Canada effective May 21, 2004 (70 FR 41207, July 18, 2005).

³ Following a changed circumstances review, Commerce revoked the countervailing duty order on stainless steel plate from Italy, effective September 4, 1998 (71 FR 15380, March 28, 2006).