

(a) The complainant is:

Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., 7200 Suter Road, Coopersburg, PA 18036.

(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:

Pass & Seymour, Inc., 50 Boyd Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13209.

AH Lighting, 2442 Hunter Street, Los Angeles, CA 90021.

American Top Electric Corp., 1202 E. Walnut Avenue, Suite H, Santa Ana, CA 92701.

Big Deal Electric Corp., 1202 E. Walnut Avenue, Suite H, Santa Ana, CA 92701.

Diode LED, 1195 Park Avenue, Suite 211, Emeryville, CA 94608.

Elemental LED, LLC, 1195 Park Avenue, Suite 211, Emeryville, CA 94608.

Wenzhou Huir Electric Science & Technology Co. Ltd., Bridge East Wan-Ao, Qiatou Village, Yueqing, Zhejiang 325600, China.

Westgate Mfg., Inc., 4500 S. Boyle Avenue, Vernon, CA 90058.

Zhejiang Lux Electric Co. Ltd., Weiqi Road, Yueqing Economic Development Zone, Yueqing, Zhejiang 325600, China.

Zhejiang Yuelong Mechanical & Electrical Co. Ltd., Yaa Road & Nanxi Road, Jiaying, Zhejiang 31400, China.

(c) The 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 Paul J. Luckern, Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate 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)–(e) 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 an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 9, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-14778 Filed 6-14-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140-0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: Investigator Integrity Questionnaire

ACTION: 30-Day Notice and request for comments.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** Volume 76, Number 69, page 20009–20010, on April 11, 2011, allowing for a 60 day comment period.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until July 15, 2011. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments concerning this information collection should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: DOJ Desk Officer. The best way to ensure your comments are received is to e-mail them to oir_submission@omb.eop.gov or fax them to 202-395-7285. All comments should reference the 8 digit OMB number for the collection or the title of the collection. If you have questions concerning the collection, please call Renee Reid at 202-648-9620 or the DOJ Desk Officer at 202-395-3176.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Summary of Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Investigator Integrity Questionnaire.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: Form Number:* ATF F 8620.7. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or households. *Other:* none.

Need for Collection

ATF utilizes the services of contract investigators to conduct security/suitability investigations on prospective or current employees, as well as those contractors and consultants doing business with ATF. Persons interviewed by contract investigators will be randomly selected to voluntarily complete a questionnaire regarding the investigator's degree of professionalism.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* There will be an estimated 2,500 respondents, who will complete the form within approximately 5 minutes.

(6) *An estimate of the total burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* There are an estimated 250 total burden hours associated with this collection.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, <http://www.Doj.PRA@usdoj.gov>, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Policy and Planning Staff, Justice Management Division, 2 Constitution Square, Room 2E-808, 145 N Street, NE., Washington, DC 20530.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer, PRA, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2011-14726 Filed 6-14-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States et al. v. United Regional Health Care System; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby publishes below the comment received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States and State of Texas v. United Regional Health Care System*, Civil Action No. 7:11-cv-00030-0, which was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Wichita Falls Division, on June 6, 2011, together with the response of the United States to the comment.

Copies of the comment and the response are available for inspection at the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-2481); on the Department of Justice's Web site at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>; and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Wichita Falls Division. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

In The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Wichita Falls Division

United States Of America And State Of Texas, (RCO) Plaintiffs, V. United Regional Health Care System, Defendant.

Case No.: 7:11-cv-00030

Response Of Plaintiff United States To Public Comment On The Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act,

15 U.S.C. § 16(b)–(h) (“APPA7 or “Tunney Act”), the United States hereby responds to the public comment received regarding the proposed Final Judgment in this case. The single comment received agrees that the proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint. The United States will move the Court for entry of the proposed Final Judgment after the public comment and this response have been published in the Federal Register, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 16(d).

On February 25, 2011, the United States and the State of Texas filed a civil antitrust lawsuit against Defendant United Regional Health Care System (“United Regional”) challenging United Regional’s contracts with commercial health insurers that effectively prevented insurers from contracting with United Regional’s competitors (“exclusionary contracts”). The Complaint alleged that United Regional had unlawfully used those contracts to maintain its monopoly for hospital services, in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2. By effectively preventing most commercial health insurers from including in their networks other inpatient and outpatient facilities, the Complaint alleged that United Regional (1) delayed and prevented the expansion and entry of its competitors, likely leading to higher health-care costs and higher health insurance premiums; (2) limited price competition for price-sensitive patients, likely leading to higher health-care costs for those patients; and (3) reduced quality competition between United Regional and its competitors. The Complaint sought to enjoin United Regional from entering exclusionary contracts with insurers.

Simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, the United States and the State of Texas filed a proposed Final Judgment and Stipulation signed by the plaintiffs and United Regional consenting to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16. Pursuant to those requirements, the United States also filed its Competitive Impact Statement (“CIS”) with the Court on February 25, 2011; published the proposed Final Judgment and CIS in the Federal Register on March 10, 2011, see 76 Fed. Reg. 13209; and had summaries of the terms of the proposed Final Judgment and CIS, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, published in The Washington Post and Times Record News for seven days

beginning on March 9, 2011, and ending on March 15, 2011. The sixty-day period for public comment ended on May 14, 2011. One comment was received, as described below and attached hereto.

I. THE INVESTIGATION AND PROPOSED RESOLUTION

The proposed Final Judgment is the culmination of an investigation by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice (“Department”) of United Regional’s contracting practices with commercial insurers. As part of its investigation, the Department issued more than fifteen Civil Investigative Demands for documents. The Department reviewed the documents and other materials received, conducted more than 80 interviews, and took oral testimony of United Regional personnel. The Department carefully analyzed the information obtained and thoroughly considered all of the issues presented.

The Department found that beginning in 1998, United Regional responded to the competitive threat posed by the entry of a competing hospital, Kell West; and other outpatient-surgery facilities by systematically entering into exclusionary contracts with commercial health insurers. The precise terms of these contracts varied, but all shared the same anticompetitive feature: a significant pricing penalty if an insurer contracts with competing facilities within a region that is no larger than Wichita County. In general, the contracts offered a substantially larger discount off billed charges (e.g., 25%) if United Regional was the only local hospital or outpatient surgical provider in the insurer’s network; and the contracts provided for a much smaller discount (e.g., 5% off billed charges) if the insurer contracted with one of United Regional’s rivals.

Within three months after Kell West opened in January 1999, United Regional had entered into exclusionary contracts with five commercial health insurers, and by 2010, it had exclusionary contracts with eight insurers. In each instance, United Regional-not the insurer-required the exclusionary provisions in the contract. The only major insurer that did not sign an exclusionary contract with United Regional was Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas (“Blue Cross”), by far the largest insurer in Wichita Falls and Texas.

Because United Regional is a “must have” hospital for any insurer that wants to sell health insurance in the Wichita Falls area, and because the penalty for contracting with United Regional’s rivals was so significant, most insurers entered into exclusionary contracts with United Regional.