

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-821]

Certain Dynamic Random Access Memory Devices, and Products Containing Same; Institution of Investigation Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on November 21, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Nanya Technology Corporation of Kueishan, Taiwan. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain dynamic random access memory devices, and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,566 (“the ‘566 patent’”); U.S. Patent No. 6,399,983 (“the ‘983 patent’”); U.S. Patent No. 6,586,796 (“the ‘796 patent’”); and U.S. Patent No. 6,664,634 (“the ‘634 patent’”). The complaint 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 an exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, 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: The Office of the Secretary, Docket Services Division, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-1802.

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 (2011).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on December 20, 2011, 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 dynamic random access memory devices, and products containing same that infringe one or more of claims 5-10, 13, 14, and 16 of the ‘566 patent; claims 1-7 and 9-14 of the ‘983 patent; claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 of the ‘796 patent; and claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 13, and 15 of the ‘634 patent, 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: Nanya Technology Corporation, Hwa Ya Technology Park, 669, Fu Hsing 3rd Road, Kueishan, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan.

(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: Elpida Memory, Inc., Sumitomo Seimei Yaesu Building, 3rd Floor, 2-1 Yaesu 2-chome Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Elpida Memory (USA) Inc., 1175 Sonora Court, Sunnyvale, CA 94086.
Kingston Technology Co., Inc., 17600 Newhope Street, Fountain Valley, CA 92708.

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

(4) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations will not participate as a party in this investigation.

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: December 21, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-33080 Filed 12-23-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Notice is hereby given that on December 20, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree (“Consent Decree”) in *United States v. Dover Chemical Corporation*, Civil Action No. 5:11-cv-02754-BYP, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

In this action, the United States sought injunctive relief and penalties from Dover Chemical Corporation (“Dover”) for alleged violations of Sections 111 and 112 of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”), 42 U.S.C. 7411 and 7412; Title V of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7661 *et seq.*; and Title VI of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7671 *et seq.*, at Dover’s chemical manufacturing facility in Dover, Ohio. Under the Consent Decree, Dover will implement enhanced leak detection and repair practices more stringent than the minimum required by the regulations; accept and comply with the Hazardous and Miscellaneous Organic NESHAP at various process units; accept “major source” status under the CAA and apply