imports of xanthan gum from Austria and China. Accordingly, effective June 5, 2012, the Commission instituted antidumping duty investigation Nos. 731–TA–1202–03 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference 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** of July 12, 2012 (77 FR 34997). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on June 26, 2012, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on July 20, 2012. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4342 (July 2012), entitled *Xanthan Gum from Austria and China: Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1202–03 (Preliminary).*

Issued: July 23, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–18271 Filed 7–25–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–703]

Certain Mobile Telephones and Wireless Communication Devices Featuring Digital Cameras, and Components Thereof; Determination To Review the Initial Remand Determination in Part and on Review To Affirm a Determination of No Violation of Section 337; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to affirm, on modified grounds, the remand initial determination (''remand ID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on May 21, 2012, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337), as amended, (''section 337'') in the above-captioned investigation. The investigation is thus terminated with a finding of no violation of section 337.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amanda S. Pitcher, 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) 205–2737. 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: This investigation was instituted on February 23, 2010, based upon a complaint filed on behalf of Eastman Kodak Company of Rochester, New York (''Kodak'') on January 14, 2010, and supplemented on February 4, 2010. 75 *FR* 8112. The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile telephones and wireless communication devices featuring digital cameras, and components thereof, that infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,218 (''the '218 patent''). The notice of investigation named as respondents Apple, Inc. of Cupertino, California (''Apple''); Research in Motion, Ltd. of Ontario, Canada; and Research in Motion Corp. of Irving, Texas (collectively, ''RIM''). Claim 15 is the only asserted claim remaining in the investigation.

On January 24, 2011, then-Chief Judge Luckern issued a final Initial Determination (''final ID'') finding no violation of section 337. On March 25, 2011, the Commission determined to review the final ID in its entirety. 76 FR 17,965 (March 31, 2011). On June 30, 2011, the Commission issued a notice that determined to affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand in part, the final ID. The Commission remanded the investigation in order for the ALJ to consider (1) infringement under the Commission's construction of the ''still processor'' limitation; (2) infringement under the Commission's construction of the ''motion processor'' limitation; (3) whether Kodak waived the argument that the iPhone 3GS and iPhone 4 in their non-flash-photography mode practice the ''initiating capture'' limitation under the doctrine of equivalents and if not, whether the iPhone 3GS and iPhone 4 practice this limitation under the doctrine of equivalents; and (4) validity in light of the Commission's claim constructions, including further analysis of the pertinence of the *ex parte* reexaminations of the '218 patent and an explanation of the secondary considerations of nonobviousness. After remand, Chief Judge Luckern retired, and the investigation was reassigned to Judge Pender.

On May 21, 2012, Judge Pender issued the remand ID finding no violation of section 337. In particular, he found claim 15 to be obvious in view of Japanese Patent Application Laid-Open Disclosure No. H5–122574 (''Mori'') and U.S. Patent No. 5,493,335 to Parulski (''Parulski '335''). He found the claim to be infringed by the accused RIM products and by the Apple iPhone 3G, but not the iPhone 3GS and iPhone 4. Kodak and the Commission investigative attorney (''IA'') petitioned for review of, *inter alia,* the ALJ's finding that claim 15 of the '218 patent is invalid. RIM has petitioned for review of the ALJ's finding of infringement by the accused RIM products, the ALJ's failure to consider certain newly introduced products that RIM contends do not infringe, and the ALJ's finding that claim 15 is not obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,887,161 (Watanabe), U.S. Patent No. 3,971,065 (Bayer), and Sharp ViewCam. Apple petitioned for review of the ALJ's finding that the iPhone 3G infringes claim 15, and Apple joined in RIM's petition on the invalidity issues. The IA, Apple and RIM filed responses to Kodak's petition. The IA and Kodak filed responses to RIM's and Apple's petitions.

Having reviewed the record of this investigation, including the parties' petitions for review and responses thereto, as well as the parties' submissions to the ALJ, both before and after remand, and the transcripts of the hearing conducted by the ALJ, the Commission has determined to review the ALJ's remand ID in part. The Commission has determined to review the ALJ's finding of infringement of the '218 patent by the accused RIM products and the iPhone 3G, and his finding of invalidity based on the Mori and Parulski '335 combination. The Commission affirms the remaining findings of the ALJ. On review, the Commission has determined to (1) find that the accused RIM products and the Apple iPhone 3G infringe claim 15; and (2) affirm the ALJ's invalidity findings

regarding the Mori and Parulski '335 combination on modified grounds.

The Commission's determination and reasons in support thereof will be further detailed in the Commission's forthcoming opinion.

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 210.42–46 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–46).

Issued: July 20, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–18190 Filed 7–25–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)

Notice is hereby given that on July, 13, 2012, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Alcoa Inc., et al.,* Civil Action No. 3:12–cv–00210, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

This action pertains to the ''Malone Services Company'' Superfund Site in Texas City, Texas. The Consent Decree requires a group of 27 companies to clean up the Site and pay EPA $900,000 towards past and future costs. The cleanup will cost $56.4 million according to an estimate by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Seventy-six entities, including the United States and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), are resolving their liability in the Consent Decree by paying cash to the group of 27 companies that will carry out the cleanup. The United States, which shipped 1.62% of the waste, will pay $1,490,029. TCEQ, which shipped 0.00545% of the waste, will contribute $6,766. EPA previously completed four rounds of administrative settlements with approximately 230 ''de minimis'' generators of waste.

The settlement also addresses natural resources damages. Under the Consent Decree, the federal and state natural resource trustees for the Site will receive a total of $3,109,000 to implement environmental restoration projects. (This amount also covers some assessment, planning, and oversight costs.) The trustees are the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Department of the Interior represented by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, TCEQ, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and the Texas General Land Office.

For a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication the Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to *pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov*, or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to *United States* v. *Alcoa Inc., et al.,* D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–2–07465/4. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.* A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, or by faxing or emailing a request to ''Consent Decree Copy'' EESCDCopy (*EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov*), fax number (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–5271. If requesting a full copy of the Consent Decree from the Consent Decree Library—including 105 pages of defendant signature pages and the 242-page Record of Decision for the Site (September 2009) — please enclose a check in the amount of $116.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury, or, if requesting by email or fax, please forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the address given above. If requesting a copy of the proposed Consent Decree that includes neither the defendants' signature pages nor the appendix that is a copy of the Record of Decision for the Site, please enclose a check in the amount of $30.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Maureen M. Katz,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2012–18191 Filed 7–25–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of a Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Notice is hereby given that on July 2, 2012, a proposed Consent Decree in the case of *United States* v. *Hercules Incorporated,* No. 3:12CV483, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division. In this action, the United States sought relief for violations of Section 112 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7412, and implementing regulations at 40 CFR part 63, Subpart UUUU, the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Cellulose Products Manufacturing, and for violations of the Defendant's State-issued operating permit at its cellulose products manufacturing facility in Hopewell, Virginia. The proposed Consent Decree requires the Defendant to pay a civil penalty of $175,000, and to implement a program aimed at preventing future violations of the Clean Air Act at its Hopewell facility.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to *pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov,* or mailed to: P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to: *U.S.* v. *Hercules Incorporated.,* DJ. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–09609.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined at the following Department of Justice Web site: *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.* A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, or by faxing or emailing a request to ''Consent Decree Copy''(*EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov*), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–5271. If requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library by mail, please enclose a check in the amount of $16.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if requesting by email or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent