

the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), 207.24, and 207.66 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 business days prior to the date of the hearing.

**Written submissions.**—Each party to the reviews may submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.65 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is May 7, 2013. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.67 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is May 28, 2013; witness testimony must be filed no later than three days before the hearing. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the reviews may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the reviews on or before May 28, 2013. On June 28, 2013, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before July 2, 2013, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.68 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. Please be aware that the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing have been amended. The amendments took effect on November 7, 2011. See 76 FR 61937 (Oct. 6, 2011) and the newly revised Commission's Handbook on E-Filing, available on the Commission's Web site at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

Additional written submissions to the Commission, including requests pursuant to section 201.12 of the Commission's rules, shall not be accepted unless good cause is shown for accepting such submissions, or unless the submission is pursuant to a specific request by a Commissioner or Commission staff.

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 BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

**Authority:** These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 29, 2012.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2012-29263 Filed 12-4-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-893 (Second Review)]

### Honey From China; Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on honey from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

### Background

The Commission instituted this review on July 2, 2012 (77 FR 39257) and determined on October 5, 2012 that it would conduct an expedited review (77 FR 65204, October 25, 2012).

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on November 29, 2012. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4364 (November 2012), entitled *Honey from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-893 (Second Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 29, 2012.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2012-29290 Filed 12-4-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-790]

### Certain Coenzyme Q10 Products and Methods of Making Same; Commission Determination (1) To Review and Affirm With Respect To Two Issues, (2) To Review and Vacate With Respect To One Issue, and (3) Not To Review the Remainder of the Final Initial Determination of the Administrative Law Judge; 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 the following: (1) To review and affirm (a) the finding that Mitsubishi Gas Chemical Co., Inc. ("MGC") does not satisfy the 70 mole % limitation, and (b) the claim construction of "inert gas atmosphere" with respect to the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,910,340 ("the '340 patent"); (2) to review and vacate the finding that certain asserted claims of the '340 patent are not invalid under the new matter prohibition of 35 U.S.C. 132; and (3) not to review the remainder of the final initial determination of the administrative law judge ("ALJ") in the above-captioned investigation. This action terminates the investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James A. Worth, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3065. 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 instituted this investigation on July 19, 2011, based on a complaint filed on June 17, 2011, by Kaneka Corp.

<sup>1</sup>The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

of Osaka, Japan (“Kaneka”), and supplemented on June 24 and 27, 2011. 76 FR 42729 (July 19, 2011). The complaint alleged violations of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the sale for importation, importation, or sale after importation into the United States of certain coenzyme Q10 products by reason of infringement of certain claims of the ‘340 patent. The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents Zhejiang Medicine Co., Ltd. of Zhejiang, China; ZMC–USA, LLC of The Woodlands, Texas; Xiamen Kingdomway Group Co. of Xiamen, China; Pacific Rainbow International Inc. of City of Industry, California; MGC of Tokyo, Japan; Maypro Industries, Inc. of Purchase, New York (“Maypro Inc.”); and Shenzhen Biology & Technology Co., Ltd. of Beijing, China.

On January 12, 2012, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID granting a motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add a new respondent, Mitsubishi Gas Chemical America, Inc. of New York, New York and to replace respondent Maypro Inc. with Maypro Industries, LLC of Purchase, New York.

An evidentiary hearing was held from July 9–13, 2012.

On September 27, 2012, the presiding ALJ (Judge Rogers) issued a final initial determination (“final ID” or “ID”) finding no violation of section 337. The ALJ also issued a recommended determination on remedy and bonding.

Specifically, the ALJ found that the imported products were not shown to be manufactured by processes covered by the asserted claims. The ALJ found that Kaneka satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement but failed to satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement. The ALJ found that the asserted claims were not shown to be invalid.

On October 10, 2012, Kaneka filed a petition for review of the final ID. The Respondents and the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) filed contingent petitions for review. On October 18, 2012, each party filed a response (with Kaneka filing separate responses to the Respondents and the IA).

Having reviewed the final ID, the petitions for review, and the record in this investigation, the Commission has determined the following: (1) To review and affirm (a) the finding that MGC does not satisfy the 70 mole % limitation, and (b) the claim construction of “inert gas atmosphere” with respect to the asserted claims of the ‘340 patent; (2) to review and vacate the finding that the asserted claims of the ‘340 patent are

not invalid under the new matter prohibition of 35 U.S.C. § 132; and (3) not to review the remainder of the final initial determination of the ALJ, including the ALJ’s finding that certain asserted claims of ‘340 patent are not invalid under 35 U.S.C. 112. This action terminates the investigation.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of section 210.42(h) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42(h)).

By order of the Commission.  
Issued: November 29, 2012.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2012–29311 Filed 12–4–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act and Proposed Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

On November 28, 2012, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree and Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction with the United States District Court for the District of Utah in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Parish Chemical Company and Uintah Pharmaceutical Corporation*, Civil Action No. 09–804.

This action involves the claim of the United States under Section 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9607(a), for reimbursement of its unreimbursed response costs (“CERCLA Claim”) incurred in response to releases and/or threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Parish Chemical Company (“PCC”) chemical manufacturing facility located at 145 N. Geneva Road, Vineyard Utah (“PCC Facility”). This action also involves multiple claims of the United States under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6901 *et seq.* (“RCRA”), to obtain injunctive relief and civil penalties (“RCRA Claims”) for multiple violations of RCRA at the PCC Facility. The Consent Decree provides for the entry of a judgment in the amount of \$908,348.57 against the Defendants, and obligates the Defendants to transfer

possession of the PCC facility into a trust to resolve the United States’ CERCLA Claim. The Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction provide for a \$100,000 civil penalty to be adjudged against PCC, and the entry of a permanent injunction against PCC to resolve the United States’ RCRA Claims.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree and Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States versus Parish Chemical Company and Uintah Pharmaceutical Corporation*, Civil Action No. 09–804., D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–2–1215/1. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
By e-mail ....	<i>pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.</i>
By mail .....	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Decree and Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: [http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html). We will provide a paper copy of the proposed Consent Decree and Stipulated Judgment and Permanent Injunction upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to:

Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—  
ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington,  
DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$13.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

**Robert Brook,**

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

[FR Doc. 2012–29265 Filed 12–4–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–15–P**