

decided to conduct a full review of the antidumping duty order on imports of silicomanganese from Venezuela. The Commission found that the respondent interested party group responses with respect to the reviews on subject imports from India and Kazakhstan were inadequate. Notwithstanding this, the Commission determined to conduct full reviews of the antidumping duty orders on imports of silicomanganese from India and Kazakhstan to promote administrative efficiency in light of its decision to conduct a full review with respect to the order on subject imports from Venezuela. A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

**Authority:** This review is 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.

Issued: January 15, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-01089 Filed 1-18-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-813]

### Investigations: Terminations, Modifications and Rulings: Certain Electronic Devices With Graphics Data Processing Systems, Components Thereof, and Associated Software

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (Order No. 32) terminating the above-captioned investigation in its entirety based upon a settlement agreement. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Clark S. Cheney, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2661. 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 November 14, 2011, based on a complaint filed by S3 Graphics Co., Ltd., of Grand Cayman Islands, British West Indies, and S3 Graphics, Inc., of Fremont, California (collectively, "S3G"). 76 FR 70490 (Nov. 14, 2011). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain electronic devices with graphics data processing systems, components thereof, and associated software, by reason of infringement of various claims of four United States patents. The notice of investigation named Apple Inc. of Cupertino, California ("Apple"), as the only respondent.

On November 19, 2012, S3G and Apple filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based upon a settlement agreement. On December 7, 2012, S3G and Apple supplemented their motion. On December 12, 2012, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the motion to terminate.

On December 13, 2012, the ALJ granted the motion and issued an initial determination ("ID") terminating the investigation in its entirety. The ALJ found that termination of the investigation based upon an alternative method of dispute resolution is generally in the public interest. The ALJ further found that granting the motion would not be contrary to the public interest. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID. The investigation is terminated.

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 Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

Issued: January 15, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-01090 Filed 1-18-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and Clean Air Act

On January 14, 2013, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of the Virgin Islands in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Government of the Virgin Islands, et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:10-cv-48.

In this action the United States seeks, among other things, injunctive relief and civil penalties for the failure by the Government of the Virgin Islands ("GVI") and the Virgin Islands Waste Management Authority ("WMA") to operate the Anguilla Landfill on St. Croix in compliance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA") and the Clean Air Act ("CAA"). The proposed Consent Decree provides for the GVI and WMA to: (a) Operate and maintain the landfill in accordance with RCRA; (b) construct and operate a landfill gas collection and combustion system (GCCS); (c) construct and operate a storm water collection system; (d) install groundwater monitoring wells; (e) implement closure of the landfill in phases beginning in 2014; (f) remove and dispose of off-site used tires remaining at the landfill; (g) remove and dispose of off-site scrap metal remaining at the landfill; (h) remediate the soils in the former scrap metal storage area; (i) construct and operate a scrap metal management facility; (j) implement a waste diversion/recycling program; and (k) pay a civil penalty of \$50,000.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. Government of the Virgin Islands, et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-5-2-1-08776. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments—	Send them to—
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 Consent Decree 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 Consent Decree 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 \$11.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

**Ronald G. Gluck,**

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

[FR Doc. 2013–01103 Filed 1–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### ***United States v. Oklahoma State Chiropractic Independent Physicians Association and Larry M. Bridges; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement***

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma in *United States of America v. Oklahoma State Chiropractic Independent Physicians Association and Larry M. Bridges*, Civil Case No. 13–CV–21–TCK–TLW. On January 10, 2013, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the Defendants and other competing chiropractors in Oklahoma formed a conspiracy to gain more favorable fees and other contractual terms by agreeing to coordinate their actions, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The proposed Final Judgment, enjoins the Defendants from establishing prices or terms for chiropractic services.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the 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.justice.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to Peter J. Mucchetti, Chief, Litigation I Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 4100, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–307–0001).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement.*

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

(1) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff,*  
v.

(1) OKLAHOMA STATE CHIROPRACTIC INDEPENDENT PHYSICIANS ASSOCIATION and (2) LARRY M. BRIDGES,  
*Defendants.*

Case No 13–CV–21–TCK–TLW

#### COMPLAINT

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against Defendants Oklahoma State Chiropractic Independent Physicians Association (“OSCIPA”) and Larry M. Bridges to obtain equitable and other relief to prevent and remedy violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Plaintiff alleges:

#### I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant OSCIPA is an association of approximately 350 chiropractors who compete with each other in the sale of chiropractic services. OSCIPA's members comprise approximately 45 percent of all chiropractors practicing in Oklahoma. Defendant Bridges is OSCIPA's executive director and manages all of OSCIPA's activities, including OSCIPA's contracting with health insurers, health-care provider rental networks, and other payers (collectively “payers”), and handles many of OSCIPA's communications with its members.

2. Since at least 1997, all of OSCIPA's members have entered into membership

agreements with OSCIPA that give OSCIPA the right to collectively negotiate rates on its members' behalf with payers. Since at least 2004, OSCIPA's membership agreements require its members to suspend all of their pre-existing contracts with those payers with which OSCIPA negotiates contracts.

3. From 2004 to 2011, on behalf of all OSCIPA's members, Defendants negotiated contracts with at least seven payers that set the prices and price-related terms between OSCIPA's members and those payers. Defendants' conduct has raised the prices of chiropractic services and decreased the availability of chiropractic services in Oklahoma.

4. The United States, through this suit, asks this Court to declare Defendants' conduct illegal and to enter injunctive relief to prevent further injury to consumers of chiropractic services.

#### II. DEFENDANTS

5. OSCIPA is a corporation organized and doing business under the laws of the State of Oklahoma, with its principal place of business in Tulsa.

6. Larry M. Bridges has been employed by OSCIPA as its executive director since at least 1999. As alleged below, Bridges negotiated on behalf of OSCIPA's members at least seven contracts with payers, and Bridges signed several of those contracts on OSCIPA's behalf.

#### III. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE

7. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4, to obtain equitable and other relief to prevent and restrain Defendants' violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

8. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action under Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.

9. Defendants have consented to personal jurisdiction and venue in this District. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant, and venue is proper in the Northern District of Oklahoma under Section 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 22, and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because Defendants are found, have transacted business, and committed acts in furtherance of the alleged violations in this District. A substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.

10. Defendants engage in interstate commerce, and their activities—including the conduct alleged in this Complaint—substantially affect interstate commerce. Defendants' conduct increased prices for chiropractic services that some non-Oklahoma residents traveled to Oklahoma to purchase and consume, and which a number of payers paid for across state lines.

#### IV. OTHER CONSPIRATORS

11. Various persons not named as defendants in this action have participated as conspirators with Defendants in the offenses alleged and have performed acts and made statements in furtherance of the alleged conspiracies.