and that it is in the interest of the public and administrative economy to grant the Motion. The Motion also requests that the Commission limit service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties because the disclosure of the documents will prejudice Nokia's ongoing discussions with Google and its customers.

On February 12, 2014, Google stated that it has no position on the Motion because none of the patents upon which it had intervened were currently before the Commission.

The Commission finds that the Motion complies with the Commission Rules, and there is no evidence that the proposed settlement will be contrary to the public interest. The Commission therefore determines to grant the Motion, and to terminate the investigation. The Commission also finds that good cause exists to limit the service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties, and grants the request to limit service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties.

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: March 7, 2014. By order of the Commission. **Lisa R. Barton,** *Acting Secretary to the Commission.* [FR Doc. 2014–05468 Filed 3–12–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

# DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

# Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in United States v. A. Derek Hoyte, et al., Case No. C10–2044BHS, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington on February 28, 2014.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against Defendants Derek A. Hoyte, Columbia Pacific Enterprises, Inc., and Columbia Crest Partners LLC, in part pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319, to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendants to restore the impacted areas and to pay a civil penalty.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to the Clean Water Act aspects of this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Brian C. Kipnis, Assistant United States Attorney, Office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, 5220 United States Courthouse, 700 Stewart Street, Seattle, Washington 98101 and refer to United States v. Derek A. Hoyte, et al., Case No. C10–2044BHS, U.S.A.O. #2010V00667.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Western District of Washington in Seattle, located at 700 Stewart Street, Suite 2310, Seattle, Washington 98101, or in Tacoma, located at 1717 Pacific Avenue, Room 3100, Tacoma, Washington 98402. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at http://www.justice.gov/ enrd/Consent\_Decrees.html.

## Cherie L. Rogers,

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

[FR Doc. 2014–05439 Filed 3–12–14; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. Procedural History	5
I. Procedural History II. The Complaint and the Proposed Settlement	5
A. The Complaint B. The Proposed Final Judgment	5
R The Proposed Final Judgment	10
D. The Proposed Phila Judgment	10
1. Terms of the Proposed Final Judgment and Status of the Divestitures	10
2. Explanation of the Proposed Final Judgment	11
a. Consumer Benefits from LCC Entry	12
b. The Importance of the Remedy Assets to Enhancing LCC Competition	14
b. The Importance of the Remedy Assets to Enhancing LCC Competition III. Standard of Judicial Review	19
IV. Public Comments and the United States' Response	23
A. Any Challenge to the Merits of the Complaint Is Beyond the Scope of Tunney Act Review	25
B. The Proposed Settlement Will Counteract Competitive Harm From the Merger by Enhancing LCC Competition	27
1. LCCs Provide Meaningful Competition	27
2. The Remedy Adequately Addresses the Harms Alleged in the Complaint	31
C. The Remedy Does Not Mandate Changes in Service Patterns at Reagan National	36

# DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### **Antitrust Division**

# United States, et al., v. US Airways Group, Inc., et al.; 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 Response of the United States to Public Comments on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States, et al.,* v. *US Airways Group, Inc., et al.,* Civil Action No. 1:13–CV–1236–CKK (D.D.C. 2013).

Copies of the 14 Public Comments and the Response of the United States to Public Comments are available for inspection at the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 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/cases/ usairways/index.html; and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may also be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

#### Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al. Plaintiffs, v. US AIRWAYS GROUP, INC. and AMR CORPORATION DEFENDANTS. Case No. 1:13–cv–1236 (CKK)

RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT