

Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at USITC.² The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS.³ 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 has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of ViXS Systems, Inc. and ViXS USA, Inc. on April 17, 2014. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 set-top boxes, gateways, bridges, and adapters and components thereof. The complainant name as respondents Entropic Communications, Inc. of San Diego, CA; DirecTV, LLC of El Segundo, CA; Wistron Corporation, of Taiwan; Wistron NeWeb Corporation, of Taiwan and Cybertan of Taiwan. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a permanent limited exclusion order and a permanent cease and desist orders.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 3008") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, *Electronic Filing Procedures*⁴). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.⁵

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 sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

Issued: April 18, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014-09291 Filed 4-23-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-901]

Certain Handheld Magnifiers and Products Containing Same Terminating An Investigation on the Basis of a Consent Order; Issuance of Consent Order

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 the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 4) granting the respondents' unopposed motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation in its entirety on the basis of a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. The Commission has issued the subject consent order, and has terminated the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sidney A. Rosenzweig, 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) 205-2000. 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>. 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 15, 2013, based on a

² United States International Trade Commission (USITC): <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

³ Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

⁴ Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf.

⁵ Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

complaint filed by Freedom Scientific, Inc. of St. Petersburg, Florida (“Freedom”). 78 FR 68862 (Nov. 15, 2013). 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 handheld magnifiers and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Design Patent No. D624,107 and U.S. Patent No. 8,264,598. The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents Aumed Group Corp. of Beijing, China, and Aumed Inc. of San Carlos, California (collectively, “Aumed”).

On December 18, 2013, Aumed moved to terminate the investigation based upon a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. See 19 CFR 210.21(c). Freedom did not oppose the motion. On December 27, 2013, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion. On February 12, 2014, Aumed filed a substitute consent order stipulation executed by Aumed, as opposed to Aumed counsel.

On March 20, 2014, the ALJ granted the motion as an ID. Order No. 4 at 3. The ALJ found that the substitute consent order stipulation conforms with Commission Rule 210.21(c)(3), 19 CFR 210.21(c)(3), and that the proposed consent order is consistent with Commission Rule 210.21(c)(4), 19 CFR 210.21(c)(4). Order No. 4 at 2. Further, the ALJ found that the public interest favored granting Aumed’s motion. *Id.* at 2–3; see 19 CFR 210.50(b)(2).

No petitions for review were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the ID. The Commission has issued the subject consent order, and has terminated the investigation.

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

Issued: April 18, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014–09297 Filed 4–23–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–Ta–641 (Remand)]

Certain Variable Speed Wind Turbines and Components Thereof Commission Determination To Grant a Joint Motion To Terminate the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to grant a joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

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 the original investigation on March 31, 2008, based upon a complaint filed on behalf of General Electric of Fairfield, Connecticut (“GE”) on February 7, 2008. 73 FR 16910. The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 variable speed wind turbines and components thereof that infringe claims 121–125 of U.S. Patent No. 5,083,039 (“the ‘039 patent’”) and claims 1–12, 15–18, and 21–28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,921,985 (“the ‘985 patent’”). The complaint named as respondents Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan and Mitsubishi Power Systems, Inc. of Lake Mary, Florida (collectively, “Mitsubishi”), and a third

entity which was subsequently found not to import. On October 8, 2008, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 10) granting GE’s motion to amend its complaint and the notice of investigation to add claims 1–19 of United States Patent No. 7,321,221 (“the ‘221 patent’”) to the investigation.

On August 7, 2009, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337. The ALJ found a violation of section 337 with respect to the ‘039 patent and the ‘985 patent but not the ‘221 patent.

On January 8, 2010, the Commission issued notice of its final determination of no violation of section 337 as to all of these patents. With respect to the ‘985 patent, the Commission found that GE failed to satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement.

GE filed an appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. On motion by the Commission, the Court dismissed the appeal as to the ‘039 patent and thereby vacated as moot the Commission determination as to that patent. Subsequently, the Court affirmed the Commission’s determination as to the ‘221 patent, and reversed the Commission’s determination that GE had not satisfied the domestic industry requirement as to the ‘985 patent. The opinion originally issued by the Court contained a further Part III, which commented on the Commission’s authority to take no position on an issue pursuant to *Beloit Corp. v. Valmet Oy*, 742 F.2d 1421 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Subsequently, the panel granted a petition for rehearing, withdrawing Part III of its Opinion. *General Electric Co. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, Order, 692 F.3d 1218 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

The Federal Circuit issued its mandate on August 27, 2012. Subsequently, the Commission received numerous unsolicited submissions from the parties concerning the merits of the remand. The Commission also received a motion for sanctions by Mitsubishi against GE, a response thereto by GE, and motions for leave to file a reply and surreply.

On January 2, 2014, GE and Mitsubishi filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement pursuant to Commission rule 210.21(b), 19 CFR 210.21(b). The parties stated that termination is in the interest of the public and administrative economy. On January 27, 2014, the Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) filed a response in opposition, stating that the public version of the settlement agreement was overly redacted. On