TEXAS

Travis County

All Saints' Chapel, 209 W. 27th St., Austin, 15000543

Simpson Memorial Methodist Church, (East Austin MRA) 1701 E. 12th St., Austin, 15000544

VIRGINIA

Accomack County

Tangier Island Historic District (Boundary Increase), S. of Tangier Island in Chesapeake Bay, Tangier, 15000545

Chesapeake Independent City

Cornland School, 2309 Benefit Rd., Chesapeake (Independent City), 15000546

Danville Independent City

Danville Historic District (Boundary Increase), Jefferson Ave., Chestnut Pl., Grove, Chambers, 100 blks. Ross & Holbrook Sts., Danville (Independent City), 15000547

Halifax County

Mountain Road Historic District (Boundary Increase), Mountain Rd., Academy St., Poplar Ln., Halifax, 15000548

Hopewell Independent City

Downtown Hopewell Historic District (Boundary Increase and Decrease), E. Broadway Ave., S. Main & E. Poythress Sts., Hopewell (Independent City), 15000549

Pittsylvania County

Chatham Southern Railway Depot, 340 Whitehead St., Chatham, 15000550

WISCONSIN

Green County

Chalet of the Golden Fleece, 618 2nd St., New Glarus, 15000551

Rock County

Courier Building, 513 Vernal Ave., Milton, 15000552

[FR Doc. 2015-19011 Filed 8-3-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-51-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-925]

Certain Communications or Computing Devices and Components Thereof Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation in its Entirety Based Upon Settlement; Termination of Investigation; and Vacatur of Order No. 34; Correction

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Correction of Notice. The Commission hereby corrects the summary section of the notice

published in the **Federal Register** July 29, 2015 (80 FR 45232).

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. 41) terminating the above-captioned investigation in its entirety based upon settlement. The commission has also determined to vacate Order No. 34 as moot.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. 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 August 21, 2014, based on a Complaint filed by Enterprise Systems Technologies S.a.r.l. of Luxembourg ("Enterprise"). 79 FR 49537-38 (Aug. 21, 2014). The Complaint alleges 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 communications or computing devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,691,302 ("the '302 patent"); 5,870,610; 6,594,366; and 7,454,201. The notice of investigation named the following respondents: HTC Corporation of Taoyuan, Taiwan; HTC America, Inc. of Bellevue, Washington; LG Electronics Inc. of Seoul, Republic of Korea; LG Electronics USA, Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc. of San Diego, California; Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. of Seoul, Republic of Korea; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; Samsung

Telecommunications America, LLC of Richardson, Texas (collectively, "Remaining Respondents"); Apple Inc. of Cupertino, California ("Apple"); and Cirrus Logic Inc. of Austin, Texas ("Cirrus"). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also named as a party to the investigation.

On September 9, 2014, the ALJ issued an initial determination, Order No. 6, granting intervenor status to Google Inc. of Mountain View, California ("Google"). On March 9, 2015, the ALJ issued an ID, Order No. 20, terminating the investigation as to Cirrus. On June 5, 2015, the ALJ issued an ID, Order No. 37, terminating the investigation as to Apple. The Commission determined not to review those IDs.

On May 21, 2015, the ALJ issued Order No. 34, an initial determination terminating the '302 patent from the investigation based upon a lack of standing. Enterprise filed a petition for review on May 28, 2015. The parties subsequently moved for a 60-day extension to file any further briefing on the issue. The Commission granted the motion on June 1, 2015, and extended the date for determining whether to review Order No. 34 to August 21, 2015. Thus, Order No. 34 remains outstanding.

On June 22, 2015, Enterprise, Remaining Respondents, and Google jointly moved to terminate the investigation in its entirety based upon settlement. On June 29, 2015, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion. No other responses to the motion were received.

The ALJ issued the subject ID on July 1, 2015, and a corrected version on July 17, 2015, granting the joint motion for termination. The ALJ found that the settlement agreement satisfies the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21(b). She further found, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(2), that there is no indication that termination of the investigation would adversely impact the public interest. No one petitioned for review of the ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID as corrected. In light of the settlement, the Commission has determined to vacate Order No. 34 as moot.

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 29, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-18984 Filed 8-3-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration [Docket No. DEA-392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Registration: Johnson Matthey, Inc.

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: Johnson Matthey, Inc. applied to be registered as an importer of certain basic classes of controlled substances. The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) grants Johnson Matthey, Inc., registration as an importer of those controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By notice dated April 14, 2015, and published in the Federal Register on April 22, 2015, 80 FR 22559, Johnson Matthey, Inc., Pharmaceutical Materials, 2003 Nolte Drive, West Deptford, New Jersey 08066–1742 applied to be registered as an importer of certain basic classes of controlled substances. No comments or objections were submitted for this notice. Comments and requests for hearings on applications to import narcotic raw material are not appropriate. 72 FR 3417, (January 25, 2007).

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823, 952(a) and 958(a) and determined that the registration of Johnson Matthey, Inc. to import the basic classes of controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated the company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing the company's physical security systems, verifying the company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing the company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 952(a) and 958(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34, the above-named company is granted registration as an importer of the basic classes controlled substances:

Controlled substance	Schedule
Coca Leaves (9040)	
Thebaine (9333) Opium, raw (9600)	Ш
Noroxymorphone (9668)	H

Controlled substance	Schedule
Poppy Straw Concentrate (9670) Fentanyl (9801)	II II

The company plans to import thebaine derivatives and fentanyl as reference standards.

The company plans to import the remaining listed controlled substances as raw materials, to be used in the manufacture of bulk controlled substances, for distribution to its customers.

Dated: July 29, 2015.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,

Deputy Assistant Administrator. [FR Doc. 2015–19107 Filed 8–3–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 15-15]

Adeline Davies Essien, M.D.; Decision and Order

On March 25, 2015, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Christopher B. McNeil issued the attached Recommended Decision. Neither party filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision.

Having reviewed the record in its entirety, I adopt the ALJ's findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommended order.¹ Accordingly, I will order that Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration be revoked and that any pending application to renew or modify her registration be denied.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3), as well as 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration BE6969541, issued to Adeline Davies Essien, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending application of Adeline Davies Essien, M.D., to renew or modify her registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective September 3, 2015.

Dated: July 27, 2015.

Chuck Rosenberg,

Acting Administrator.

Frank W. Mann, Esq., for the Government. Thomas P. O'Connell, Esq., for the Respondent.

ORDER GRANTING THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION and FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

Administrative Law Judge Christopher B. McNeil. On January 21, 2015, the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause as to why the DEA should not revoke DEA Certificate of Registration Number BE6969541 issued to Adeline Davies Essien, M.D., the Respondent in this matter. The Order seeks to revoke Respondent's registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and 823(f), and to deny any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration, and deny any applications for any new DEA registrations pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f). As grounds for denial, the Government alleges that Respondent is "currently without authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Illinois, the state in which [Respondent is] registered with the DEA.'

On February 27, 2015, the DEA's Office of Administrative Law Judges received Respondent's written request for a hearing, which is dated February 26, 2015. Respondent stated that she objected to the Government's allegation regarding Respondent's authority to handle controlled substances. Respondent further stated that she "does have authority to practice medicine and handle controlled substances."

On March 3, 2015, this Office issued an Order for Briefing on Allegations Concerning Respondent's Lack of State Authority, Order for Prehearing Statements, and Order Setting the Matter for Hearing. In the Order, I mandated that the parties provide briefs regarding the allegation that Respondent lacks state authority to handle controlled substances no later than 2:00 p.m. on March 17, 2015. In my Order, I also provided that responses to any briefs be submitted by no later than 2:00 p.m. on March 24, 2015. On March 17, 2015, I timely received the Government's Response to Order and Motion for Summary Disposition. According to the Government's motion,

¹I take official notice of the fact that, according to the registration records of the Agency, Respondent retains an active registration as of this date. Pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.59(e), Respondent may controvert this finding by filing a properly supported motion, no later than 10 days from the date of this Order.