

Mount Diablo Meridian, California

- T. 5 N., R. 4 E., the dependent resurvey of a portion of the south boundary and the metes-and-bounds survey of certain parcels, accepted June 28, 2016.
- T. 20 N., R. 7 E., the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines and a portion of the Brown Bear Lode (U.S. Mineral Survey No. 5690) and the subdivision of section 11, accepted July 22, 2016.
- T. 6 N., R. 12 E., the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines and the subdivision of section 24, accepted August 5, 2016.
- T. 6 N., R. 13 E., the corrective resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines and a portion of the subdivision of section 20, and the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivision of section 19, accepted August 8, 2016.

San Bernardino Meridian, California

- T. 4 S., R. 4 E., a supplemental plat, showing a corrected distance on the north line of lot 3 and showing the bearing and distance of the west line of lot 1 in the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of section 24, accepted July 25, 2016.
- T. 2 N., R. 8 W., the metes-and-bounds survey of Tract 37, accepted August 1, 2016.

Authority: 43 U.S.C., Chapter 3.

Dated: August 10, 2016.

Jon L. Kehler,

(Acting) Chief Cadastral Surveyor, California.

[FR Doc. 2016-20388 Filed 8-24-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-962]

Certain Resealable Packages With Slider Devices; Commission Decision To Review-in-Part an Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; On Review, To Modify-in-Part the Initial Determination and To Take No Position on One Issue; Affirmance of the Finding of No Violation and 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 to review-in-part a final initial determination (“ID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) finding no violation of section 337. On review, the Commission has determined to modify-in-part the ID and to take no position with respect to one issue. The Commission has also determined to affirm the ID’s finding of no violation of

section 337 and has terminated the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clint Gerdine, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2310. 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 <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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 20, 2015, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Reynolds Presto Products Inc. of Appleton, Wisconsin. 80 FR 42839-40. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation in the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain resealable packages with slider devices by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Reexamination Certificate No. 6,427,421 and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,524,002 and 7,311,443. The complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission’s notice of investigation named Inteplast Group, Ltd. of Livingston, New Jersey and Minigrip, LLC of Alpharetta, Georgia as respondents. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is participating in this investigation.

On March 14, 2016, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review the ALJ’s ID (Order No. 8) granting complainant’s motion for summary determination that it has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(A) and (B) for all asserted patents.

On June 20, 2016, the ALJ issued his final ID finding no violation of section 337. The ALJ found that none of respondents’ accused products infringe any of the asserted patents. He also found that the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement had been

satisfied with respect to the ‘443 patent, but not with respect to the ‘421 or ‘002 patents. The ALJ also issued his recommended determination (RD) on remedy and bond. The ALJ recommended, in the event the Commission finds a violation, that both limited exclusion and cease and desist orders should issue against infringing products and each respondent.

On July 6, 2016, complainant and respondents each filed a petition for review of the final ID. On July 14, 2016, complainant, OUII, and respondents each filed a response to the opposing petition.

Having examined the record of this investigation including the ID, the parties’ petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review-in-part the final ID. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review (1) the ID’s finding of no invalidity of claim 1 of the ‘443 patent under 35 U.S.C. 102(b); and (2) the ID’s analysis regarding infringement of the ‘421 patent. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the final ID.

On review with respect to issue (1), the Commission determines to take no position on the ID’s finding of no invalidity of claim 1 of the ‘443 patent under § 102(b). On review with respect to issue (2), the Commission modifies-in-part the final ID. Specifically, the Commission supplements the ID’s finding of no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents of asserted claim 39 of the ‘421 patent with respect to the “feeding a zipper sheet” limitation (ID at 45-49) with the following:

Presto’s doctrine of equivalents arguments are so broad that they read the limitation “reasably adhered” out of asserted claim 39. “Under the all elements rule, there can be no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents if even one limitation of a claim or its equivalent is not present in the accused device. . . . Thus, if a court determines that a finding of infringement under the doctrine of equivalents ‘would entirely vitiate a particular claim[ed] element,’ [as the case is here with respect to the “reasably adhered” limitation] then the court should rule that there is no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents.” *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.*, 324 F.3d 1308, 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

The Commission therefore affirms the ID’s finding of no violation of section 337 and terminates 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 part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR part 210.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 19, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–20357 Filed 8–24–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–808 (Third Review)]

Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Russia; Scheduling of an Expedited Five-Year Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Russia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 5, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Szustakowski ((202) 205–3169), Office of Investigations, U.S.

International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436.

Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On August 5, 2016, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (81 FR 26256, May 2, 2016) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.¹ Accordingly,

¹ 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.

the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)).

For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on August 31, 2016, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission’s rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission’s rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,² and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before September 6, 2016 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by September 6, 2016. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce’s final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce’s results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules with respect to filing were revised effective July 25, 2014. See 79 FR 35920 (June 25, 2014), and the revised Commission Handbook on E-filing, available from the Commission’s Web site at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be

² The Commission has found the responses submitted by AK Steel Corporation, ArcelorMittal USA LLC, Nucor Corporation, SSAB Enterprises LLC, Steel Dynamics Inc., and United States Steel Corporation to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (see 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

served on all other parties to the review (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: 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.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 19, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–20334 Filed 8–24–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Miscellaneous Tariff Bill (MTB) Petition System Submission of Petition and Comment Forms for OMB Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of submission of request for approval of a questionnaire to the Office of Management and Budget. This notice is being given pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Purpose of Information Collection: The information requested by these forms is for use by the Commission in connection with evaluating miscellaneous tariff petitions submitted under the authority of American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016 (Pub. L. 114–159 approved May 20, 2016). Section 3 of this Act establishes a process for the submission and consideration of petitions and public comments for duty suspensions and reductions for imported goods in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States. The collection periods are 60-day periods starting October 15, 2016 and October 15, 2019.

Summary of Proposal:

- (1) Number of forms submitted: 2.
- (2) Title of forms: MTB Petition System: Information for Petitions Form and MTB Petition System: Information for Comments Form.
- (3) Type of request: New.
- (4) Frequency of use: Once.
- (5) Description of affected industry: Domestic firms.
- (6) Estimated number of petitioners and commenters: up to 5,000 petitions; 14,000 comments.
- (7) Estimated total number of hours to complete the form: 8 hours for compiling information and submitting petitions and 2 hours to draft and submit comments.