

9:00 Promenades and the Man base) from 10:00 a.m. Sunday through the end of day Tuesday, post event;

(vi) Passage through, without stopping, the public temporary closure area on the west or east playa roads or from the east side of the playa to the west and vice versa to traverse the entirety of the playa surface.

(vii) Support vehicles for art vehicles, mutant vehicles and theme camps will be allowed to drive to and from fueling stations.

(3) Definitions:

(i) A motor vehicle is any device designed for and capable of travel over land and which is self-propelled by a motor, but does not include any vehicle operated on rails or any motorized wheelchair.

(ii) Motorized wheelchair means a self-propelled wheeled device, designed solely for and used by a mobility-impaired person for locomotion.

(iii) "Trailer" means every vehicle without motive power designed to carry property or passengers wholly on its own structure and to be drawn by a motor vehicle, this includes camp trailers, pop-up trailers, 4' x 7' or larger flatbed trailers, enclosed cargo trailers, or RV style trailers.

(i) *Public Camping*

The public temporary closure area is closed to public camping with the following exception:

The permitted event's ticket holders who are camped in designated event areas provided by the permit holder and ticket holders who are camped in the authorized pilot camp and the permit holder's authorized staff, contractors and BLM authorized event management related camps are exempt from this closure.

(j) *Public Use*

The public temporary closure area is closed to use by members of the public unless that person:

(i) Is traveling through, without stopping, the public temporary closure area on the west or east playa roads; possesses a valid ticket to attend the event;

(ii) Is an employee or authorized volunteer with the BLM, a law enforcement officer, emergency medical service provider, fire protection agency employee working at the event and that individual is assigned to the event;

(iii) Is a person working at or attending the event on behalf of the permit holder; or is authorized by the permit holder to be onsite prior to the commencement of the event for the primary purpose of constructing,

creating, designing or installing art, displays, buildings, facilities or other items and structures in connection with the event;

(iv) Is an employee of a commercial operation contracted to provide services to the event organizers and/or participants authorized by the permit holder through a contract or agreement and authorized by BLM through a Special Recreation Permit.

(k) *Unmanned Aircraft Systems*

(1) The use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) is prohibited, unless the operator is authorized through and complies with the Remote Control BRC (RCBRC) program and operates the UAS in accordance with Federal laws and regulations, specifically the operational limitations under the Small Unmanned Aircraft Rule (Part 107).

(2) Definition:

(i) Unmanned aircraft means an aircraft operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from within or on the aircraft.

(ii) UAS is the unmanned aircraft and all of the associated support equipment, control station, data links, telemetry, communications and navigation equipment, etc., necessary to operate the unmanned aircraft.

(l) *Lasers*

(1) The possession and or use of handheld lasers is prohibited.

(2) Definition: A laser means any hand held laser beam device or demonstration laser product that emits a single point of light amplified by the stimulated emission of radiation that is visible to the human eye.

(m) *Weapons*

(1) The possession of any weapon is prohibited except weapons within motor vehicles passing, without stopping, through the public temporary closure area on the designated west or east playa roads or from the east side of the playa to the west and vice versa to traverse the entirety of the playa surface.

(2) The discharge of any weapon is prohibited.

(3) The prohibitions above shall not apply to county, State, tribal and Federal law enforcement personnel who are working in their official capacity at the event. "Art projects" that include weapons and are sanctioned by the permit holder will be permitted after obtaining authorization from the BLM authorized officer.

(4) Definitions:

(i) Weapon means a firearm, compressed gas or spring powered pistol or rifle, bow and arrow, cross bow, blowgun, spear gun, hand-thrown

spear, sling shot, irritant gas device, electric stunning or immobilization device, explosive device, any implement designed to expel a projectile, switch-blade knife, any blade which is greater than 10 inches in length from the tip of the blade to the edge of the hilt or finger guard nearest the blade (e.g., swords, dirks, daggers, machetes) or any other weapon the possession of which is prohibited by state law. Exception: This rule does not apply in a kitchen or cooking environment or where an event worker is wearing or utilizing a construction knife for their duties at the event.

(ii) Firearm means any pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other device which is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the ignition of a propellant.

(iii) Discharge means the expelling of a projectile from a weapon.

*Enforcement:* Any person who violates this temporary closure or any of these temporary restrictions may be tried before a United States Magistrate and fined in accordance with 18 U.S.C. 3571, imprisoned no more than 12 months under 43 U.S.C. 1733(a) and 43 CFR 8360.0-7, or both. In accordance with 43 CFR 8365.1-7, State or local officials may also impose penalties for violations of Nevada law.

**Authority:** 43 CFR 8364.1.

**Mark E. Hall,**

*Field Manager, Black Rock Field Office, Winnemucca District.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14177 Filed 6-29-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-945]

**Certain Network Devices, Related Software and Components Thereof (II) (Modification 2); Modification of Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Order; Termination of the Modification Proceeding as to U.S. Patent No. 6,377,577 and Suspension of the Modification Proceeding as to U.S. Patent No. 7,224,668**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to modify a limited exclusion order and a cease and desist order ("the remedial orders") issued against Arista Networks, Inc. of Santa Clara, California ("Arista") in Inv. No. 337-TA-945. The above-captioned

modification proceeding is terminated as to U.S. Patent No. 6,377,577 (“the ‘577 patent”) and is suspended as to U.S. Patent No. 7,224,668 (“the ‘668 patent”).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Megan M. Valentine, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2301. 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 January 27, 2015, based on a Complaint filed by Cisco Systems, Inc. of San Jose, California (“Cisco”). 80 FR 4313–14 (Jan. 27, 2015). The Complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,023,853 (“the ‘853 patent”); the ‘577 patent; 7,460,492 (“the ‘492 patent”); 7,061,875 (“the ‘875 patent”); the ‘668 patent; and 8,051,211 (“the ‘211 patent”). The Complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission’s Notice of Investigation named Arista as the respondent. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) was also named as a party to the investigation. The Commission terminated the investigation in part as to certain claims of the asserted patents. Notice (Nov. 18, 2015) (see Order No. 38 (Oct. 27, 2015)); Notice (Dec. 1, 2015) (see Order No. 47 (Nov. 9, 2015)).

On June 11, 2016, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office instituted separate *inter partes* review (“IPR”) proceedings concerning the ‘577 and ‘668 patents. *Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, Case IPR2016–00303 (regarding the ‘577 patent); *Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, Case IPR2016–00309 (regarding the ‘668 patent).

On May 4, 2017, the Commission found a violation of section 337 with respect to certain of the asserted claims of the ‘577 and ‘668 patents. Notice (May 4, 2017); 82 FR 21827–29 (May 10, 2017); see also Notice of Correction (May 30, 2017); 82 FR 25811 (June 5, 2017). The Commission issued a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) and a cease and desist order (“CDO”) against Arista. *Id.* The Commission did not find a violation with respect to the ‘853, ‘875, ‘492, and ‘211 patents. *Id.*

On May 25, 2017, the PTAB issued its final written decision finding claims 1, 7–10, 12–16, 18–22, 25, and 28–31 of the ‘577 patent unpatentable based on prior art not presented in the Commission investigation. On June 1, 2017, the PTAB issued its final written decision finding claims 1–10, 12, 13, 15–28, 30, 33–36, 55–64, 66, 67, and 69–72 of the ‘668 patent unpatentable based on certain combinations of prior art not presented in the Commission investigation.

On June 30, 2017, Cisco filed a notice of appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”), seeking review of the Commission’s finding of no violation as to the ‘853, ‘875, ‘492, and ‘211 patents. *Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, Appeal No. 17–2289. On July 21, 2017, Arista filed a notice of appeal with the Federal Circuit, seeking review of the Commission’s finding of violation as to the ‘577 and ‘668 patents. *Arista Networks, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, Appeal No. 17–2336. On August 3, 2017, the Federal Circuit consolidated the Arista and Cisco appeals. *Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, Appeal No. 17–2289, Dkt. No. 20. The consolidated appeal is currently pending before the Federal Circuit.

On August 25, 2017, Arista filed a motion with the Federal Circuit seeking to stay the Commission’s remedial orders pending resolution of the appeal on the merits. On September 22, 2017, the Federal Circuit denied this request “subject to the condition that the product redesign on which Cisco relies to deny irreparable harm must be permitted to enter the country, without being blocked by the Commission order under review in this case, unless and until Commission proceedings are initiated and completed to produce an enforceable determination that such a redesign is barred by the order here under review or by a new or amended order.” *Cisco Sys., Inc. v. ITC; Arista Networks, Inc. v. ITC*, Appeal Nos. 2017–2289, –2351, Order at 3 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 22, 2017).

On September 27, 2017, Cisco petitioned for a modification proceeding to determine whether Arista’s redesigned switches infringe the patent claims that are the subject of the LEO and CDO issued in this investigation and for modification of the remedial orders to specify the status of these redesigned products.

On November 1, 2017, the Commission instituted the modification proceeding. 82 FR 50678 (Nov. 1, 2017). On November 7, 2018, the Commission issued a notice clarifying that OUII is not named as a party in the modification proceeding. 82 FR 52318 (Nov. 13, 2017).

On February 14, 2018, the Federal Circuit summarily affirmed the PTAB’s decision finding the claims of the ‘668 patent unpatentable. *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Arista Networks, Inc.*, Appeal No. 17–2384, Order (Feb. 14, 2018). The Court issued the mandate on March 23, 2018. *Id.*, Dkt. No. 54.

On March 15, 2018, Arista filed a motion before the Commission to stay the Commission’s remedial orders as to the ‘668 patent. On March 26, 2018, Cisco filed its response stating that it takes no position on Arista’s motion.

On March 23, 2018, the ALJ issued a recommended determination in the modification proceeding (“MRD”), finding that Arista’s redesigned products infringe the relevant claims of the ‘668 patent but do not infringe the relevant claims of the ‘577 patent. MRD (Mar. 23, 2018). Also on March 23, 2018, the ALJ issued an order denying Arista’s motion to stay the modification proceedings or to stay the remedial orders with respect to the ‘668 patent. Order No. 20 (Mar. 23, 2018).

On April 5, 2018, the Commission determined to modify the remedial orders to suspend enforcement of those orders with respect to the ‘668 patent. Notice (Apr. 5, 2018); Comm’n Order (Apr. 5, 2018).

Also on April 5, 2018, Cisco filed comments to the MRD, requesting review of the ALJ’s findings that Arista’s redesigned products do not infringe the relevant claims of the ‘577 patent. On the same day, Arista filed comments to the MRD, requesting review of the ALJ’s finding that its redesigned products infringe the relevant claims of the ‘668 patent and preserving certain alternative grounds of affirmance regarding the ALJ’s finding that the redesigned products do not infringe the relevant claims of the ‘577 patent.

Further on April 5, 2018, Arista filed a motion to stay the modification proceeding as to the ‘668 patent based on the Federal Circuit’s affirmance of the PTAB’s determination that the

relevant claims of the '668 patent are unpatentable.

On April 12, 2018, Cisco and Arista filed responses to each other's comments.

On April 16, 2017, Cisco filed a response to Arista's stay motion.

Having examined the record of this modification proceeding, including the MRD, the comments to the MRD, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to find that Cisco has failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that Arista's redesigned products infringe claims 1, 7, 9, 10, and 15 of the '577 patent or that Arista has indirectly infringed those claim by contributing to or inducing infringement by its customers. Accordingly, the Commission has determined to modify the remedial orders to exempt Arista's redesigned products that were the subject of this modification proceeding. The modification proceeding is terminated with respect to the '577 patent.

The Commission has also determined to suspend the modification proceeding with respect to the '668 patent and to deny Arista's motion to stay the modification proceeding as to the '668 patent as moot in light of the Commission's prior suspension of the remedial orders with respect to the '668 patent.

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: June 26, 2018.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14130 Filed 6-29-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140-0079]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension Without Change of a Currently Approved Collection; Transactions Among Licensee/Permittees and Transactions Among Licensees and Holders of User Permits

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. **DATES:** Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until August 31, 2018.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments, particularly with respect to the estimated public burden or associated response time, have suggestions, need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or desire any additional information, please contact Anita Scheddel, Program Analyst, Explosives Industry Programs Branch, either by mail 99 New York Ave. NE, Washington, DC 20226, or by email at [eipb-informationcollection@atf.gov](mailto:eipb-informationcollection@atf.gov), or by telephone at 202-648-7158.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

1. *Type of Information Collection (check justification or form 83):* Extension, without change, of a currently approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Transactions Among Licensee/

Permittees and Transactions Among Licensees and Holders of User Permits.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:*

*Form number (if applicable):* None.

*Component:* Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

*Primary:* Business or other for-profit.

*Other (if applicable):* Individuals or households, and farms.

*Abstract:* This information collection requires specific transactions for licensee/permittees and holders of user permits. These requirements are outlined in 27 CFR part 555.103 in order to comply with the Safe Explosives Act.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated 50,000 respondents will respond once to this collection, and it will take each respondent approximately 30 minutes to complete each response.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 25,000 hours, which is equal to 50,000 (total respondents) \* 1 (# of response per respondent) \* .5 (30 minutes).

*If additional information is required contact:* Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 27, 2018.

**Melody Braswell,**

*Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14167 Filed 6-29-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. CRH plc, et al.: 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 District of Columbia in *United States of America v. CRH plc, et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:18-