

of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

### Background

On February 19, 2019, AdvanSix Inc., Parsippany, New Jersey, Altivia Petrochemicals, LLC, Haverhill, Ohio, and Olin Corporation, Clayton, Missouri filed a petition with the Commission and Commerce, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of LTFV imports of acetone from Belgium, Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, and Spain. Accordingly, effective February 19, 2019, the Commission, pursuant to section 733(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)), instituted antidumping duty Investigation Nos. 731-TA-1435-1440 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigation and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of February 28, 2019 (84 FR 6819). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on March 12, 2019, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 733(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on April 5, 2019. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4884 (April 2019), entitled *Acetone from Belgium, Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, and Spain: Investigation Nos. 731-TA-1435-1440 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 5, 2019.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2019-07153 Filed 4-10-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1129]

#### Certain Lithography Machines and Systems and Components Thereof (II); Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation Based on Settlement; 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 not to review an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 17) issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") that terminates the above-captioned investigation based on settlement. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. 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 this investigation on August 21, 2018, based on a complaint filed by Carl Zeiss SMT GmbH of Oberkochen, Germany ("Zeiss"). 83 FR 42316-17. The complaint, as supplemented, 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 lithography machines and systems and components thereof that infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,929,115, 8,441,613, and 9,052,609. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents Nikon Corporation of Tokyo, Japan; Nikon Research Corporation of America of Belmont, California; and Nikon Precision Inc. of Belmont, California (collectively, "Nikon"). *Id.* at 42317. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in this investigation. *Id.*

On February 22, 2019, Zeiss and Nikon filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement. The parties supplied the settlement agreement and indicated that there are no other agreements related to the subject matter of the investigation.

On March 18, 2019, the ALJ granted the motion pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(b) (19 CFR 210.21(b)). The ALJ found that the motion complied with Rule 210.21(b) and that there is no evidence that the settlement has any adverse effect on the public interest. No petitions for review of the ID were received.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is hereby terminated.

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: April 5, 2019.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2019-07145 Filed 4-10-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-19-011]

#### Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.

**TIME AND DATE:** April 19, 2019 at 11:00 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

1. Agendas for future meetings: None.
  2. Minutes.
  3. Ratification List.
  4. Vote on Inv. Nos. 701-TA-620 and 731-TA-1445 (Preliminary) (Wooden Cabinets and Vanities from China). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations on April 22, 2019; views of the Commission are currently scheduled to be completed and filed on April 29, 2019.
  5. Outstanding action jackets: None.
- In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 9, 2019.

**William Bishop,**

*Supervisory Hearings and Information  
Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2019-07329 Filed 4-9-19; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### **United States et al. v. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, d/b/a Carolinas Healthcare System; Response to Public Comment**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that one comment was received concerning the proposed Final Judgment in this case, and that comment together with the Response of the United States to Public Comment have been filed with the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina in *United States and State of North Carolina v. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, d/b/a Carolinas HealthCare System*, Civil Action No. 3:16-cv-00311-RJC-DCK. Copies of the comment and the United States' Response are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil, Enforcement.*

#### **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION**

*United States of America and the State of North Carolina, Plaintiffs, v. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, d/b/a Carolinas Healthcare System, Defendant.*  
Case No. 3:16-cv-00311-RJC-DCK  
Judge Robert J. Conrad, Jr.

#### **RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES TO PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT**

As required by the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (the "APPA" or "Tunney Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby responds to the one public comment received by the United States about the proposed Final Judgment in this case. After careful consideration of the comment submitted, the United States

continues to believe that the proposed remedy will address the harm alleged in the Complaint and is therefore in the public interest. The proposed Final Judgment will prevent Atrium from impeding insurers' steered plans and transparency initiatives and restore competition among healthcare providers in the Charlotte area. The United States will move the Court for entry of a modified proposed Final Judgment<sup>1</sup> after this response and the public comment have been published in the *Federal Register*, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 16(d).

#### **I. Procedural History**

On June 9, 2016, the United States and the State of North Carolina filed a civil antitrust lawsuit against the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, formerly known as Carolinas HealthCare System and now doing business as Atrium Health ("Atrium"), to enjoin it from using steering restrictions in its agreements with health insurers in the Charlotte, North Carolina area. The Complaint alleges that Atrium's steering restrictions are anticompetitive and violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

After over two years of litigation, on November 15, 2018, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment and a Stipulation signed by the parties that consents to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act. (Dkt. No. 87-1.) On December 4, 2018, the United States filed a Competitive Impact Statement describing the proposed Final Judgment. (Dkt. No. 89.) The United States caused the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, and the Competitive Impact Statement to be published in the *Federal Register* on December 11, 2018, *see* 83 Fed. Reg. 63,674, and caused notice regarding the same, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, to be published in *The Charlotte Observer* and *The Washington Post* for seven days beginning on December 7, 2018, and ending on December 13, 2018.

<sup>1</sup> During the December 13, 2018 hearing in this matter, the Court raised concerns regarding certain aspects of Paragraph IX(B) of the proposed Final Judgment. The United States and Atrium have agreed to modify the proposed Final Judgment to address the Court's concerns. The modifications do not alter the structure or substance of the remedy and will not materially affect Atrium's obligations and therefore do not require an additional notice and comment period under the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16. The United States will describe in detail the parties' agreed-upon modifications and discuss how those modifications address the Court's concerns regarding Paragraph IX(B) in its forthcoming motion for entry of the modified proposed Final Judgment.

The 60-day period for public comment ended on February 11, 2019. The United States received only one comment, which is described below in Section IV, and attached as Exhibit A hereto.

#### **II. Standard of Judicial Review**

The Clayton Act, as amended by the APPA, requires that proposed consent judgments in antitrust cases brought by the United States be subject to a 60-day comment period, after which the court shall determine whether entry of the proposed Final Judgment "is in the public interest." 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1). In making that determination, the court, in accordance with the statute as amended in 2004, is required to consider:

- (A) the competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are ambiguous, and any other competitive considerations bearing upon the adequacy of such judgment that the court deems necessary to a determination of whether the consent judgment is in the public interest; and
- (B) the impact of entry of such judgment upon competition in the relevant market or markets, upon the public generally and individuals alleging specific injury from the violations set forth in the complaint including consideration of the public benefit, if any, to be derived from a determination of the issues at trial.

15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1)(A) & (B). In considering these statutory factors, the court's inquiry is necessarily a limited one as the government is entitled to "broad discretion to settle with the defendant within the reaches of the public interest." *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1461 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see generally United States v. SBC Commc'ns, Inc.*, 489 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2007) (assessing public-interest standard under the Tunney Act); *United States v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr.*, No. 2:16-3664, 2016 WL 6156172, at \*2 (S.D. W. Va. Oct. 21, 2016) (noting that in evaluating whether the proposed final judgment is in the public interest, the inquiry is "a narrow one" and only requires the court to determine if the remedy effectively addresses the harm identified in the complaint); *United States v. U.S. Airways Grp., Inc.*, 38 F. Supp. 3d 69, 75 (D.D.C. 2014) (explaining that the "court's inquiry is limited" in Tunney Act settlements); *United States v. InBev N.V./S.A.*, No. 08-1965 (JR), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at \*3 (D.D.C. Aug. 11, 2009) (noting that the court's review of a consent judgment is limited and only inquires "into whether the government's