

the United States after importation of certain eye cosmetics and packaging therefor by reason of the infringement of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,328,655 (“the ‘655 mark”). The second amended complaint also alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by the applicable Federal Statute. The second amended complaint further alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, or in the sale of certain eye cosmetics and packaging therefor by reason of unfair competition and false advertising, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States. The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a general exclusion order, or in the alternative a limited exclusion order, and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained 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 at <https://www.usitc.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pathenia M. Proctor, The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2560.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in section 210.10 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2024).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on July 10, 2024, *ordered that*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine:

(a) whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(C) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of

certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of the ‘655 mark, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337; and

(b) Whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, or in the sale of certain products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of unfair competition or false advertising, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is “eye cosmetics, *i.e.*, eye creams, eye palettes, eye kits, eye patches, eye serums and eye lashes”;

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: Amarte USA Holdings, Inc., 1731 California St., Redding, California 96001.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served: Unilever PLC, Port Sunlight, Wirral, Merseyside CH62 4ZD, United Kingdom
Unilever United States, Inc., 800 Sylvan Avenue, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632

Carver Korea Co., Ltd., 81 Tojeong-ro 31-gil, Mapo-gu, Seoul (Daeheung-dong), South Korea

Bourne & Morgan Ltd., 71–75 Shelton Street, Covent Garden, London, United Kingdom, WC2H 9JQ

MZ Skin Ltd., 5 Elstree Gate, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, Hertfordshire, United Kingdom, WD61JD

Kaibeautey, 104 Nanjing W Rd., Zhongshan District, Taipei City, Taiwan 10491

I’ll Global Co., Ltd., 3F, Samdeok Bldg., 315, Sinbanporro, Seocho-gu, Seoul, South Korea 06546

Hikari Laboratories Ltd., 207 Rishonim Street, Bnei Atarot 60991, Israel

Iman Cosmetics, P.O. Box 6867, London, Greater London, E14 5AN, United Kingdom; and, 363 7th Ave Suite 8, New York, NY 10001

Strip Lashed, 38 Main Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham, South Yorkshire, S62 50W, United Kingdom
Kelz Beauty, Almassy Ter 11, 1077, Budapest, Hungary

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade

Commission, 500 E Street SW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), as amended in 85 FR 15798 (March 19, 2020), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the complainant of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 11, 2024.

Sharon Bellamy,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2024–15630 Filed 7–15–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On July 11, 2024, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed consent decree with the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Marathon Oil Company*, Civil Action No. 1:24–cv–00136–DMT–CRH.

The United States filed this lawsuit under the Clean Air Act against Defendant Marathon Oil Company, alleging two types of violations at oil

and gas production facilities on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota: (1) violation of requirements to obtain preconstruction permits under the prevention of significant deterioration program and operating permits under the Title V permitting program; and (2) violation of design, operation and maintenance requirements applicable to oil and gas production facilities. The complaint seeks injunctive relief and civil penalties for the defendants' alleged violations. The consent decree requires the defendants to perform injunctive relief to address the alleged violations, perform additional projects to mitigate excess emissions, and pay a \$64.5 million civil penalty.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. Marathon Oil Company*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–10388/4. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
By email	<i>pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.</i>
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Any comments submitted in writing may be filed in whole or in part on the public court docket without notice to the commenter.

During the public comment period, the consent decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. If you require assistance accessing the consent decree, you may request assistance by email or mail to the addresses provided above for submitting comments.

Laura Thoms,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2024–15615 Filed 7–15–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA–2011–0858]

Permit-Required Confined Spaces Standard; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Request for public comments.

SUMMARY: OSHA solicits public comments concerning the proposal to extend the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval of the information collection requirements specified in the Permit-Required Confined Spaces Standard.

DATES: Comments must be submitted (postmarked, sent, or received) by September 16, 2024.

ADDRESSES:

Electronically: You may submit comments and attachments electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for submitting comments.

Docket: To read or download comments or other material in the docket, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Documents in the docket are listed in the <https://www.regulations.gov> index; however, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through the websites. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection through the OSHA Docket Office. Contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693–2350 (TTY (877) 889–5627) for assistance in locating docket submissions.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and OSHA docket number (OSHA–2011–0858) for the Information Collection Request (ICR). OSHA will place all comments, including any personal information, in the public docket, which may be made available online. Therefore, OSHA cautions interested parties about submitting personal information such as social security numbers and birthdates.

For further information on submitting comments, see the “Public Participation” heading in the section of this notice titled **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Seleda Perryman, Directorate of

Standards and Guidance, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor; telephone (202) 693–2222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of the continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (*i.e.*, employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, the collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information collection burden is accurate. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSH Act) (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the OSH Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657). The OSH Act also requires that OSHA obtain such information with minimum burden upon employers, especially those operating small businesses, and to reduce to the maximum extent feasible unnecessary duplication of effort in obtaining information (29 U.S.C. 657).

The following sections describe who uses the information collected under each requirement, as well as how they use it. The purpose of these requirements is to ensure that employers systematically evaluate the dangers in permit spaces before entry is attempted, and to ensure that adequate measures are taken to make the spaces safe for entry.

Section 1910.146(c)(2) requires the employer to post danger signs to inform exposed employees of the existence and location of, and the dangers posed by, permit spaces.

Section 1920.146(c)(4) requires the employer to develop and implement a written “permit-space program” when the employer decides that its employees will enter permit spaces. The written program is to be made available for inspection by employees and their authorized representatives. Section 1910.146(d) provides the employer with the requirements of a permit-required confined space program.

Section 1910.146(c)(5)(i)(E) requires that the determinations and supporting data specified by paragraphs (c)(5)(i)(A), (c)(5)(i)(C) of this section are