

have not satisfied the domestic industry requirement with respect to those patents. He also found that the asserted claims of the '440 and '736 patents are not invalid and that those patents are not unenforceable.

On May 27, 2005, complainants and nineteen respondents each petitioned for review of portions of the final ID. On July 19, 2005, the Commission determined to review the ID in part. 70 FR 42589–91. Specifically, the Commission determined to review the ID's findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to the '527 and '440 patents. *Id.* The Commission determined not to review the ID's findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to the '736 patent, thereby adopting them. *Id.* Accordingly, the Commission found no violation of section 337 with respect to the '736 patent. *Id.* The Commission also determined to review and modify the ID to clarify that respondents accused of infringing only the asserted claims of the '736 patent (viz., respondents Audiovox Corporation; Initial Technology, Inc.; Mintek Digital, Inc.; Shinco International AV Co., Ltd.; Changzhou Shinco Digital Technology Co., Ltd.; Jiangsu Shinco Electronic Group Co., Ltd.; Terapin Technology Pte., Ltd. [formerly known as Teraoptix d/b/a Terapin Technology] of Singapore; and Terapin Technology U.S. [formerly also known as Teraoptix]) are not in violation of section 337. *Id.*

On review, the Commission determined that there was a violation of section 337 as to claim 3 of the '527 patent, but no violation of the statute as to the remaining claims in issue of the '527 patent (viz., claims 1 and 2) and no violation as to the claims in issue of the '440 patent (viz., claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 19, and 21). 70 FR 57620. On September 28, 2005, the Commission determined that the appropriate form of relief is a limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed entry of chips or chipsets covered by claim 3 of the '527 patent manufactured abroad or imported by or on behalf of MediaTek, Inc. of Hsin-Chu City, Taiwan, and optical storage devices containing such covered chips or chipsets that are manufactured abroad or imported by or on behalf of Artronix Technology, Inc. of Brea, California; ASUSTek Computer, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; ASUS Computer International of Fremont, California; MSI Computer Corporation of City of Industry, California; TEAC America Inc. of Montebello, California; EPO Science and Technology, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; LITE-ON Information Technology Corp. of Taipei, Taiwan; Micro-Star International Co., Ltd. of Taipei Hsien,

Taiwan; TEAC Corp. of Tokyo, Japan; or Ultima Electronics Corp. of Taipei Hsien, Taiwan (collectively, with MediaTek, Inc. "respondents"). *Id.* The Commission also determined to issue cease and desist orders directed to Artronix Technology, Inc.; ASUSTek Computer, Inc.; ASUS Computer International; MSI Computer Corporation; TEAC America Inc.; EPO Science and Technology, Inc.; and LITE-ON Information Technology Corp. *Id.*

On February 10, 2006, complainants Zoran and Oak and respondent MediaTek filed, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337(k) and Commission rule 210.76(a) (19 CFR 210.76(a)), a joint petition for rescission of the limited exclusion order and the cease and desist orders issued in the investigation based on a settlement agreement that resolves the underlying dispute between all of the parties, including all of the other respondents. On February 22, 2006, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the joint petition.

Having reviewed the parties' submissions, the Commission has determined that the settlement agreement satisfies the requirement of Commission rule 210.76(a)(1), 19 CFR 210.76(a)(1), for changed conditions of fact or law. The Commission therefore has issued an order rescinding the remedial orders previously issued in this investigation.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) and § 210.76(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.76(a)(1)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 17, 2006.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6–4154 Filed 3–21–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Inv. No. 337–TA–564]

### **In the Matter of Certain Voltage Regulators, Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Notice of Investigation**

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

**ACTION:** Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on

February 17, 2006, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Linear Technology Corporation of Milpitas, California. Letters supplementing the complaint were filed on March 13 and 14, 2006. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain voltage regulators, components thereof and products containing same by reason of infringement of claims 1–14 and 23–35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,531 and claims 1–19, 31, 34, and 35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,258. The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a permanent exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

**ADDRESSES:** The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. 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 <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>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Hollander, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–2746.

**Authority:** The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in § 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2005).

**Scope of Investigation:** Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 16, 2006, *ordered that—*

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

to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) 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 voltage regulators, components thereof or products containing same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–14 and 23–35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,531 and claims 1–19, 31, 34, and 35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,258, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

(2) 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—Linear Technology Corporation, 1630 McCarthy Boulevard, Milpitas, California 95035.

(b) The respondent is the following entity alleged to be in violation of section 337, and is the party upon which the complaint is to be served: Advanced Analogic Technologies, Inc., 830 East Arques Avenue, Sunnyvale, California 94085.

(c) David H. Hollander, Jr., Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436, who shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Sidney Harris is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

A response to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent in accordance with § 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such response will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting a response to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of the 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 both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a permanent exclusion order or cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 17, 2006.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6–4155 Filed 3–21–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act and Rivers and Harbors Act

Notice is hereby given that on March 9, 2006, a consent decree in *United States v. James H. Pflueger, et al.*, Civil Action No. 06–00140 SPK BMK, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

The complaint, filed concurrently with lodging of the consent decree, was brought on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and the State of Hawaii, Department of Health, under Sections 309 and 504 of the Clean Water Act (“CWA”), 33 U.S.C. 1319 & 1364, Section 13 of the Rivers & Harbors Act of 1899 (“R&HA”), 33 U.S.C. 407, and State law. The complaint alleges that defendants James H. Pflueger, Pflueger Properties, and Pilaa 400 LLC illegally discharged storm water associated with their construction activities on the Island of Kauai, Hawaii, and seeks civil penalties and injunctive relief. The federal claims in the proposed complaint also include a claim for injunctive relief under R&HA Section 13, 33 U.S.C. 407, to address sediment discharges from defendants’ property, and claims for civil penalties and injunctive relief for defendants’ placement of unpermitted fill in stream courses on their property, in violation of CWA Section 404. Finally, the complaint includes state claims for violations of state storm water and water quality regulations.

The consent decree requires defendants to pay a \$2 million civil penalty and to perform a Supplemental Environmental Project designed to reduce the inflow of pollution to receiving waters and improve water quality, at an estimated cost of \$200,000. Finally, the decree requires defendants to complete measures necessary to abate further discharges of pollution and to repair the damage done to waterways on their property.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the consent decrees. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to *United States v. James H. Pflueger, et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–1–07871.

During the public comment period, the consent decrees may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html>. Copies of the consent decrees may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood ([tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov](mailto:tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–1547. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$14.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury, for a copy of the consent decree without attachments. Requesters who desire copies of the attachments (which include oversize and color materials) should call to make separate arrangements for reproduction, which will be charged at the cost for outside commercial copying.

**Henry Friedman,**

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

[FR Doc. 06–2776 Filed 3–21–06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–15–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–54,242 and TA–W–54,242A]

### Badger Paper Mills, Inc., Pestigo, WI, and Oconto Falls, WI; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor issued a split determination regarding workers’ eligibility to apply for benefits available under the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program. On March 22, 2004, the Department certified workers of Badger Paper Mills, Inc., Peshtigo, Wisconsin as