State	Department	Contact information
New Mexico	Taxation and Revenue Department, Oil and Gas Bureau.	Valdean Severson, 1200 South St. Francis Drive, Santa Fe, NM 87502–4034

ONRR received the State's proposal on December 23, 2011. In accordance with 30 CFR 1227.101(b)(1), the State requests that ONRR delegate the royalty management functions of conducting audits and investigations. The State requests delegation of these functions for producing Federal oil and gas leases within the State boundaries; as applicable, for producing Federal oil and gas leases in the Outer Continental Shelf, subject to revenue sharing under 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, 43 U.S.C. 1337(g); and for other producing solid mineral or geothermal Federal leases within the state. The State does not request delegation of royalty and production reporting functions.

The State of New Mexico requests 100-percent funding of the delegated functions for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 2012, with the opportunity to extend for an additional 3-year period. The State has a current audit delegation agreement with ONRR, as shown in the table below.

State	Agreement Nos.	Term
New Mexico	D12AX70004 0206CA27654	10/01/2011–06/30/2012 07/01/2006–09/30/2011

Therefore, ONRR has determined that we will not hold a formal hearing for comments under 30 CFR 1227.105.

Dated: March 2, 2012.

Gregory J. Gould,

Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

[FR Doc. 2012–5670 Filed 3–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–T2–P

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–12–005]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY: *Agency Holding the Meeting:* United States International Trade Commission.

DATES: *Time and Date:* March 14, 2012 at 11 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 in Inv. No. 731–TA–1089 (Review)(Certain Orange Juice from Brazil). The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before March 27, 2012.
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.

Issued: March 5, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–5722 Filed 3–6–12; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–744]

Certain Mobile Devices, Associated Software, and Components Thereof; Determination To Review Final Initial Determination

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 the final initial determination (''ID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on December 20, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3115. 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 *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 November 5, 2010, based on a complaint filed by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington. 75 FR 68379–80 (Nov. 5, 2010). The complaint 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 mobile devices, associated software, and components thereof by reason of infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,579,517 (''the '517 patent''); 5,758,352 (''the '352 patent''); 6,621,746 (''the '746 patent''); 6,826,762 (''the '762 patent''); 6,909,910 (''the '910 patent''); 7,644,376 (''the '376 patent''); 5,664,133 (''the '133 patent''); 6,578,054 (''the '054 patent''); and 6,370,566 (''the '566 patent.'') Subsequently, the '517 and the '746 patents were terminated from the investigation. The notice of investigation, as amended, names Motorola Mobility, Inc. of Libertyville, Illinois and Motorola, Inc. of Schaumburg, Illinois as respondents. Motorola, Inc. n/k/a Motorola Solutions was terminated from the investigation based on withdrawal of infringement allegations on July 12, 2011.

The final ID on violation was issued on December 20, 2011. The ALJ issued his recommended determination on remedy and bonding on the same day.

The ALJ found that a violation of section 337 has occurred in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile devices, associated software, and components thereof containing same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the '566 patent. Both Complainant and Respondent filed timely petitions for review of various portions of the final ID, as well as timely responses to the petitions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the ID in part. In particular, the Commission has determined to review: (1) The ID's determination regarding the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to all of the presently asserted patents in this investigation, *i.e.,* the '352 patent, the '762 patent, the '910 patent; the '376 patent, the '133 patent, the '054 patent, and the '566 patent; (2) the ID's determination regarding the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to all of the presently asserted patents; (3) the ID's anticipation and obviousness determinations with respect to the '566 patent; (4) the ID's infringement determination with respect to the '352 patent; and (5) the ID's analysis of induced infringement with respect to all of the presently asserted patents. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the final ID.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on only the following issues, with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record:

(1) With respect to the domestic industry:

(a) For all of the presently asserted patents, what statutory provisions, Federal Circuit and Commission precedent, and record evidence support respondent's argument that the ALJ impermissibly analyzed different articles for purposes of the technical and economic prongs of the domestic industry requirement, *see* Respondent's Petition for Review at 28?

(b) Under Federal Circuit and Commission precedent and section 337 statutory provisions, where an asserted patent covers both hardware and software as one system, is it (i) necessary, and/or (ii) sufficient to demonstrate that the software at issue is implemented and functions on a third party's hardware (*e.g.,* a smartphone) in order to satisfy the technical prong of domestic industry requirement?

(c) For all of the presently asserted patents, what statutory provisions and Commission precedent specifically support the ID's determination regarding the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement and particular findings made in support of such determination?

(2) With respect to the '566 patent:

(a) (i) Please identify all the arguments made before the ALJ that rely on factual support from the record and legal support provided by applicable Federal Circuit and Commission precedent demonstrating that the Apple Newton MessagePad prior art reference discloses the ''synchronization component'' of claim 1; (ii) What, if any, disclosures are missing from the Apple Newton MessagePad reference such that it does not meet the ''synchronization component'' limitation of claim 1;

(b) Please identify all the arguments made before the ALJ that rely on factual support from the record and legal support provided by applicable Federal Circuit and Commission precedent demonstrating that respondent met its burden of proof to show that the Apple Newton MessagePad reference anticipates claim 5.

(c) Please identify all the arguments made before the ALJ that rely on factual support from the record and legal support provided by applicable Federal Circuit and Commission precedent demonstrating that prior art references render the asserted claims of the '566 patent obvious;

(3) With respect to the '352 patent, please identify all the arguments made before the ALJ that rely on factual support from the record and legal support provided by applicable Federal Circuit and Commission precedent demonstrating that complainant met its burden of proof to show that (a) the accused products infringe the asserted claims of the '352 patent, and (b) complainant satisfied the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or are likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines,* Inv. No. 337–TA–360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7–10 (Dec. 1994).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the President has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues under review. The submissions should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination on remedy and bonding issued on December 20, 2011, by the ALJ. Complainant is also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainant is further requested to provide the expiration date of the '352 patent, the '762 patent, the '910 patent, the '376 patent, the '133 patent, the '054 patent, and the '566 patent, and state the HTSUS numbers under which the accused articles are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on March 19, 2012. Reply submissions must be filed

no later than the close of business on March 27, 2012. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must do so in accordance with Commission rule 210.4(f), 19 CFR 210.4(f) which requires electronic filing. The original document and eight true copies thereof must also be filed on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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 sections 210.42-.46 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42-.46).

Issued: March 2, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–5609 Filed 3–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–801]

Certain Products Containing Interactive Program Guide and Parental Controls Technology; Modification of Initial Determination and Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined on review to modify the presiding administrative law judge's (''ALJ'') initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 5) granting a joint motion by Complainants Rovi Corporation, Rovi Guides, Inc. (f/k/a Gemstar-TV International Inc.), United Video Properties, Inc., and Gemstar Development Corporation, all of Santa Clara, California (collectively ''Rovi'') and Respondents Sharp Corporation of Osaka, Japan, Sharp Electronics Corporation of Mahwah, New Jersey and Sharp Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. of Mahwah, New Jersey (collectively ''Sharp'') for termination of the investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement. On review, the Commission has modified the ID by further basing it on the final detailed agreement submitted by the parties.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean H. Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3104. 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 *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 31, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Rovi. 76 FR 54253 (Aug. 31, 2011). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,305,016; 7,493,643; and RE41,993.

On September 30, 2011, Rovi and Sharp filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety based upon a settlement agreement. On October 4, 2011, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 5) granting the motion for termination of the investigation in its entirety. In the subject ID, the ALJ found that the parties satisfied all the requirements under 19 CFR 210.21(b)(1), including a statement that the parties have no other agreements concerning the subject matter of this investigation. The ALJ noted that the settlement agreement contemplates the execution of a more detailed agreement by October 30, 2011, but he found that the possibility of further agreements between the parties did not affect his initial determination to grant the joint motion for termination. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission determined to review the ID on its own motion and required Rovi and Sharp to submit their detailed final agreement, so that the Commission could fully assess compliance with the requirements of 19 CFR 210.21(b)(1) and 210.50(b)(2). The parties filed their final agreement with the Commission on January 13, 2012. Upon consideration of that document, the Commission has determined that the parties' joint motion for termination complies with §§ 210.21(b)(1) and 210.50(b)(2). Accordingly, the Commission has modified the ALJ's ID to include a consideration of the final agreement.

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 section 210.45 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.45).

Issued: March 5, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–5637 Filed 3–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Accellera Systems (Formerly Open Systemc Initiative)

Notice is hereby given that, on February 6, 2012, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Accellera Systems (formerly Open SystemC Initiative) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Open SystemC Initiative (''OSCI'') has changed its name to Accellera Systems Initiative (''Accellera'') through a merger whereby Accellera is the successor.

In addition, Global Unichip Corp., Hsinchu, Taiwan; CoFluent Design, Nantes, France; GreenSocs Ltd., Cambridge, United Kingdom; Infineon