Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of November 6, 1996 (61 FR 57449). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on February 28, 1997, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on April 9, 1997. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3035 (April 1997), entitled ''Certain Brake Drums and Rotors from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–744 (Final).''

Issued: April 8, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–9844 Filed 4–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–388]

Certain Dynamic Random Access Memory Controllers and Certain Multi-layer Integrated Circuits, as Well as Chipsets and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination Not to Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

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 the presiding administrative law judge's (ALJ's) initial determination (ID) (Order No. 13) in the above-captioned investigation terminating the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark D. Kelly, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3106.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 12, 1996, the Commission voted to institute this investigation based on a complaint filed by Intel Corp. of Santa Clara, California (''Intel''), to determine whether there were violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in the importation, sale for importation, or sale within the United States after importation of certain dynamic random access memory controllers and certain multi-layer integrated circuits, as well as chipsets and products containing same, by reason of infringement of claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,703,320, or claims 1 and 11 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,775,550, both owned by Intel. 61 F.R. 31148. The complaint named the following parties as respondents: Silicon Integrated Systems Corp. of Taiwan and Silicon Integrated Systems Corp. (U.S.) (collectively, ''the SiS respondents''), United Microelectronics Corporation, Hsinchu, Taiwan (''UMC''), and Integrated Technology Express, Santa Clara, CA (''ITE''). On November 7, 1996, the presiding ALJ issued an initial determination (ID) (Order No. 5), terminating the SiS respondents from the investigation pursuant to agreement and removing U.S. Letters Patent 5,703,320 from the scope of the investigation. This ID was not reviewed by the Commission and became the Commission's final determination on December 3, 1996. *See* Commission Notice issued December 3, 1996.

On February 6, 1997, Intel and the remaining respondents, UMC and ITE, filed a joint motion under 19 C.F.R. § 210.21 to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement. On March 13, 1997, the ALJ granted the joint motion and issued his ID (Order No. 13) terminating the investigation on the basis of the settlement agreement. The ALJ found that there is no indication that termination of the investigations would have an adverse impact on the public interest and that termination based on settlement is generally in the public interest. No petitions for review were filed.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. § 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 C.F.R. § 210.42.

Copies of the public version of the ALJ's ID, and all other nonconfidential 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 S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

Issued: April 9, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–9843 Filed 4–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–372 Enforcement Proceeding]

Certain Neodymium-Iron-Boron Magnets, Magnet Alloys, and Articles Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination Concerning Violation of Consent Order; Denial of Request for Oral Argument; and Schedule for the Filing of Written Submissions on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that the respondents in the above-captioned formal enforcement proceeding have violated the Commission consent order issued to them on October 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jay H. Reiziss, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3116.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 11, 1995, the Commission issued a consent order in the above-captioned investigation. The consent order provides that respondents San Huan New Materials High Tech, Inc., Ningbo Konit Industries, Inc., and Tridus International, Inc. (collectively the ''San Huan respondents''):

> shall not sell for importation, import into the United States or sell in the United States after importation or knowingly aid, abet, encourage, participate in, or induce the sale for importation, importation into the United States or sale in the United States after importation of neodymium-iron-boron magnets which infringe any of claims 1–3 of [U.S. Letters Patent 4,588,439 (the ''439 patent'], or articles or products which contain such magnets, except under consent or license from Crucible.

On March 4, 1996, complainant Crucible Materials Corporation (''Crucible'') filed a complaint seeking institution of formal enforcement proceedings against the San Huan respondents for alleged violations of the consent order. On May 16, 1996, the Commission issued a notice instituting this enforcement proceeding based on Crucible's enforcement complaint. The following were named as parties to the formal enforcement proceeding: (1) Crucible Materials Corporation, State Fair Boulevard, P.O. Box 977, Syracuse, New York 13201–0977 (complainant in the original investigation and requester of the formal enforcement proceeding); (2) San Huan New Materials High Tech,

Inc., No. 8 South 3rd Street, Zhong Guan Cun Road, Beijing, Peoples Republic of China 100080 (enforcement proceeding respondent); (3) Ningbo Konit Industries, Inc., Ningbo Economic and Technical Development Zone, Zhejiang Province, People's Republic of China (enforcement proceeding respondent); (4) Tridus International, Inc., 8527 Alondra Boulevard, Suite 205, Paramount, California 90723 (enforcement proceeding respondent); and (5) a Commission investigative attorney to be designated by the Director, Office of Unfair Import Investigations.

On July 1, 1996, the Commission referred the formal enforcement proceeding to an administrative law judge (''ALJ'') for issuance of a recommended determination (''RD'') regarding whether respondents violated the consent order and what enforcement measures, if any, are appropriate in light of the nature and significance of any such violations. The ALJ conducted an evidentiary hearing in the enforcement proceeding from November 4 through November 8, 1996. Post-hearing briefs were submitted, and closing arguments were made before the ALJ on December 12, 1996. On December 24, 1996, the ALJ issued his RD in which he recommended that the Commission find that the San Huan respondents have violated the Commission's consent order, and that a penalty of $1,625,000 be assessed against them. In order to allow the parties to express their views concerning the RD prior to Commission action, the Commission provided the parties with the opportunity to file exceptions to the RD and proposed alternative findings of fact and conclusions of law. Exceptions and proposed alternative findings of fact and conclusions of law were filed by all parties.

Having considered the RD, the exceptions thereto, and proposed alternative findings of fact and conclusions of law, as well as the entire record in this proceeding, the Commission determined that the San Huan respondents had violated the Commission's consent order by importing and selling infringing neodymium-iron-boron magnets on thirty one (31) days between October 11, 1995, and September 10, 1996. The Commission adopted the RD with respect to the ALJ's determinations concerning (1) whether to rely on Crucible's in-house testing to determine whether respondents'' sales of imported magnets infringed Crucible's patent; (2) whether respondents'' sales of certain magnets containing cobalt infringed Crucible's patent and therefore violated the consent order; and (3) whether Crucible met its burden of proving that certain other magnets in evidence in this proceeding were imported and sold in violation of the consent order.

The Commission declined to adopt the RD with respect to the ALJ's determinations concerning (1) the effect that the Federal Circuit decision in *Maxwell* v. *J. Baker,* 86 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir.), *reh'g denied, suggestion of reh'g in banc declined, petition for cert. filed* (1996), should have on the enforcement proceeding and on the Commission's outstanding remedial orders in this investigation; (2) whether respondents'' sales of certain magnets with elevated levels of rare earth elements infringed Crucible's patent and therefore violated the consent order; and (3) the date from which it is appropriate to find that respondents'' importations and sales of magnets that infringe under the doctrine of equivalents violated the consent order. Finally, the Commission denied complainant's request for an oral argument.

The Commission issued its determination on violation concurrently with issuance of this notice. A Commission opinion concerning certain issues addressed in the RD will be issued shortly.

In connection with final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may revoke the consent order and issue (1) an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in respondents 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 the Commission Opinion, *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines,* Inv. No. 337-TA–360.

If the Commission contemplates revoking the consent order and issuing some other 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 other than the consent order, 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 a 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, if remedial orders are issued.

Written Submissions

The parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested persons are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration in the event it determines to revoke the consent order. Written submissions shall not exceed 35 pages in length. Parties are requested not to repeat any arguments made to the Commission in their exceptions to the RD and proposed alternative findings of fact and conclusions of law. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on April 22, 1997. Reply submissions shall not exceed 20 pages in length and must be filed no later than the close of business on April 29, 1997. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 14 true copies thereof with the Office of the Secretary on or before the deadlines stated above. 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 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment is granted by the Commission will be

treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

Copies of the public version of the Commission's opinion in support of this determination and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this enforcement proceeding 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, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and section 210.75 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. 210.75).

Issued: April 8, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–9845 Filed 4–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–745 (Final)]

Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission determines,[2] pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1673d(b)) (the Act), that a regional industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from Turkey of steel concrete reinforcing bars, provided for in subheadings 7213.10.00 and 7214.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States,[3] that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV). The Commission also makes a negative determination, pursuant to section 735(b)(4)(A) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1673d(b)(4)(A)), regarding critical circumstances.

Background

The Commission instituted this investigation effective March 8, 1996, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and the Department of Commerce by AmeriSteel Corporation,[4] Tampa, FL, and New Jersey Steel Corporation, Sayreville, NJ. The final phase of the investigation was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by the Department of Commerce that imports of steel concrete reinforcing bars from Turkey were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's investigation and of a public hearing 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 November 6, 1996 (61 FR 57451, November 6, 1996). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on February 26, 1997, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on April 9, 1997. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3034 (April 1997), entitled ''Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Turkey: Investigation No. 731–TA–745 (Final).''

Issued: April 11, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–9842 Filed 4–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(f)).

[2] Commissioner Carol T. Crawford dissenting.

[3] The product covered by this investigation is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain-round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar.

[4] Formerly Florida Steel Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

[INS No. 1841–97]

Notice of Requirement of Carriers To Present for Inspection In-Transit Passengers

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice informs carriers that effective April 1, 1997, carriers are required to present for inspection, in accordance with the special procedures outlined in the notice, all international-to-international (ITI) passengers, formerly known as in-transit lounge (ITL) passengers, transiting through the United States from one foreign country to another foreign country with one stop in the United States. This change is necessary to comply with the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (the Act of 1996) which amended section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) to statutorily require the Service to inspect aliens transiting through the United States. It is anticipated that further modifications to the ITI program and procedures to conform to the change in law will be accomplished through promulgation of rules in accordance with the notice and comment provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert F. Hutnick, Assistant Chief Inspector, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 425 I Street, NW., Room 4064, Washington, DC 20536, telephone number (202) 616–7499.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Prior to the enactment of the Act of 1996, the Service employed its discretionary authority under section 235 of the Act to exempt ITI passengers from inspection under certain circumstances. However, section 235(a)(3) of the Act, as amended by the Act of 1996 and effective April 1, 1997, now provides:

(3) INSPECTION.—All aliens (including alien crewmen) who are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission or readmission to or transit through the United States *shall* be inspected by immigration officers [emphasis added].

To give effect to the legal mandate to inspect ITI passengers, on March 26, 1997, the Service issued the following instructions to the appropriate field offices which take effect on April, 1, 1997:

''*New Procedures:*

(1) International-to-international passengers shall be inspected but not admitted to the United States. This inspection should be conducted at the ITL. If this is not feasible, the port director or district office manager shall contact the appropriate deputy assistant regional director for inspections to provide justification for not using the ITL and to make alternative arrangements in keeping with the