from the effective date of publication in the **Federal Register** unless, prior to the end of the 2-year period, the BLM publishes a **Federal Register** notice terminating the segregation.

The lands to be segregated are identified in the proposed withdrawal notice that was published in the **Federal Register** on April 21, 2011 (76 FR 22414).

Michael D. Nedd,

Assistant Director, Minerals and Realty Management.

[FR Doc. 2011–16429 Filed 6–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–694]

In the Matter of Certain Multimedia Display and Navigation Devices and Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination That No Violation of Section 337 Exists; 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 to affirm, on modified grounds, the final initial determination (''ID'') issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') on December 16, 2010, finding no violation of section 337 in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel E. Valencia, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–1999. 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 the instant investigation on December 16, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Pioneer Corporation of Tokyo, Japan and Pioneer Electronics (USA) Inc. of Long Beach, California (collectively, ''Pioneer''). 74 FR 66676 (Dec. 16, 2009). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 multimedia display and navigation devices and systems, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 5,365,448 (''the '448 patent''), 5,424,951 (''the '951 patent''), and 6,122,592 (''the '592 patent''). The complaint named Garmin International, Inc. of Olathe, Kansas, Garmin Corporation of Taiwan (collectively, ''Garmin'') and Honeywell International Inc. of Morristown, New Jersey (''Honeywell'') as the proposed respondents. Honeywell was subsequently terminated from the investigation.

On December 16, 2010, the ALJ issued a final ID. In his final ID, the ALJ found no violation of section 337 by Garmin. Specifically, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe claims 1 and 2 of the '448 patent, claims 1 and 2 of the '951 patent, or claims 1 and 2 of the '592 patent. The ALJ found that the '592 patent was not proven to be invalid and that Pioneer has established a domestic industry under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C). On February 23, 2011, the Commission determined to review the final ID in part. On April 18, 2011, the Commission determined to extend the target date and requested supplemental briefing.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID and the submissions of the parties, the Commission has determined to affirm, on modified grounds, the ALJ's finding that Garmin has not violated section 337. In particular, the Commission has determined to reverse the ALJ's finding that Garmin's products do not infringe the asserted claims of the '951 patent, affirm his finding that Garmin's products do not infringe the asserted claims of the '592 patent, reverse his finding that the asserted claims of the '592 patent are not invalid under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and reverse his finding that Pioneer has established a licensing-based domestic industry for the '951 and '592 patents. The '448 patent is no longer asserted. The investigation is 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 sections 210.42–.50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–.50).

Issued: June 24, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–16317 Filed 6–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–780]

In the Matter of Certain Protective Cases and Components Thereof; Notice of Institution of Investigation; Institution of Investigation Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on May 25, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Otter Products, LLC of Fort Collins, Colorado. A supplement was filed on June 16, 2011. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain protective cases and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,933,122 (''the '122 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D600,908 (''the '908 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D617,784 (''the '784 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D615,536 (''the '536 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D617,785 (''the '785 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D634,741 (''the '741 patent''); U.S. Patent No. D636,386 (''the '386 patent''); and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,788,534 (''the '534 trademark''); U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,788,535 (''the '535 trademark''); U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,623,789 (''the '789 trademark''); and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,795,187 (''the '187 trademark''). 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 an exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

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: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2011).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on June 24, 2011, *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 subsections (a)(1)(B) and (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 protective cases and components thereof that infringe the '908 patent; the '784 patent; the '536 patent; the '785 patent; the '741 patent; the '386 patent; one or more of claims 1, 5–7, 13, 15, 17, 19–21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30–32, 37, 38, 42, and 44 of the '122 patent; the '534 trademark; the '535 trademark; the '789 trademark; and the '187 trademark, 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: Otter Products, LLC, 1 Old Town Square, Suite 303, Fort Collins, CO 80524.

(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:

A.G. Findings and Mfg. Co., Inc., d/b/a Ballistic, 1133 Sawgrass Corp. Parkway, Sunrise, FL 33323.

AFC Trident Inc., 14270 Albers Way, Chino, CA 91710.

Alibaba.com Hong Kong Ltd., 699 Wang Shang Road, Binjiang District, Hangzhou 310052, China.

Anbess Electronics Co. Ltd., 1F, Block B, Building 4, Cui Feng Hao Yuan, ShuiJing, BuJi, LongGang, Shenzhen, GD, 518112, China.

Cellairis Franchise, Inc., 6485 Shiloh Road, Suite B100, Alpharette, GA 30005.

Cellet Products, 14530 Anson Avenue, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670.

DHgate.com, 6F Dimeng Commercial Building No. 3–2, Hua Yuan Road, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100191.

Griffin Technology, Inc., 1930 Air Lane Drive, Nashville, TN 37210.

Guangzhou Evotech Industry Co., Ltd., No. 28 E–05, Baoli Center Square, Jiansheda Ma Road, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China (Mainland) 510000.

Hardcandy Cases LLC, d/b/a GUMDROP LLC, 2730 Gateway Oaks Drive 100, Sacramento, CA 95833.

Hoffco Brands, Inc., d/b/a Celltronix, 4860 Ward Road, Wheat Ridge, CO 80033.

Hong Kong Better Technology Group Ltd., 10A, Hongling Building, Hongling South Road, Futian District, Shenzhen, China 518000.

Hong Kong HJJ Co. Ltd., Room 4, Block 2 West, SEG Technology Park, HuaQiang North Road, Futian District, Shenzhen, China 518028.

Hypercel Corporation, d/b/a Naztech Technologies, 28010 Industry Drive, Valencia, CA 91355.

InMotion Entertainment, 4801 Executive Park Court, Suite 100, Jacksonville, FL 32216.

MegaWatts Computers, LLC, 3501 South Sheridan Road, Tulsa, OK 74145.

National Cellular, 5620 1st Avenue, Third Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11220.

OEMBargain.com, P.O. Box 7132, Wantagh, NY 11793.

One Step Up Ltd., d/b/a Lifeworks Technology Group LLC, 1412 Broadway 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10018.

Papaya Holdings Ltd., 8/F, CNT Commercial Bldg., 302 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Quanyun Electronics Co., Ltd., Floor 1, Workshop No. 1, Weihua Industrial Areas, Tongsheng Community, Dalang Street, Baoan District, Shenzhen, China (Mainland) 518000.

ShenZhen Star & Way Trade Co., Ltd., d/b/a DHgate Sellers Best8168 and Julyoung, Guangzhou Chaoshanglong Company, Room 901, No. 43–3 Siheng Street, Shuiyin Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou City, China 510000.

Sinatech Industrial Co., Ltd., Room 3005, #570, FangCun, LiWan District, GuangZhou City, China.

SmileCase, 3226 Ridgeway Place, Windsor Mill, MD 21244.

Suntel Global Investment Ltd., 2F–D5, Jian Fa Square, 111#, Ji Chang Road, Baiyun District, Guangzhou, China.

TheCaseInPoint.com, 793 Marian Court, Titusville, FL 32780.

TheCaseSpace, 215 East Foothills Parkway #D–003, Fort Collins, CO 80525.

Topter Technology Co. Ltd., 2nd Floor, Building B, Jinkajin Industrial Zone, Minying Industrial Park, Shuitian Village, Shiyan Town, Shenzhen Guangdong, China.

Trait Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., 416—419RM, 305# Sufa Building, Huafa North Road, Futian District, Shenzhen, China.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern, 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(d)–(e) and 210.13(a), such responses 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 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.

Issued: June 24, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–16361 Filed 6–29–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. George's Foods, LLC, et. al.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia in *United States of America* v. *George's Foods, LLC, et. al.,* Civil Action No. 5:11–cv–00043. On May 10, 2011, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that George's Foods, LLC; George's Family Farms, LLC; and George's, Inc. (collectively, ''George's'') acquisition of Tyson Foods, Inc.'s (''Tyson's'') Harrisonburg, Virginia chicken processing complex, consummated May 7, 2011, violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed on June 23, 2011, requires the Defendants to make certain capital improvements to the Harrisonburg facility.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at *http://www.usdoj.gov/atr,* and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia. 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.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to William H. Stallings, Chief, Transportation, Energy and Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–9323).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Harrisonburg Division

United States of America, Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. *George's Foods, LLC, P.O. Drawer G, Springdale, Arkansas 72765, George's Family Farms, LLC, P.O. Drawer G, Springdale, Arkansas 72765,* and *George's, Inc, 402 West Robinson Avenue, Springdale, Arkansas 72764,* Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 5:11–cv–00043

Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action for equitable relief against George's Foods, LLC; George's Family Farms, LLC; and George's, Inc. (collectively, ''George's'') for violating Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. This lawsuit challenges George's acquisition of Tyson Foods, Inc.'s (''Tyson's'') Harrisonburg, Virginia chicken processing complex, consummated May 7, 2011 (the ''Transaction''). The Transaction violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act because its effect may be substantially to lessen competition for the services of broiler growers operating in and around the Shenandoah Valley area of Virginia and West Virginia. The United States alleges as follows:

I. Nature of Action

1. The United States learned about the Transaction on or about March 18, 2011, when Tyson and George's publicly announced George's intent to buy Tyson's Harrisonburg chicken processing complex. The United States subsequently opened an investigation into the proposed deal, and issued Civil Investigative Demands (''CIDs'') on April 18, 2011, seeking information on the potential competitive effects of the acquisition and George's proposed business justifications for purchasing the plant. After serving the CIDs, the United States engaged in numerous discussions with the parties to seek the production of relevant information as quickly as possible. These discussions were continuing at the close of business on Friday, May 6, 2011. On Saturday, May 7, 2011, without any notice to the United States and before responding to the CIDs, George's and Tyson entered into an asset purchase agreement and simultaneously closed the Transaction. The parties undertook this action even though they knew that the United States had serious concerns about the Transaction and had requested to be notified prior to the parties' closing the Transaction.

2. George's and Tyson are competing chicken processors, each operating facilities involved in the production, processing, and distribution of ''broilers,'' which are chickens raised for meat products. George's and Tyson vigorously compete with each other not only in the sale of chicken products, but also for the services of farmers, called ''growers,'' who care for and raise chicks from the time they are hatched until the time they are ready for slaughter.

3. Processors compete for growers in areas where the processors' plants are close together. Prior to consummation of the Transaction, the Shenandoah Valley region of Virginia and West Virginia was one such area where George's and Tyson competed head-to-head for broiler grower services. There, George's and Tyson operated facilities about 30 miles away from each other—George's with a processing facility in Edinburg, Virginia and a feed mill in Harrisonburg, Virginia; and Tyson with a processing facility in Harrisonburg, Virginia and a feed mill in Mount Jackson, Virginia (between Harrisonburg and Edinburg). Transportation costs are such that processors typically contract with growers within limited geographic areas surrounding their facilities. Because of their close proximity, the area from which Tyson and George's recruit growers for their respective Shenandoah Valley facilities overlap substantially. For growers in that region, Tyson and George's are two of only three processors to whom growers can sell their services.

4. On May 7, 2011, George's entered into an agreement with Tyson under which George's acquired Tyson's Harrisonburg, Virginia chicken processing complex. The complex is capable of processing approximately 32 million chickens per year. Tyson contracted with over 120 area growers to support this facility. As a result of the Transaction, George's controls approximately 43% of chicken processing capacity in the Shenandoah Valley, with only one other remaining