

Order products. The mandate of the Court issued on November 17, 2014, with respect to uPI's appeal (Appeal No. 13–1157) and on December 8, 2014, with respect to Richtek's appeal (Appeal No. 13–1159).

In its order of April 8, 2015, the Commission remanded the case to a presiding administrative law judge and ordered the presiding ALJ to:

make findings and issue a remand recommended determination (“RRD”) concerning the total number of days an importation or sale in the United States occurred in violation of the Consent Order in accordance with the Federal Circuit decision in *uPI Semiconductor Corp. v. ITC and Richtek Technology Corp. v. ITC*, 767 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2014), taking into account (1) any additional violation days with respect to the post-Consent Order products Richtek specifically accused (*see* EID at 9 n.6); and (2) the subtraction of eight (8) violation days with respect to the formerly accused products. The RRD will also recommend a total civil penalty amount based on the previous daily penalty of \$10,000 per day of violation.

Comm'n Order. On April 20, 2015, Richtek filed a motion for reconsideration of the Commission's Remand Order with respect to the amount of the daily penalty and on May 7, 2015, the motion was denied. *See* Comm'n Order Denying Motion. On October 8, 2015, the presiding ALJ issued his RRD finding that after the eight-day subtraction, eleven (11) days, associated with post-Consent Order products, should be added to the number of days (54) uPI violated the Consent Order to make the total sixty-five (65) days in violation, and accordingly increased the total civil penalty amount to \$650,000 based on the daily penalty of \$10,000. On October 19, 2015, Richtek submitted comments regarding the RRD which reiterated the same arguments made in its denied motion for reconsideration. *Id.* On October 26, 2015, uPI and the Commission investigative attorney each filed a reply to Richtek's comments.

The Commission has determined to adopt the RRD as a final determination of the Commission and has issued a modified civil penalty order in the amount of \$650,000 directed against uPI. The Commission has rejected the arguments regarding the amount of the daily penalty made by Richtek in its submitted comments for the same reasons given in the Commission's Order denying Richtek's motion for reconsideration. The Commission has terminated the remand enforcement proceeding.

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 Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR part 210.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 6, 2016.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2016–00288 Filed 1–8–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–979]

### Certain Radio Frequency Identification (“RFID”) Products and Components Thereof Institution of Investigation

**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 December 4, 2015, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Neology, Inc. of Poway, California. A supplement to the complaint was filed on December 22, 2015. 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 radio frequency identification (“RFID”) products and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,325,044 (“the ‘044 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,587,436 (“the ‘436 patent”); and U.S. Patent No. 7,119,664 (“the ‘664 patent”). 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 limited 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 (2015).

*Scope of Investigation:* Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on January 5, 2016, *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 radio frequency identification (“RFID”) products and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 13, 14, and 25 of the ‘044 patent; claims 1–4, 6–12, and 14–18 of the ‘436 patent; and claims 1, 2, 9–12, 14–18, and 26–28 of the ‘664 patent, 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: Neology, Inc., 12760 Danielson Court, Suite A, Poway, CA 92064.

(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:

Kapsch TrafficCom IVHS, Inc., 8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1002, McLean, VA 22102.

Kapsch TrafficCom IVHS Holding Corp., 8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1002, McLean, VA 22102.

Kapsch TrafficCom IVHS Technologies Holding Corp., 8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1002, McLean, VA 22102.

Kapsch TrafficCom U.S. Corp., 8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1002, McLean, VA 22102.

Kapsch TrafficCom Holding Corp.,  
8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1002,  
McLean, VA 22102.

Kapsch TrafficCom Canada, Inc., 6020  
Ambler Drive, Mississauga, ON L4W  
2P1, Canada.

Star Systems International, Ltd., Unit  
A01, 24/F Gold King Industrial  
Building, 35–41 Tai Lin Pai Road, Kwai  
Chung, Hong Kong.

STAR RFID Co., Ltd., 1 Charoenrat  
Road, Thung Wat Don, Sathon, Bangkok  
10120 Thailand.

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

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule  
210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the  
presiding administrative law judge shall  
take evidence or other information and  
hear arguments from the parties and  
other interested persons with respect to  
the public interest in this investigation,  
as appropriate, and provide the  
Commission with findings of fact and a  
recommended determination on this  
issue, which shall be limited to the  
statutory public interest factors set forth  
in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(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), 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.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 6, 2016.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2016–00289 Filed 1–8–16; 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—R Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on  
December 3, 2015, pursuant to section  
6(a) of the National Cooperative  
Research and Production Act of 1993,  
15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), R  
Consortium, Inc. (“R Consortium”) 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.  
Specifically, 0965688 BC LTD., Surrey,  
British Columbia, CANADA, has been  
added as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in  
either the membership or planned  
activity of the group research project.  
Membership in this group research  
project remains open, and R Consortium  
intends to file additional written  
notifications disclosing all changes in  
membership.

On September 15, 2015, R Consortium  
filed its original notification pursuant to  
section 6(a) of the Act. The Department  
of Justice published a notice in the  
**Federal Register** pursuant to section  
6(b) of the Act on October 2, 2015 (80  
FR 59815).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust  
Division.*

[FR Doc. 2016–00323 Filed 1–8–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—The Open Group, L.L.C.

Notice is hereby given that, on  
December 8, 2015, pursuant to section  
6(a) of the National Cooperative  
Research and Production Act of 1993,  
15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), The  
Open Group, L.L.C. (“TOG”) 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.

Specifically, AEGIS.net, Inc.,  
Rockville, MD; Air Force Research  
Laboratory, Kirtland AFB, NM; Aoyama  
Gakuin University, Tokyo, JAPAN; Bank  
of Zambia, Lusaka, ZAMBIA; Dunstan  
Thomas Consulting, Ltd., Portsmouth,  
UNITED KINGDOM; Front Metrics  
Technologies Pvt. Ltd., Pune, INDIA;  
Geco, Inc., Mesa, AZ; Inspur Co., Ltd.,  
Beijing, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF  
CHINA; IAB BVBA, Boutersem,  
BELGIUM; Intelligent Training de  
Columbia, Bogota, COLOMBIA; Joint  
Tactical Network Center, San Diego, CA;  
M J Anniss, Ltd., Nairn, UNITED  
KINGDOM; PLANAD Consultoria em  
Gestão Empresarial Ltda., São Paulo,  
BRAZIL; SIGMAXYZ Inc., Tokyo,  
JAPAN; S.P. Jain Institute of  
Management Research, Mumbai, INDIA;  
Universidad Continental, Huancayo,  
PERU; University of Dayton Research  
Institute, Dayton, OH; Vencore, Inc.,  
Lexington Park, MD; Vigilance, Inc.,  
McLean, VA; and White Cloud Software  
Ltd., Bowen Island, CANADA, have  
been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Architecture Capability  
Assurance Strategic Group, Palo Alto,  
CA; ATSI S.A., Zabierzow, POLAND;  
AXE, Inc., Nakagyo-ku, JAPAN; Bell  
Helicopter Textron Inc., Fort Worth, TX;  
CS Interactive Training, Pretoria,  
SOUTH AFRICA; EXELIS, Inc., Clifton,  
NJ; Fairchild Controls Corporation,  
Frederick, MD; Hoople Limited,  
Hereford, UNITED KINGDOM; Howell  
Instruments, Inc., Fort Worth, TX; Indra  
Colombia, Bogota, COLOMBIA;  
Kamehameha Schools-Trustees of the  
Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop,  
Honolulu, HI; Korea Software  
Technology Association, Gyeonggi-Do,  
REPUBLIC OF KOREA; Mobile  
Reasoning, Inc., Lenaxa, KS; Nippon  
Telegraph & Telephone Corporation,  
Tokyo, JAPAN; Online Business  
Systems, Winnepeg, CANADA;  
PreterLex Limited, Cambridge, UNITED  
KINGDOM; University of Nordland,  
Oslo, NORWAY; VIP Apps Consulting  
Limited, Hertfordshire, UNITED  
KINGDOM; and World Vision  
International, Monrovia, CA, have  
withdrawn as parties to this venture.

In addition, Hewlett Packard  
Company has changed its name to  
Hewlett Packard Enterprises, Cupertino,  
CA.