

Commission determined not to review Order No. 82. Notice (Aug. 26, 2015).

On October 27, 2015, in response to the issuance of an ID (Order No. 106), which terminated the investigation before the ALJ, Dentons US filed a petition for Commission review of Order Nos. 43 and 83. *See* 19 CFR 210.24 (rulings by the ALJ “on motions may not be appealed to the Commission prior to the administrative law judge’s issuance of an initial determination”). On November 3, 2015, and November 9, 2015, the Office of Unfair Import Investigations and Gap, respectively, opposed Dentons’ petition.

The Commission has determined to review Order No. 43, and, on review, has determined to vacate the disqualification decision as moot. In view of the final disposition of the investigation as to all respondents, the issue of Dentons US’s disqualification has no practical effect on this investigation.

Although the Commission has the discretion to address issues that have become moot, it has determined not to do so here. The disqualification in this investigation turns on whether Dentons US and Dentons Canada LLP as members of Salans FMC Denton Group (“Dentons Verein”) should be treated as a single law firm under the American Bar Association’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct (“Model Rules”) in this investigation. Answering that question would require further proceedings, and potentially additional factfinding. In particular, Comment 2 to Model Rule 1.0 sets forth several factors to consider in determining whether a group of lawyers constitute a law firm, including (1) how the lawyers present themselves to the public, (2) whether the lawyers conduct themselves as a law firm, (3) the terms of any formal agreement among the lawyers, and (4) whether the lawyers have mutual access to client information. Here, the record lacks sufficient evidence on these factors, especially as to the third factor, because the Dentons Verein organizational agreements have not been made part of the record of the investigation. The Commission has decided that the added delay, burdens, and expenses that would be incurred by the parties and the Commission in resolving these issues are unjustified given the termination of the investigation as to all respondents.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined to review and vacate Order No. 43, without deciding whether the disqualification in this investigation was appropriate. The reasoning in support of the Commission’s decision

will be set forth more fully in a forthcoming opinion.

In light of its determination above, the Commission has determined not to review Order No. 83, which denied as untimely a motion of Dentons US and Revolaze for reconsideration of Order No. 43 or for interlocutory review by the Commission.

The Commission notes that in April 2016, it received several submissions from RevoLaze and Dentons US after the deadlines for submissions set forth in 19 CFR 210.43 had passed. The Commission rejects these submissions as untimely and procedurally improper, and did not consider them in making its determination.

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).

Issued: April 12, 2016.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–08845 Filed 4–15–16; 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—IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 18, 2016, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc. (“IMS Global”) 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, Baltimore County Public Schools, Baltimore, MD; Broward Community College, Fort Lauderdale, FL; explorance, Montreal, Quebec, CANADA; its learning, Bergen, NORWAY; Katy Independent School District, Katy, TX; and Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, EUN Partnership AISBL, Brussels, BELGIUM; Open Universiteit

Nederland, Heerlen, THE NETHERLANDS; D.E. Solution sprl, Brussels, BELGIUM; Poway Unified School District, Poway, CA; American Institutes for Research, Washington, DC; University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT; and Gutenberg Technology, Cambridge, MA, have withdrawn as parties 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 IMS Global intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 7, 2000, IMS Global 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 September 13, 2000 (65 FR 55283).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 29, 2015. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on January 22, 2016 (81 FR 3820).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2016–08803 Filed 4–15–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Advanced Media Workflow Association, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 23, 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”), Advanced Media Workflow Association, Inc. 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, Arista Networks, Santa Clara, CA; Cisco International Limited, Feltham, UNITED KINGDOM; Coveloz Technologies, Inc., Kanata, CANADA; Masstech Innovations, Markham, Ontario, CANADA; Iain Collins (individual member), London, UNITED KINGDOM; Gabor Forgacs (individual member), Budapest, HUNGARY; Laurance Hughes