

patent and claims 15, 18, 19, 30, and 32 of the '443 patent, but do not infringe claim 17 of the '443 patent. The final ID also found that Respondents have shown that the asserted claims of the '977 patent are invalid for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, but have not shown that the asserted claims of the '443 are invalid. In addition, the final ID found that Respondents failed to show that the asserted claims of the '977 and '443 patents are unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The final ID further found that Nobel has satisfied the domestic industry requirement with respect to both the '977 and '443 patents.

On November 10, 2015, the ALJ issued his recommended determination ("RD") on remedy and bonding. The RD recommended that the appropriate remedy is a limited exclusion order barring entry of Respondents' infringing dental implants. The RD did not recommend issuance of a cease and desist order against any respondent. The RD recommended the imposition of a bond of \$120 per imported unit during the period of Presidential review.

On November 9, 2015, Nobel filed a petition for review of the final ID's finding of no violation with respect to claims 1–5 of the '977 patent. In particular, Nobel requested review of the final ID's finding that the March 2003 Product Catalog of Alpha Bio Tec, Ltd. ("the 2003 Alpha Bio Tec Catalog") constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), arguing that the catalog was not sufficiently publicly accessible prior to the critical date. Nobel also requested, if the Commission determines not to review the ID's prior art finding, that the Commission review the final ID's construction of the limitation "the coronal region having a frustoconical shape" recited in claim 1 of the '977 patent and, accordingly, review the final ID's finding that the accused products do not infringe claims 1–5 of the '977 patent under Nobel's proposed construction of that limitation. Nobel further argued that, should the Commission agree partially with Nobel concerning the proper construction of the limitation "the coronal region having a frustoconical shape," the 2003 Alpha-Bio Tec Catalog does not anticipate the asserted claims of the '977 patent.

No party petitioned for review of the final ID's finding that there is a violation of section 337 with respect to the '443 patent.

On November 17, 2015, Respondents and the Commission investigative attorney each filed responses opposing Nobel's petition for review.

On December 10, 2015, Respondents submitted a post-RD statement on the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4). On December 14, 2015, Nobel submitted a post-RD statement on the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4). No responses were filed by the public in response to the post-RD Commission Notice issued on November 12, 2015. See Notice of Request for Statements on the Public Interest, 80 FR 76574–75 (Dec. 9, 2015), *see also* Correction of Notice, 80 FR 77376–77 (Dec. 14, 2015).

On January 14, 2016, the Commission determined to review the Final ID in part with respect to the '977 patent. 81 FR 3471–3473 (Jan. 21, 2016). Specifically, the Commission determined to review the final ID's construction of the limitation "coronal region having a frustoconical shape" recited in claim 1 of the '977 patent with regard to whether or not the term "frustoconical shape" is an adjective that modifies the claimed "coronal region" or whether the term is an independent structure that may comprise only a portion of the claimed "coronal region." In accordance with its claim construction review, the Commission further determined to review the final ID's infringement findings with respect to claims 1–5 of the '977 patent, as well as the final ID's finding that the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement is satisfied with respect to claims 1–5 of the '977 patent. The Commission also determined to review the final ID's finding that the 2003 Alpha Bio Tec Catalog is a printed publication under 35 U.S.C. 102. The Commission further determined to review the final ID's finding that the 2003 Alpha Bio Tec Catalog anticipates claims 1–5 of the '977 patent. In connection with its review, the Commission requested briefing on several questions. *Id.* at 3472.

The Commission determined not to review the remaining issues decided in the final ID, including any of the Final ID's findings with respect to the '443 patent. The Commission also denied a motion filed by Nobel to amend the Administrative Protective Order issued in this investigation to add specific provisions permitting the use of discovery from this investigation in two co-pending proceedings in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office captioned as *Instradent USA, Inc. v. Nobel Biocare Services AG*, IPR2015–01784, and *Instradent USA, Inc. v. Nobel Biocare Services AG*, IPR2015–01786, as well as Nobel's motion for leave to file a reply in support of its motion. *Id.* at 3473.

On January 21, 2016, the parties filed initial submissions in response to the Commission's request for written submissions. On January 28, 2016, the parties filed response submissions.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, and the parties' submissions on review, the Commission has determined to find that a violation of section 337 has occurred. The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief is a limited exclusion order under 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), prohibiting the unlicensed entry of dental implants that infringe any of claims 1–5 of the '977 patent and claims 15, 18, 19, 30, and 32 of the '443 patent.

The Commission has further determined that consideration of the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(d) (19 U.S.C. 1337(d)) does not preclude issuance of the limited exclusion order. The Commission has determined that the bond for temporary importation during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)) shall be in the amount of \$120 per unit of articles subject to the exclusion order. The Commission's order was delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of its issuance.

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 26, 2016.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–10173 Filed 4–29–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–808 (Third Review)]

Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From Russia; Institution of a Five-Year Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted a review pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), as amended, to determine whether revocation of the antidumping

duty order on Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products ("hot-rolled steel") from Russia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is June 1, 2016. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by July 14, 2016.

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 2, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mary Messer (202–205–3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this proceeding may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—Effective July 12, 1999, Commerce suspended the antidumping duty investigation on hot-rolled steel imports from Russia (64 FR 38642, July 19, 1999). Following first five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective May 12, 2005, Commerce issued a continuation of the suspended investigation on imports of hot-rolled steel from Russia (70 FR 32571, June 3, 2005). Following second five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective June 17, 2011, Commerce issued a continuation of the suspended investigation on imports of hot-rolled steel from Russia (76 FR 35400, June 17, 2011). Effective December 19, 2014, Commerce terminated the agreement suspending the antidumping duty investigation on hot-rolled steel from Russia and issued an antidumping duty order (79 FR 77455, December 24, 2014). The

Commission is now conducting a third review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), to determine whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Provisions concerning the conduct of this proceeding may be found in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure at 19 CFR parts 201, Subparts A and B and 19 CFR part 207, subparts A and F. The Commission will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct a full review or an expedited review. The Commission's determination in any expedited review will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to this review:

(1) *Subject Merchandise* is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year review, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The *Subject Country* in this review is Russia.

(3) The *Domestic Like Product* is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the *Subject Merchandise*. In its original determination and its full first and second five-year review determinations, the Commission found one *Domestic Like Product* consisting of all hot-rolled steel, as defined in Commerce's scope.

(4) The *Domestic Industry* is the U.S. producers as a whole of the *Domestic Like Product*, or those producers whose collective output of the *Domestic Like Product* constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determination and its full first and second five-year review determinations, the Commission defined the *Domestic Industry* as all producers of hot-rolled steel.

(5) An *Importer* is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the *Subject Merchandise* into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

Participation in the proceeding and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the *Subject Merchandise* and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in the proceeding as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as

provided in section 201.11(b)(4) of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the proceeding.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are advised that they may appear in a review even if they participated personally and substantially in the corresponding underlying original investigation or an earlier review of the same underlying investigation. The Commission's designated agency ethics official has advised that a five-year review is not the same particular matter as the underlying original investigation, and a five-year review is not the same particular matter as an earlier review of the same underlying investigation for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees, and Commission rule 201.15(b) (19 CFR 201.15(b)), 79 FR 3246 (Jan. 17, 2014), 73 FR 24609 (May 5, 2008). Consequently, former employees are not required to seek Commission approval to appear in a review under Commission rule 19 CFR 201.15, even if the corresponding underlying original investigation or an earlier review of the same underlying investigation was pending when they were Commission employees. For further ethics advice on this matter, contact Carol McCue Verratti, Deputy Agency Ethics Official, at 202–205–3088.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and APO service list.—Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI submitted in this proceeding available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the proceeding, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the proceeding. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Certification.—Pursuant to section 207.3 of the Commission's rules, any person submitting information to the Commission in connection with this proceeding must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter's knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will be deemed to consent, unless

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117–0016/USITC No. 16–5–355, expiration date June 30, 2017. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 15 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436.

otherwise specified, for the Commission, its employees, and contract personnel to use the information provided in any other reviews or investigations of the same or comparable products which the Commission conducts under Title VII of the Act, or in internal audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Commission pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3.

Written submissions.—Pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules, each interested party response to this notice must provide the information specified below. The deadline for filing such responses is June 1, 2016. Pursuant to section 207.62(b) of the Commission's rules, eligible parties (as specified in Commission rule 207.62(b)(1)) may also file comments concerning the adequacy of responses to the notice of institution and whether the Commission should conduct an expedited or full review. The deadline for filing such comments is July 14, 2016. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's Handbook on E-Filing, available on the Commission's Web site at <http://edis.usitc.gov>, elaborates upon the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing. Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the proceeding must be served on all other parties to the proceeding (as identified by either the public or APO service list as appropriate), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the proceeding you do not need to serve your response).

Inability to provide requested information.—Pursuant to section 207.61(c) of the Commission's rules, any interested party that cannot furnish the information requested by this notice in the requested form and manner shall notify the Commission at the earliest possible time, provide a full explanation of why it cannot provide the requested information, and indicate alternative forms in which it can provide equivalent information. If an interested party does not provide this notification (or the Commission finds the explanation provided in the notification inadequate) and fails to provide a complete response to this notice, the Commission may take an adverse inference against the party pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677e(b)) in making its determination in the review.

Information to Be Provided In Response to this Notice of Institution: As used below, the term "firm" includes any related firms.

(1) The name and address of your firm or entity (including World Wide Web address) and name, telephone number, fax number, and Email address of the certifying official.

(2) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is a U.S. producer of the *Domestic Like Product*, a U.S. union or worker group, a U.S. importer of the *Subject Merchandise*, a foreign producer or exporter of the *Subject Merchandise*, a U.S. or foreign trade or business association, or another interested party (including an explanation). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, identify the firms in which your workers are employed or which are members of your association.

(3) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is willing to participate in this proceeding by providing information requested by the Commission.

(4) A statement of the likely effects of the revocation of the antidumping duty order on the *Domestic Industry* in general and/or your firm/entity specifically. In your response, please discuss the various factors specified in section 752(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675a(a)) including the likely volume of subject imports, likely price effects of subject imports, and likely impact of imports of *Subject Merchandise* on the *Domestic Industry*.

(5) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. producers of the *Domestic Like Product*. Identify any known related parties and the nature of the relationship as defined in section 771(4)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677(4)(B)).

(6) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. importers of the *Subject Merchandise* and producers of the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* that currently export or have exported *Subject Merchandise* to the United States or other countries after 2010.

(7) A list of 3–5 leading purchasers in the U.S. market for the *Domestic Like Product* and the *Subject Merchandise* (including street address, World Wide Web address, and the name, telephone number, fax number, and Email address of a responsible official at each firm).

(8) A list of known sources of information on national or regional prices for the *Domestic Like Product* or the *Subject Merchandise* in the U.S. or other markets.

(9) If you are a U.S. producer of the *Domestic Like Product*, provide the following information on your firm's

operations on that product during calendar year 2015, except as noted (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. production of the *Domestic Like Product* accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the *Domestic Like Product* (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix);

(c) the quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s);

(d) the quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s); and

(e) the value of (i) net sales, (ii) cost of goods sold (COGS), (iii) gross profit, (iv) selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and (v) operating income of the *Domestic Like Product* produced in your U.S. plant(s) (include both U.S. and export commercial sales, internal consumption, and company transfers) for your most recently completed fiscal year (identify the date on which your fiscal year ends).

(10) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country*, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2015 (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') imports;

(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping and/or countervailing duties) of U.S.

commercial shipments of *Subject Merchandise* imported from the *Subject Country*; and

(c) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of *Subject Merchandise* imported from the *Subject Country*.

(11) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country*, provide the following information on that product during calendar year 2015 (report quantity data in short tons and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping duties). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm(s) to produce the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix); and

(c) the quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the *Domestic Like Product* that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* after 2010, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand

abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the *Domestic Like Product* produced in the United States, *Subject Merchandise* produced in the *Subject Country*, and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (Optional) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the *Domestic Like Product* and *Domestic Industry*; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This proceeding is being conducted under authority of Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 25, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016-09928 Filed 4-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Meeting of the CJIS Advisory Policy Board

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), DOJ.

ACTION: Meeting notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to announce the meeting of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board (APB). The CJIS APB is a federal advisory committee established pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). This meeting announcement is being published as required by Section 10 of the FACA.

DATES: The APB will meet in open session from 8:30 a.m. until 5 p.m., on June 8–9, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at Norfolk Waterside Marriott Hotel & Convention Center, 235 East Main Street, Norfolk, VA 23510, telephone (757) 627–4200.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Inquiries may be addressed to Ms. Kara Delmont; Management Program Assistant; CJIS Training and Advisory Process Unit, Resources Management Section; FBI CJIS Division, Module C2, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306–0149; telephone

(304) 625–5859, facsimile (304) 625–5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FBI CJIS APB is responsible for reviewing policy issues and appropriate technical and operational issues related to the programs administered by the FBI's CJIS Division, and thereafter, making appropriate recommendations to the FBI Director. The programs administered by the CJIS Division are the Next Generation Identification, Interstate Identification Index, Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal, National Crime Information Center, National Instant Criminal Background Check System, National Incident-Based Reporting System, National Data Exchange, and Uniform Crime Reporting.

This meeting is open to the public. All attendees will be required to check-in at the meeting registration desk. Registrations will be accepted on a space available basis. Interested persons whose registrations have been accepted may be permitted to participate in the discussions at the discretion of the meeting chairman and with approval of the Designated Federal Officer (DFO). Any member of the public may file a written statement with the Board. Written comments shall be focused on the APB's current issues under discussion and may not be repetitive of previously submitted written statements. Written comments should be provided to Mr. R. Scott Trent, DFO, at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting so that the comments may be made available to the APB for their consideration prior to the meeting.

Anyone requiring special accommodations should notify Mr. Trent at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting.

Dated: April 6, 2016.

R. Scott Trent,

CJIS Designated Federal Officer, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[FR Doc. 2016-08606 Filed 4-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decrees Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On April 22, 2016, the Department of Justice lodged two proposed consent decrees with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee in the lawsuit entitled *United States and State of Tennessee v. OXY USA Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1:16-cv-103.