

Total Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost: \$30,000.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The authority for this action is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Mark Purdy,

Management Analyst, Bureau of Land Management.

[FR Doc. 2017-22615 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-344 (Fourth Review)]

Tapered Roller Bearings From China; Notice of Commission Determination To Conduct a Full Five-Year Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with a full review pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the review will be established and announced at a later date.

DATES: October 6, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Keysha Martinez (202-205-2136), 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207,

subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 6, 2017, the Commission determined that it would proceed to a full review in the subject five-year review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). In response to the Commission's notice of institution (82 FR 30898, July 3, 2017), the Commission found that the domestic interested party group response was adequate and the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission also found that other circumstances warranted conducting a full review.¹ A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 13, 2017.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2017-22551 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-678-679 and 681-682 (Fourth Review)]

Stainless Steel Bar From Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain; Notice of Commission Determination To Conduct Full Five-Year Reviews

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on stainless steel bar from Brazil, India, Japan, and Spain would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date.

¹ Vice Chairman Johanson and Commissioner Broadbent voted to conduct a full review of the order. Chairman Schmidlein and Commissioner Williamson voted to conduct an expedited review of the order.

DATES: October 6, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amanda Lawrence (202-205-3185), 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On

October 6, 2017, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). The Commission found that the domestic parties' group response to its notice of institution was adequate and that the respondent interested parties' group responses to its notice of institution for the reviews on subject imports from Japan and Spain were adequate. The Commission found that the respondent interested parties' group responses to its notice of institution for the reviews on subject imports from Brazil and India were inadequate. However, the Commission determined to conduct full reviews concerning the orders on stainless steel bar from Brazil and India to promote administrative efficiency in light of its decision to conduct full reviews of the orders on stainless steel bar from Japan and Spain. A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 12, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017-22522 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1005]

Certain L-Tryptophan, L-Tryptophan Products, and Their Methods of Production; Commission Determination to Review a Final Initial Determination Finding No Section 337 Violation; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and 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 to review a final initial determination (“FID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The Commission requests certain briefing from the parties on the issues under review, as indicated in this notice. The Commission also requests briefing from the parties and interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Houda Morad, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-4716. 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 <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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 Investigation No. 337-TA-1005 on June 14, 2016, based on a complaint filed by Complainants

Ajinomoto Co., Inc. of Tokyo, Japan and Ajinomoto Heartland Inc. of Chicago, Illinois (collectively, “Ajinomoto” or “Complainants”). See 81 FR 38735-6 (June 14, 2016). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain L-tryptophan, L-tryptophan products, and their methods of production, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,666,655 (“the ‘655 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,180,373 (“the ‘373 patent”). *Id.* The notice of investigation identified CJ CheilJedang Corp. of Seoul, Republic of Korea; CJ America, Inc. of Downers Grove, Illinois; and PT CheilJedang Indonesia of Jakarta, Indonesia (collectively “CJ” or “Respondents”) as respondents in this investigation. See *id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to the investigation.

On August 11, 2017, the ALJ issued his FID finding no violation of section 337. Specifically, the FID finds that: (1) Respondents’ accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ‘373 or the ‘655 patents either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents; (2) claim 10 of the ‘373 patent is invalid for indefiniteness and lack of written description; (3) claim 20 of the ‘655 patent is invalid for lack of written description; and (4) Complainants’ products do not satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to the ‘655 or the ‘373 patents. In addition, should the Commission find a violation of section 337, the RD recommends that the Commission issue: (1) A limited exclusion order against Respondents’ accused products; and (2) a cease and desist order against Respondent CJ America.

The Commission has determined to review the FID in its entirety. In connection with its review, the parties are requested to brief their positions with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record regarding the questions provided below:

1. Please explain, with textual support from the McKitrick reference (JX-5), discussed at column 6, lines 29-37 of the ‘373 patent, whether McKitrick discloses measuring serine sensitivity via a forward assay, a reverse assay, or both.

2. Please explain whether and why the specific conditions and methods of McKitrick (JX-5) and Bauerle (JX-37), discussed in the ‘373 patent specification, were not closely followed

to establish infringement of the ‘373 patent. Please provide factual as well as legal support to explain whether the methods employed provide adequate proof of infringement.

3. Assuming prosecution history estoppel arising from the amendment of the term a “protein that has several amino acid deletions, substitutions, insertions, or additions as compared to SEQ ID NO:2” during prosecution of the ‘655 patent, is relevant to the scope of the term “said protein consists of the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2” in claim 9, please explain whether or not any estoppel presumption is rebutted.

4. Please explain the relevance of Exhibit CX-487 (Random House Dictionary definition of “replace”) on the claim construction of the term “replacing the native promoter” in the ‘655 patent claims and include a copy of the CX-487 exhibit.

In addition, in connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent(s) 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 likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (Dec. 1994) (Comm’n Op.).

If the Commission contemplates some 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.