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 18, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2017–01530 Filed 1–23–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1091 (Second Review)]

ARTISTS’ CANVAS FROM CHINA;
SCHEDULING OF AN EXPEDITED FIVE-YEAR REVIEW


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (‘‘the Act’’) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on artists’ canvas from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

DATES: Effective Date: January 6, 2017.


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 202–205–1800.

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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On January 6, 2017, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (81 FR 86689, October 3, 2016) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review. Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)). 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 and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on February 1, 2017, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission’s rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission’s rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution, and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before February 6, 2017 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by February 6, 2017. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce’s
final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce’s results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules with respect to filing were revised effective July 25, 2014. See 79 FR 35920 (June 25, 2014), and the revised Commission Handbook on E-filing, available from the Commission’s Web site at https://edis.usitc.gov.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

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: January 17, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

BILLY CODE 7020–02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1018]

Certain Athletic Footwear; Commission’s Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation; Issuance of Consent Order; Termination of the Investigation


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge’s (“ALJ”) initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 11) terminating the respondents based on consent order stipulations and a joint proposed consent order. The Commission has terminated the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amanda Pitcher Fisherow, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2737. 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 this investigation on September 13, 2016, based on a complaint, including supplements, filed on behalf of Reebok International Ltd. of Canton, Massachusetts and Reebok International Limited of England. (“complainants”). 81 FR 62920 (Sept. 13, 2016). The complaint as supplemented alleged 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 athletic footwear by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,637,035 and U.S. Patent No. 8,505,221. The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. The Commission’s notice of investigation named the following respondents: TRB Acquisitions LLC (“TRB”) of New York, New York; RBX Active 01 LLC, RBX Direct LLC, and RBX.COM LLC (collectively, “RBX”) all of New York, New York; and Elite Performance Footwear, LLC (“Elite”) of New York, New York.

On November 14, 2016, respondent TRB filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to TRB based on a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. On November 25, 2016, the RBX respondents filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to the RBX respondents based on a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. Finally, on December 1, 2016, respondent Elite filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to Elite based on a consent order stipulation and proposed consent order. Complainants originally opposed TRB’s motion but later complainants and respondents filed a joint notice on December 12, 2016, that complainants now join respondents’ motions to terminate. This filing included a joint proposed consent order.

On December 20, 2016, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 11) terminating the investigation based on the consent order stipulations and a joint proposed consent order. The ALJ found that the consent order stipulations complied with the rules and that the respondents represented that “there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied between the parties concerning the subject matter of the investigation.” The ALJ also found that the joint proposed consent order complies with Commission Rule 210.21(c)(4). Finally, the ALJ found termination of the investigation “does not impose any undue burdens on the public health and welfare, competitive conditions in the United States economy, production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.”

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID and has issued the joint consent order. The Commission has terminated the investigation.

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 17, 2017.

Lisa R. Barton,
Secretary to the Commission.

BILLY CODE 7020–02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1036]

Certain Magnetic Tape Cartridges and Components Thereof Institution of Investigation


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on December 15, 2016, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Sony Corporation of Japan; Sony Storage Media and Devices Corporation of Japan; Sony DADC US Inc. of Terre Haute, Indiana; and Sony Latin America Inc. of Miami, Florida. Supplements to the complaint were filed on January 5, 2017. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 based