

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-990 on March 18, 2016, based on a complaint filed by Immersion Corporation of San Jose, California ("Immersion"). 81 FR 14889 (Mar. 18, 2016). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile electronic devices incorporating haptics (including smartphones and smartwatches) and components thereof, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos.: 8,773,356; 8,619,051; and 8,659,571. The notice of investigation named as respondents Apple Inc. of Cupertino, California ("Apple"); AT&T Inc. of Dallas, Texas ("AT&T Inc."); and AT&T Mobility LLC of Atlanta, Georgia ("AT&T Mobility"). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also named as a party. On May 4, 2016, the Commission issued a notice determining not to review the ALJ's ID terminating the investigation as to respondent AT&T Inc. based upon withdrawal of the complaint.

The Commission instituted Investigation No. 337-TA-1004 on June 9, 2016, based upon another complaint filed by Immersion, alleging a violation of section 337 by Apple and AT&T Mobility by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos.: 8,749,507; 7,808,488; 7,336,260; and 8,581,710. 81 FR 37210 (June 9, 2016). The notice of investigation authorized the Chief Administrative Law Judge to consolidate Investigation Nos. 337-TA-990 and 337-TA-1004 if he deemed it appropriate. *Id.* at 37211. Thereafter, the Chief Administrative Law Judge determined to consolidate the two investigations. Order No. 3, Inv. No. 337-TA-1004 (June 9, 2016).

On February 9, 2018, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement reached between Immersion and Apple that resolves the dispute in this investigation. On February 16, 2018, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 75), granting the motion. The ALJ found that the motion complies with Commission Rules and termination of the investigation will not adversely affect the public interest. No petition for review was filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

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: March 15, 2018.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018-05637 Filed 3-20-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1104 (Second Review)]

Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From China

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission ("Commission") determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act"), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain polyester staple fiber from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted this review on September 1, 2017 (82 FR 41654) and determined on December 5, 2017 that it would conduct an expedited review (83 FR 394, January 3, 2018).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on March 15, 2018. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4767 (March 2018), entitled *Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-1104 (Second Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 15, 2018.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018-05695 Filed 3-20-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Keith F. Ostrosky, D.D.S.; Dismissal of Proceeding

On August 30, 2017, the Acting Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Keith F. Ostrosky, D.D.S., of South St. Paul, Minnesota (hereinafter, Registrant).¹ GX 2. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's Certificate of Registration on the ground that he does not "have . . . state authority to handle controlled substances." *Id.* at 1.

As to the jurisdictional basis of the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant is registered as a practitioner in schedules II through V under Certificate of Registration No. BO1259983, at the registered location of 351 15th Ave. N., South St. Paul, Minnesota. The Order further alleged that this Registration was due to expire on December 31, 2017. *Id.*

As to the substantive basis for the proceeding, the Show Cause Order alleged that "[o]n February 3, 2017, the Minnesota Board of Dentistry issued a Stipulation and Order," pursuant to which the Board accepted Registrant's voluntary surrender of his license to practice dentistry in the State of Minnesota. *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus alleged that Registrant is "currently without authority to practice dentistry or handle controlled substances in the State of Minnesota, the [S]tate in which [he is] registered with the DEA," and that as a consequence, his registration is subject to revocation. *Id.* at 1-2.

The Show Cause Order notified Registrant of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement of position while waiving his right to a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence of failing to elect either option. *Id.* at 2. The Show Cause Order also notified Registrant of his right to submit a Corrective Action Plan pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 824(c)(2)(C). *Id.* at 2-3.

On September 9, 2017, the Government accomplished service of the Show Cause Order by certified mail, as evidenced by the signed Return Receipt Card. GX 4. On November 7, 2017, the Government submitted a Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA). Therein, the Government represents that Registrant did not

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

¹ While for reasons explained in this Decision, Registrant is now an Ex-Registrant, I refer to him as Registrant throughout this Decision.