

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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://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 March 18, 2015, based on a complaint filed by Andrea Electronics Corp. of Bohemia, New York ("Andrea"). 80 FR 14159-60 (March 18, 2015). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), in the importation, sale for importation, and sale after importation of audio processing articles that infringe five U.S. patents. The notice of investigation named numerous respondents, some of whom have been previously terminated. The notice also named the Office of Unfair Import Investigations as a party.

On July 2, 2015, Conexant Systems Inc. ("Conexant") moved to obtain intervenor status in the investigation. Conexant argued that, because Andrea alleges that Conexant's audio technology contained in the respondents' products infringes the asserted patents, Conexant has an interest in the subject matter of the investigation. Conexant further argues that the respondents do not adequately represent Conexant's interests because Andrea has accused the audio technology made by multiple companies, so the respondents may not necessarily have an interest in defending Conexant's specific audio technology. On July 14, 2015, Andrea filed a response in opposition to the motion and the Commission Investigative Attorney ("IA") filed a response in support of the motion.

On July 14, 2015, Waves Audio, Ltd. ("Waves Audio") moved to obtain intervenor status in the investigation for substantially the same reasons as Conexant. Additionally, Waves Audio argued that it has indemnity obligations to the extent that its products are a part of the investigation. On July 20, 2015, Andrea filed a response in opposition to the motion and the IA filed a response in support of the motion.

On August 7, 2015, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting intervenor status to Conexant and Waves Audio. The ALJ found that the motions complied with 19 CFR 210.19 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 because the motions were timely and showed that Conexant and Waves Audio had an interest in the subject matter of the investigation that was not adequately represented by the existing parties. No petitions for review of the subject ID were 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: September 2, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-22575 Filed 9-4-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-130 (Fourth Review)]

Chloropicrin 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, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on chloropicrin 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 Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted this review on April 1, 2015 (80 FR 17496) and determined on July 6, 2015 that it would conduct an expedited review (80 FR 43461, July 22, 2015).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on August 20, 2015. The views of the

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

Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4561 (August 2015), entitled *Chloropicrin from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-130 (Fourth Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 1, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-22061 Filed 9-4-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1070A (Second Review)]

Crepe Paper 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, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on crepe paper 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 Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted this review on April 1, 2015 (80 FR 17499) and determined on July 6, 2015 that it would conduct an expedited review (80 FR 43118, July 21, 2015).²

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on August 31, 2015. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4560 (August 2015), entitled *Crepe Paper from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-1070A (Second Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 1, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-22056 Filed 9-4-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

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

² Chairman Broadbent and Commissioner Kieff concluded that the respondent group response was inadequate, but that the circumstances warranted a full review.