

U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Sling Media, Inc. of Foster City, California. The complaint alleges 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 electronic devices having placeshifting or display replication functionality and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,877,776 ("the '776 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 8,051,454 ("the '454 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 8,060,909 ("the '909 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,725,912 ("the '912 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 8,266,657 ("the '657 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 8,365,236 ("the '236 patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained 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 at <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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Docket Services, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-1802.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2012).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on April 10, 2013, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain electronic devices having placeshifting or display replication functionality and products containing same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 18-24, 26, 28-30, 32-40, 42, and 43 of the '776 patent; claims 7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 of the '909 patent; claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-20 of the '454 patent; claims 58-68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 103, 104, 106, and 108 of the '912 patent; claim 81 of the '657 patent; and claims 1-8 and 15-20 of the '236 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:
Sling Media, Inc., 1051 East Hillsdale Boulevard, Suite 500, Foster City, CA 94404.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:
Belkin International, Inc., 12045 East Waterfront Drive, Playa Vista, CA 90094.

Monsoon Multimedia, Inc., 1730 South Amphlett Boulevard, Suite 101, San Mateo, CA 94402.

C2 Microsystems, Inc., 2833 Junction Avenue, Suite 101, San Jose, CA 95134.

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

The Office of Unfair Import Investigations will not participate as a party in this investigation.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)-(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of 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.

Issued: April 11, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013-08964 Filed 4-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. John F. Ashe, Jr., Dianne Ashe, and Wayne D. Raether, d/b/a County Line Grading*, Civil Action No.13-cv-246, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin on April 10, 2013.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against John F. Ashe, Jr., Dianne Ashe, and Wayne D. Raether, d/b/a County Line Grading, pursuant to Section 309(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319(b), to obtain injunctive relief from the Defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendants to restore the impacted areas.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Laurel A. Bedig, United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Environmental Defense Section, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044 and refer to *United States v. John F. Ashe, Jr., Dianne Ashe, and Wayne D. Raether, d/b/a County Line Grading*, DJ # 90-5-1-1-19322.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United

States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, Robert W. Kastenmeier United States Courthouse, 120 North Henry Street, Room 320, Madison, WI 53703-2559. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.

Cherie L. Rogers,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2013-08969 Filed 4-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Chiropractic Associates, Ltd. of South Dakota Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota in *United States of America v. Chiropractic Associates Ltd. of South Dakota*, (CASD), Civil Case No. 13–CV–4030–LLP. On April 8, 2013, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that CASD and its members formed a conspiracy to gain more favorable fees and other contractual terms by agreeing to coordinate their actions, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, enjoins CASD from establishing prices or terms for chiropractic services.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at <http://www.justice.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be filed with the Court and posted on the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust

Division's Web site, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be directed to Peter J. Mucchetti, Chief, Litigation I Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 4100, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–307–0001).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against Defendant Chiropractic Associates, Ltd. of South Dakota (“CASD” or the “Defendant”) to obtain equitable and other relief to prevent and remedy violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. Plaintiff alleges as follows:

I. Nature of the Action

1. CASD is an association of approximately 300 chiropractors who compete with each other in the sale of chiropractic services. CASD's members compromise approximately 80 percent of all chiropractors practicing in South Dakota. On behalf of its members, CASD contracts with health insurers and other payers (collectively, “payers”).

2. Since 1997, all of CASD's members have entered into membership agreements with CASD that give CASD the right to collectively negotiate rates on their behalf with payers.

3. Since 1997, CASD has negotiated contracts on behalf of its members with at least seven payers. These contracts set the prices and price-related terms between CASD's members and those payers. CASD's conduct has raised the prices of chiropractic services and decreased the availability of chiropractic services in South Dakota.

4. The United States, through this suit, asks this Court to declare CASD's conduct illegal and to enter injunctive relief to prevent further injury to consumers of chiropractic services.

II. Defendant

5. CASD is a company organized and doing business under the laws of the State of South Dakota, with its principal place of business in Brookings.

III. Jurisdiction, Venue, and Interstate Commerce

6. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4, to obtain equitable and other relief to prevent and restrain the Defendant's violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

7. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action under

Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 4, and 28 U.S.C. 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.

8. The Defendant has consented to personal jurisdiction and venue in this District. The Court also has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant, and venue is proper in the District of South Dakota under Section 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 22, and 28 U.S.C. 1391(b), because the Defendant is found, has transacted business, and committed acts in furtherance of the alleged violations in this District. A substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.

9. The Defendant engages in interstate commerce, and its activities—including the conduct alleged in this Complaint—substantially affect interstate commerce. The Defendant's conduct increased prices for chiropractic services that some non-South Dakota residents traveled to South Dakota to purchase, and for which a number of payers paid across state lines.

IV. Other Conspirators

10. Various persons not named as defendants in this action have participated as conspirators with the Defendant in the offenses alleged and have performed acts and made statements in furtherance of the alleged conspiracies.

V. Defendant's Illegal Conduct

11. Since 1997, CASD has required that chiropractors joining the association enter into a membership agreement (called a “Provider Agreement”) that authorizes CASD to negotiate the fees that CASD's chiropractors charge payers for health-care related services and products.

12. For years, CASD has had a stated goal of leveraging its contracts with a large share of South Dakota chiropractors to negotiate higher fees from payers for chiropractor members. One CASD official stated that “the first thing that we felt was very important to us was to establish a fair reimbursement for a full scope of practice.” Thus, CASD sought to “[h]ave a membership large enough to negotiate fair and equitable contracts with insurance companies, including Fair Fee Schedules (minimum of 130% of Medicare)[.]”

13. Since 1997, CASD has negotiated at least seven contracts with payers that fix the prices and other price-related terms for all CASD members dealing with those payers. In these negotiations, CASD, acting on behalf of its members, made proposals and counterproposals on price and price-related terms, accepted and rejected offers, and