

entities; Federal Commissions; Institutions of Higher Education; State and local governments.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 108.

Estimated Completion Time per Response: Varies from 10 to 40 hours, depending on activity and form type.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 2,700 hours.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

Total Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost: None.

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.*).

Phadrea Ponds,

*Information Collection Clearance Officer,
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2023–10307 Filed 5–12–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–709 (Fifth Review)]

Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe From Germany; Scheduling of an Expedited Five-Year Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

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 seamless carbon and alloy steel standard, line, and pressure pipe from Germany would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

DATES: April 10, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Duffy (202–708–2579), 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 proceeding may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On April 10, 2023, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (88 FR 110, January 3, 2023) 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.¹ 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 has been placed in the nonpublic record, and will be made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review on July 12, 2023. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission’s rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in § 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,² 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 July 20, 2023, 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

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 website.

² The Commission has found the responses submitted on behalf of Vallourec Star, LP, to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by July 20, 2023. However, should the Department of Commerce (“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 §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s *Handbook on Filing Procedures*, available on the Commission’s website at https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf, elaborates upon the Commission’s procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 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.

Determination.—The Commission has determined this review is extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 10, 2023.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2023–10323 Filed 5–12–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–579–580 and 731–TA–1369–1372 (Review)]

Fine Denier Polyester Staple Fiber From China, India, South Korea, and Taiwan; Notice of Commission Determinations 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 countervailing duty orders on fine denier polyester staple fiber from China and India and the antidumping duty orders on fine denier polyester staple fiber from China, India, South Korea, and Taiwan 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.

DATES: May 8, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charles Cummings (202–708–1666), 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 May 8, 2023, 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 both the domestic and respondent interested party group responses from India to its notice of institution (88 FR 6790, February 1, 2023) were adequate and determined to conduct full reviews of the orders on imports from India. The Commission also found that the respondent interested party group responses from China, South Korea, and Taiwan were inadequate but determined to conduct full reviews of the orders on imports from those countries in order to promote administrative efficiency in light of its determinations to conduct full reviews of the orders with respect to India. A record of the Commissioners' votes will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's website.

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: May 10, 2023.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2023–10293 Filed 5–12–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. ASSA ABLOY AB, et al.; 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, Asset Preservation Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America v. ASSA ABLOY AB, et al.*, Civil Action No. 22–2791–ACR. On September 15, 2022, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that ASSA ABLOY AB's proposed acquisition of the Hardware and Home Improvement division of Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. would violate section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed on May 5, 2023, requires ASSA ABLOY to divest its EMTEK-branded business, its Schaub-branded business, its August-branded business, and its Yale-branded multifamily and residential smart lock business in the United States and Canada. It also requires ASSA ABLOY and Spectrum Brands to submit to oversight by a monitoring trustee, who will have the power and authority to monitor ASSA ABLOY's and Spectrum Brands' compliance with the Asset Preservation Stipulation and Order and proposed Final Judgment.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. 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, including the name of the

submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the Antitrust Division's website, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be submitted in English and directed to Chief, Defense, Industrials, and Aerospace Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530 (email address: ATRJudgmentCompliance@usdoj.gov).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v., ASSA ABLOY AB, Klarabergsviadukten 90, Stockholm, Sweden SE-111 64, and, Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc., 3001 Deming Way, Middleton, WI 53562, Defendants.

Complaint

The United States brings this antitrust lawsuit to stop Defendant ASSA ABLOY AB (“ASSA ABLOY”) from acquiring a division of Defendant Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. (“Spectrum”)—ASSA ABLOY's largest competitor in supplying the \$2.4 billion residential door hardware industry in the United States. Foreshadowing the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction, ASSA ABLOY internally predicted that, as a result of the transaction, one of its residential door hardware brands would be “in a better pricing negotiation position and can expect to increase prices.”

The Defendants are close head-to-head competitors whose rivalry has benefitted consumers and who are part of a trio that today dominates the concentrated U.S. residential door hardware industry. But this entrenched position was not enough for ASSA ABLOY, whose CEO insisted just last year that the company “ha[s] to make sure we stop or buy” competitors before they “can grow.” For ASSA ABLOY, which has a long history of buying firms in the industry, purchasing Spectrum's Hardware and Home Improvement division (“Spectrum HHI”) is the latest step in its attempts to advance the trend toward concentration in the residential door hardware industry.

The proposed transaction, which would leave American consumers with only two significant producers of residential door hardware, violates the Clayton Act in at least two separate antitrust markets in the United States: (1) premium mechanical door hardware