

products and related marketing materials by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. RE38,096 (“the ‘096 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 6,978,775 (“the ‘775 patent”); U.S. Trademark Registration No. 2,501,255 (“the ‘255 mark”); and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,312,392 (“the ‘392 mark”). *Id.* The complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry. *Id.* The Commission’s notice of investigation named Ningbo Topoint as the only respondent, and indicated that the Office of Unfair Import Investigations is participating in this investigation. *Id.*

On September 2, 2014, the ALJ ordered Ningbo Topoint to show cause why it should not be found in default. See Order No. 10. No response to Order No. 10 was filed. On September 16, 2014, the ALJ issued an initial determination finding Ningbo Topoint in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1) (19 CFR 210.16(a)(1)). See Order No. 11. On October 16, 2014, the Commission determined not to review the initial determination.

The Commission requested briefing from the parties and the public on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. The Commission received responsive submissions from Complainants and the Commission Investigative Attorney (“IA”) on October 30, 2014, and a reply submission from the IA on November 6, 2014. The submissions agreed that the appropriate remedy is the entry of a limited exclusion order against Ningbo Topoint, that the public interest factors do not weigh against granting such a limited exclusion order, and that bonding should be set at 100 percent of the entered value of the infringing products.

The Commission finds that the statutory requirements of section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) and Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1) (19 CFR 210.16(a)(1)) are met with respect to Ningbo Topoint. Accordingly, pursuant to section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) and Commission Rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)), the Commission presumes the facts alleged in the complaint to be true and finds that Ningbo Topoint is in violation of section 337.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief in this investigation is a limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed entry of archery products and related marketing materials that are manufactured abroad by or on behalf of, or imported by or on behalf of, Ningbo Topoint that infringe one or more of claims 1–3, 6–12, and 15–38 of the ‘096 patent and claims 1–3, 16–22, 24–26,

29, 31, and 32 of the ‘775 patent, or infringe the ‘255 or ‘392 marks. The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) do not preclude the issuance of the limited exclusion order. Finally, the Commission has determined that the bond for importation during the period of Presidential review shall be in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of the imported subject articles of Ningbo Topoint. The Commission’s order was delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of its issuance.

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.

Dated: December 3, 2014.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–28765 Filed 12–8–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–509 and 731–TA–1244 (Final)]

### 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane From China Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b)) and (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)) (“the Act”), that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury, and the establishment of an industry in the United States is not materially retarded, by reason of imports of 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane from China, provided for in subheading 2903.39.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”) and subsidized by the government of China.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> Commissioners Irving A. Williamson and Rhonda K. Schmidtlein dissenting.

## Background

The Commission instituted these investigations effective October 22, 2013, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by Mexichem Fluor Inc., St. Gabriel, LA. The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane from China were subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)) and sold at LTFV within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission’s investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on June 24, 2014 (79 FR 35795). The hearing was held in Washington, DC on October 15, 2014, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on December 3, 2014. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4503 (December 2014), entitled *1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane from China: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–509 and 731–TA–1244 (Final)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 4, 2014.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–28790 Filed 12–8–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1110–0045]

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection FD–1000 Customer Satisfaction Assessment

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** 60-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice (DOJ), FBI Laboratory, Federal Bureau of Investigation, will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in

accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until February 9, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Steven W. Perry, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531 (phone: 202-307-0777).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.
2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* FBI Laboratory Customer Satisfaction Assessment
3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The form number is FD-1000. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Laboratory Division.
4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* This information collection is

an assessment of the FBI Laboratory services by law enforcement agencies (federal, state, and local) that submit evidence for examination. The information collected is used by FBI Laboratory management to evaluate the quality of the forensic services provided to law enforcement. Additionally, the FBI Laboratory is accredited by the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) under the ASCLD/LAB-*International* Accreditation Program. A requirement for maintaining accreditation is for the FBI Laboratory to seek feedback, both positive and negative, from its customers. This feedback is evaluated to improve the services of the FBI Laboratory. The information gathered in the FD-1000 will meet this requirement.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated 3000 respondents will complete the assessment with an estimated range of burden for respondents to be 5 minutes for completion.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated public burden associated with this collection is 250 hours. It is estimated that respondents will take 5 minutes to complete the assessment. The burden hours for collecting respondent data sum to 250 hours (3000 respondents × 5 minutes = 250 hours).

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 4, 2014.

**Jerri Murray,**  
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S.  
Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2014-28784 Filed 12-8-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-02-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 *ABB Inc. v. United States*, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-01265-CSH, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut on December 1, 2014.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by ABB Inc. against the United States, pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601-75, in connection with alleged releases of or threatened releases of hazardous substances at a facility located at 2000 Day Hill Road, in Windsor, Connecticut, owned by Combustion Engineering. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations, as well as potential claims by the United States Army Corps of Engineers that could have been brought against ABB if the matter had not settled. The proposed Consent Decree provides for the United States to pay ABB \$31,044,520 as soon as reasonably practicable after the Effective Date of the Consent Decree. It also provides for ABB to pay the United States \$3,148,322 within seventy five (75) days after the Effective Date of the Consent Decree.

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 Kate Bowers, Trial Attorney, United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Environmental Defense Section, Post Office Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044 and refer to *ABB Inc. v. United States*, DJ #90-11-6-19963.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, 450 Main Street, Hartford, CT 06103. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at [http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html).

**Cherie L. Rogers,**

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

[FR Doc. 2014-28735 Filed 12-8-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-15-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Employee Benefits Security Administration

##### Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans: Notice of Charter Renewal

In accordance with section 512(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and its implementing regulations issued by the General Services Administration (GSA), the