

to terminate the investigation was granted.

With respect to respondent Lentek, section 337(g)(1), 19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1), and Commission Rule 210.16(c), 19 CFR 210.16(c), authorizes the Commission to order limited relief against a respondent found in default unless, after consideration of public interest factors, it finds that such relief should not issue. In this investigation, the ALJ found respondent Lentek in default and this decision was not reviewed by the Commission. As a result, ABC requested issuance of (a) a permanent exclusion order excluding from entry into the United States all of Lentek's "Mosquito Trap" products that infringe the claims of the asserted patents; and (b) a permanent cease and desist order prohibiting the importation into the United States, the sale for importation or sale within the United States after importation of all of Lentek's "Mosquito Trap" products that infringe the claims of the asserted patents.

The Commission may issue an order that could result in the exclusion of Lentek's "Mosquito Trap" products from entry into the United States, and/or issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in Lentek being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of "Mosquito Trap" products. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or are likely to do so. For background, see *In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) The public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the President has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed.

*Written Submissions:* The parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the September 24, 2004, recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. Complainants and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on November 8, 2004. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on November 15, 2004. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All non-confidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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 sections 210.16(c) and 210.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.16(c) and 210.21).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 25, 2004.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 04-24206 Filed 10-28-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1088 (Preliminary)]

### Polyvinyl Alcohol From Taiwan

#### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) (the Act), that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or that the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Taiwan of polyvinyl alcohol, provided for in subheading 3905.30.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).<sup>2 3</sup>

#### Background

On September 7, 2004, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by Celanese Chemicals Ltd., Dallas, TX, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with further material injury by reason of LTFV imports of polyvinyl alcohol from Taiwan. Accordingly, effective September 7, 2004, the Commission instituted antidumping duty investigation No. 731-TA-1088 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigation and of a public conference 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** of September 15, 2004 (69 FR 55653). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on September 28,

<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> Commissioner Hillman did not participate in this investigation.

<sup>3</sup> Chairman Koplan and Commissioner Miller dissented, having determined that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of allegedly LTFV imports of polyvinyl alcohol from Taiwan.

2004, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on October 22, 2004. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3732 (October 2004), entitled Polyvinyl Alcohol from Taiwan: Investigation No. 731-TA-1088 (Preliminary).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 25, 2004.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 04-24205 Filed 10-28-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

[EOIR No. 149]

**Executive Office for Immigration Review; Notice Extending Period To File Motions To Reopen Under the Barahona-Gomez v. Ashcroft Settlement**

**AGENCY:** Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”), Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is to inform all parties that the motion to reopen period as defined in section (II)(B)(4) of the settlement agreement in *Barahona-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 243 F. Supp. 2d 1029 (N.D. Cal. 2002), was extended to March 20, 2005. The full settlement agreement can be found at 243 F. Supp. 2d 1029 (N.D. Cal. 2002), and also is reproduced on the EOIR Web site at <http://www.usdoj.gov/eoir>. The settlement agreement initially provided that the motion to reopen period was for eighteen (18) months from the date the Advisory Statement was published in the **Federal Register**. The Advisory Statement providing notice of the settlement was published in the **Federal Register** on March 20, 2003. See 68 FR 13727. The motion to reopen period was to close on September 20, 2004. Under section (II)(B)(4) of the settlement agreement, if any eligible class member filed a motion to reopen proceedings under the settlement agreement within six months prior to September 20, 2004, the motion to reopen period is extended for an additional 180 days. This notice acknowledges that the deadline date was extended to March 20, 2005.

**DATES:** The deadline for filing motions to reopen under the settlement agreement was extended to March 20, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** MaryBeth Keller, General Counsel,

Office of the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, 5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, VA 22041, telephone (703) 305-0470.

Dated: October 15, 2004.

**Kevin D. Rooney,**

*Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review.*

[FR Doc. 04-24208 Filed 10-28-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-30-M

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

**Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.33(a), this is notice that on May 25, 2004, Cambrex North Brunswick Inc., Technology Centre of New Jersey, 661 Highway One, North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902, made application by renewal and on June 11, 2004 by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed:

Drug	Schedule
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475) .....	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370) .....	I
2,5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396) .....	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400) .....	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411) .....	I
Amphetamine (1100) .....	II
Methamphetamine (1105) .....	II
Methylphenidate (1724) .....	II
Codeine (9050) .....	II
Hydromorphone (9150) .....	II
Hydrocodone (9193) .....	II
Methadone (9250) .....	II
Methadone Intermediate (9254) .....	II
Morphine (9300) .....	II
Sufentanil (9740) .....	II
Fentanyl (9801) .....	II

The company plans to manufacture the listed controlled substances in bulk for distribution to its customers.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such a substance may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.33(a).

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA **Federal Register** Representative (ODLR) and must be filed no later than December 28, 2004.

Dated: October 1, 2004.

**William J. Walker,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 04-24154 Filed 10-28-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

**EZRX, LLC Revocation of Registration**

On May 17, 2004, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration to EXRX, LLC (EZRX) of Union, New Jersey. EZRX was notified of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke its DEA Certificate of Registration, BE8488783, as a retail pharmacy, and deny any pending applications for renewal or modification of such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(4) for reason that its continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. EZRX was further notified that its DEA registration was immediately suspended as an imminent danger to the public health and safety pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(d).

The Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension alleged in sum, that EZRX was engaged in illegally dispensing controlled substances as part of a scheme in which controlled substances were dispensed by EZRX based on Internet orders placed by customers and approved by associated physicians, based solely on their review of Internet questionnaires and without personal contact, examination or bona fide physician/patient relationships. Such prescriptions were not issued “in the usual course of professional treatment” and violated 21 CFR 1306.04 and 21 U.S.C. 841(a). This action was part of a nationwide enforcement operation by DEA titled Operation Pharmnet, which targeted online suppliers of prescription drugs, including owners, operators, pharmacists and doctors, who have illegally and unethically been marketing controlled substances via the Internet.

According to the investigative file on May 26, 2004, the Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration was personally served by Special Agents and Diversion Investigators of the DEA at EZRX’s registered premises in Union, New Jersey. More than thirty days have passed since the Order to Show Cause