and products containing same by reason of infringement of claims 1–22 of the ’600 patent. The notice of investigation named Fortinet, Inc. (“Fortinet”) of Sunnyvale, California as the sole respondent.

On May 9, 2005, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337 based on his findings that claims 4, 7, 8, and 11–15 of the ’600 patent are not invalid or unenforceable, and are infringed by respondent’s products. The ALJ also found that claims 1 and 3 of the ’600 patent are invalid as anticipated by prior art and that a domestic industry exists. He also issued his recommended determination on remedy and bonding.

On July 8, 2005, the Commission issued a notice that it had determined not to review the ALJ’s final ID on violation, thereby finding a violation of Section 337. 70 FR 40731 (July 14, 2005). The Commission also requested a briefing on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. ID.

Submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding were filed on July 18, 2005, by all parties. All parties filed response submissions on July 25, 2005. On August 8, 2005, the Commission terminated the investigation, and issued a limited exclusion order and a cease and desist order covering respondent’s systems for detecting and removing viruses or worms, components thereof, and products containing same covered by claims 4, 7, 8, and 11–15 of the ’600 patent.

On September 13, 2005, complainant Trend Micro Inc. filed a complaint for enforcement proceedings of the Commission’s remedial orders. Trend Micro asserts that respondent Fortinet, and its distributors, have circumvented the cease and desist order by continuing to advertise, market, sell and offer for sale in the United States the imported infringing products and antivirus features of Fortinet’s infringing software.

The Commission, having examined the complaint seeking a formal enforcement proceeding, and having found that the complaint complies with the requirements for institution of a formal enforcement proceeding contained in Commission rule 210.75, has determined to institute formal enforcement proceedings to determine whether Fortinet is in violation of the Commission’s cease and desist order issued in the investigation, and what if any enforcement measures are appropriate. The following entities are named as parties to the formal enforcement proceeding: (1) Complainant Trend Micro, (2) respondent Fortinet, and (3) a Commission investigative attorney to be designated by the Director, Office of Unfair Import Investigations.


By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 7, 2005.
Marilyn R. Abbott, Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 05–20572 Filed 10–13–05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
[Investigation No. 731–TA–860 (Review)]

Tin- and Chromium-Coated Steel Sheet from Japan
ACTION: Notice of Commission determination to conduct a full five-year review concerning the antidumping duty order on tin- and chromium-coated steel sheet from Japan.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with a full review pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on tin- and chromium-coated steel sheet from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the review will be established and announced at a later date. 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 through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 4, 2005.


General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at http://edis.usitc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 4, 2005, the Commission determined that it should proceed to a full review in the subject five-year review pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act. The Commission found that both the domestic and respondent interested party group responses to its notice of institution (70 FR 38210, July 1, 2005) were adequate. 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 Web site.

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

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 11, 2005.
Marilyn R. Abbott, Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 05–20622 Filed 10–13–05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

October 7, 2005.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 134 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Department of Labor. To obtain documentation contact Ira Mills on 202–693–4122 (this is not a toll-free number) or e-mail: Mills.Ira@dol.gov.

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for ETA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, 202–395–7316 (this is not a toll free number), within 30 days from the date of this publication in the Federal Register. The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

• Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary