cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. Appendix 2

Margaret Triebsch,

Program Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2018–25331 Filed 11–19–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4334–63–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1203 (Review)]

Xanthan Gum From China

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on xanthan gum from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted this review on June 1, 2018 (83 FR 25485) and determined on September 4, 2018 that it would conduct an expedited review (83 FR 48653, September 26, 2018).

The Commission made this determination pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determination in this review on November 15, 2018. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4839 (November 2018), entitled *Xanthan Gum from China: Investigation No. 731–TA–1203 (Review).*

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 15, 2018.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–25290 Filed 11–19–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1059]

Certain Digital Cameras, Software, and Components Thereof; Commission Determination To Review-In-Part a Final Initial Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Request for Written Submissions; Extension of Target Date for Completion of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the presiding administrative law judge's (''ALJ'') final initial determination (''Final ID'') issued on August 17, 2018, finding a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''section 337'') in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has also determined to extend the target date for completion of the above-captioned investigation to February 1, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Megan M. Valentine, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2301. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be 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, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (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 investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.* Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on June 2, 2017, based on a complaint filed by Carl Zeiss AG of Oberkochen, Germany, and ASML Netherlands B.V. of Veldhoven, Netherlands. 82 FR 25627–28. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''section 337''), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain digital cameras, software, and components thereof that infringe U.S. Patent Nos. 6,301,440 (''the '440 patent''); 6,463,163 (''the '163 patent''); 6,714,241 (''the '241 patent''); 6,731,335 (''the '335 patent''); 6,834,128 (''the '128 patent''); 7,297,916 (''the '916 patent''); and 7,933,454 (''the '454 patent''). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists in the United States. The Commission's Notice of Investigation named as respondents Nikon Corporation of Tokyo, Japan; Sendai Nikon Corporation of Natori, Japan; Nikon Inc. of Melville, New York; Nikon (Thailand) Co., Ltd. of Ayutthaya, Thailand; Nikon Imaging (China) Co., Ltd. of Wuxi, China; and PT Nikon Indonesia of Jakarta, Indonesia. *Id.* at 25627. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in this investigation. *Id.* The Commission later terminated respondent PT Nikon from the investigation. Order No. 36 (Dec. 27, 2017) (unreviewed Notice (Jan. 19, 2018)). The Commission also subsequently terminated from the investigation all claims of the '163 and '335 patents and certain claims of the '440, '241, '128, '916, and '454 patents. Order No. 23 (Oct. 3, 2017) (unreviewed Notice (Oct. 17, 2017)); Order No. 32 (Nov. 22, 2017) (unreviewed Notice (Dec. 19, 2017)); Order No. 45 (Feb. 5, 2018) (unreviewed Notice (Mar. 6, 2018)); Order No. 65 (Mar. 27, 2018) (unreviewed Notice (Apr. 25, 2018)); Order No. 67 (Apr. 13, 2018) (unreviewed Notice (May 4, 2018)).

On August 17, 2018, the ALJ issued her Final ID, finding a violation of section 337 with respect to asserted claims 1 and 8 of the '916, asserted claims 6, 35, and 39 of the '440 patent, and asserted claim 22 of the '454 patent. The final ID finds no violation as to asserted claims 1, 12, and 16 of the '128 patent, asserted claim 10 of the '241 patent, and asserted claims 37, 46, and 50 of the '440 patent.

In particular, the Final ID finds that asserted claims 1 and 8 of the '916 patent read on the accused products under the DOE. The Final ID also finds that asserted claims 1 and 8 are not invalid for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. The Final ID further finds that Zeiss has satisfied the technical prong of the domestic industry (''DI'') requirement with respect to the '916 patent.

The Final ID finds that asserted claims 6, 35, 37, 39, 46, and 50 of the '440 patent read on the accused products. The Final ID also finds that asserted claim 37 is invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, but that asserted claims 6, 35, 39, 46, and