United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain semiconductor chips with minimized chip package size or products containing same that infringe one or more of claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 16–19, 21, 24–26, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,326; claims 1–11, 14, 15, 19, and 22–24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,419; and claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,679,977; and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is—Tessera, Inc., 3099 Orchard Drive, San Jose, California 95134.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

ASE Inc., 26 Chin Third Road, Nantze Export Processing Zone, Nantze, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

ASE Test Limited, 10 West Fifth Street, Nantze Export Processing Zone, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

ASE (U.S.) Inc., 3590 Peterson Way, Santa Clara, California 95054.

ChipMOS Technologies Inc., No. 1 R&D Road 1, Science Based Industrial Park, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

ChipMOS Technologies (Bermuda) Ltd., 11F, No. 3, Lane 91, Dongmei Road, Hsinchu, Taiwan.

ChipMOS USA Inc., 2890 N 1st Street, San Jose, California 95134.

Siliconware Precision Industries, Co., Ltd., No. 123, Sec. 3, Da Fong Road, Tantzu, Taichung, Taiwan.

Siliconware USA Inc., 1735 Technology Drive, #300, San Jose, California 95110.

STATS Chippac (BVI) Limited, Craigmuir Chambers, Road Town, Tortola, British Virgin Islands.

STATS Chippac, Ltd., 10 Ang Mo Kio Street 65, #50–17/20, Techpoint, Singapore 569059.

STATS Chippac, Inc., 47400 Kato Road, Fremont, California 94538.

(c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Kecia J. Reynolds, Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Theodore Essex is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

Any order deciding a motion for stay should be issued in the form of an initial determination (ID).

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

Issued: May 21, 2008.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8–11844 Filed 5–27–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–627]

In the Matter of Certain Short Wavelength Semiconductor Lasers and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant's Motion To Amend the Complaint to Add Five Additional Respondents

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 6) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') granting a motion to file an amended complaint adding five additional respondents in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul M. Bartkowski, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5432. 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 at *http://www.usitc.gov.* The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://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: This investigation was instituted on January 3, 2008, based on a complaint filed by Seoul Semiconductor Company, Ltd. (''SSC'') of Seoul, Korea. The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of short wavelength semiconductor lasers (''SWCLs'') and products containing the same that infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,321,713. The complaint initially named Nichia Corporation (''Nichia'') of Tokushima, Japan as the sole respondent.

On April 22, 2008, SSC moved to file an amended complaint naming the following five additional respondents: Hitachi, Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; Hitachi America, Ltd. of Brisbane, CA; Panasonic Communications Co., Ltd. of Fukuoka, Japan; Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. of Osaka, Japan; and LaCie Ltd. of Hillsboro, OR. On May 1, 2008, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response conditionally supporting the motion and Nichia filed an opposition to the motion.

On May 2, 2008, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the motion. No petitions for review were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

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 210.14 and 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.14, 210.42).

Issued: May 21, 2008.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E8–11843 Filed 5–27–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Two Amendments to Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (''CERCLA'')

Consistent with Section 122(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(d), and 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on May 20, 2008, the United States lodged two amendments to the Consent Decree approved by the Court on February 23, 2001 in *United States of America* v. *Abex Aerospace Division, et al,* Civil No. 00-cv-012471 TJH(JWJx) (USDC C.D. Cal.). The original Consent Decree resolved the liability of certain defendants for the ''Phase 1a Area'' of the Site under Sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607, as amended, and Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6973, as alleged in the Complaint filed in this matter.

The First Amendment primarily amends the Statement of Work under the original Consent Decree to add certain response activities necessary to address indoor air contamination observed at an indoor roller skating rink located adjacent to the Omega Chemical Corporation Superfund Site, listed on the National Priorities List on January 19, 1999, 64 FR 2950 (''Site''). The Second Amendment adds additional Settling Work Defendants, and Settling Cash Defendants to those covered by the original Consent Decree, as amended. The Second Amendment also incorporates additional volume and related payments of certain original Settling Cash Defendants, and corrects certain omissions and typographical errors in the caption. The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Consent Decree Amendments. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either e-mailed to *pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov* or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–06529.

The Consent Decree Amendments may be examined at U.S. EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105 (contact Stephen Berninger, Esq. (415) 972–3909). During the public comment period, the Consent Decree Amendments may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.* A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, U.S. Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611 or by faxing or e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood (*tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov*), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please refer to *United States of America* v. *Abex Aerospace Division, et al,* Civil No. 00-cv-012471 TJH(JWJx) (USDC C.D. Cal.) (DOJ Ref. No. 90–11–3–06529), and enclose a check in the amount of $57.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Henry S. Friedman,

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

[FR Doc. E8–11846 Filed 5–27–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[No. 06–45]

Paul H. Volkman; Denial of Application

On February 10, 2006, I, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration to Paul H. Volkman, M.D. (Respondent), of Chillicothe, Ohio. The Order immediately suspended Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration, AV6952837, as a practitioner, on the grounds that his continued registration during the pendency of the proceeding ''would constitute an imminent danger to public health and safety because of the substantial likelihood that [he] will continue to divert controlled substances to persons who will abuse these products.'' *Id.* at 12.

More specifically, the Show Cause Order alleged that in twelve instances, Respondent had prescribed multiple controlled substances to persons who, within days, died of overdoses of the drugs. *Id.* at 9–11. The Show Cause Order further alleged that Respondent had issued prescriptions to these persons for multiple controlled substances including opiates in schedule II (oxycodone) and/or schedule III (hydrocodone); schedule IV benzodiazepines such as diazepam and valium; and carisoprodol, a non-controlled drug which is nonetheless highly abused. *Id.; see also id.* at 3. Relatedly, the Order alleged that in July 2005, the assistant coroner for the county in which Respondent was practicing, had notified DEA ''that his staff [had] observed an increase in emergency room overdoses and believed that several recent drug-related deaths involving young [and] otherwise healthy individuals could be attributed to the consumption of large amounts of oxycodone, hydrocodone and alprazolam,'' which Respondent had dispensed. *Id.* at 8.

The Show Cause Order also alleged that DEA had received information from various distributors that Respondent was ordering excessive quantities of controlled substances. *Id.* Relatedly, the Show Cause Order alleged that during 2004, Respondent was the largest practitioner-purchaser of oxycodone in the country having purchased 438,000 dosage units, when the average amount of this drug purchased by other physicians ''was only 4,792 dosage units.'' *Id.* at 2.

The Show Cause Order further alleged that DEA investigators interviewed several of Respondent's patients who informed them that Respondent had prescribed controlled substances without performing physical examinations, that the clinic charged between $160 and $200 for an office visit, and that the clinic required that the patients pay cash and would not accept third-party payments from insurers, Medicare, Medicaid or worker's compensation. *Id.* at 4.

The Show Cause Order also alleged that on various dates, confidential sources had visited the clinic, and that Respondent had issued these persons prescriptions for controlled substances without performing physical examinations and other medical tests. *Id.* at 5. The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that on two occasions, the confidential sources had told the clinic's employees that their pain levels were ''one or two'' and ''zero'' on a scale of one-to-ten (with the latter being the most severe); that upon Respondent's asking them how they felt, the sources had told him ''fair'' and ''pretty good''; and that Respondent,