Africa from which citrus fruit is authorized for importation into the United States, our review of the information presented by the Republic of South Africa in support of its request is examined in a commodity import evaluation document (CIED) titled ''Recognition of Additional Magisterial Districts as Citrus Black Spot Pest-Free Areas for the Republic of South Africa.''

The CIED may be viewed on the Regulations.gov Web site or in our reading room (see **ADDRESSES** above for instructions for accessing Regulations.gov and information on the location and hours of the reading room). You may request paper copies of the CIED by calling or writing to the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Therefore, in accordance with § 319.56–5(c), we are announcing the Administrator's determination that the magisterial districts of Boshof, Fauresmith, Jacobsdal, Koffiefontein, and Philippolis in the Free State Province; Christiania and Taung in the North West Province; and Barkly-wes/west, Gordonia, Hay, Herbert, Hopetown, Kenhardt, Kimberely, Namakwaland, and Prieska in the Northern Cape Province meet the criteria of § 319.56–5(a) and (b) with respect to freedom from citrus black spot. After reviewing the comments we receive on this notice, we will announce our decision regarding the status of these areas with respect to their freedom from citrus black spot. If the Administrator's determination remains unchanged, we will add these areas in the Republic of South Africa to the list of pest-free areas.

Done in Washington, DC, this 21st day of July 2009.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E9–17794 Filed 7–24–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2009–0056]

Determination of Regulatory Review Period for Purposes of Patent Extension; NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined the regulatory review period for NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine and is publishing this notice of that determination as required by law. We have made this determination in response to the submission of an application to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, for the extension of a patent that claims that veterinary biologic.

DATES: We will consider all requests for revision of the regulatory review period determination that we receive on or before August 26, 2009. We will consider all due diligence petitions that we receive on or before January 25, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit revision requests and due diligence petitions by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocketDetail&d=APHIS-2009-0056* to submit or view revision requests and due diligence petitions and to view supporting and related materials available electronically.
- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Please send two copies of your request or petition to Docket No. APHIS–2009–0056, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road, Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238. Please state that your revision request or due diligence petition refers to Docket No. APHIS–2009–0056.

Reading Room: A copy of the regulatory review period determination and any revision requests or due diligence petitions that we receive on this determination are available for public inspection in our reading room. The reading room is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 690–2817 before coming.

Other Information: Additional information about APHIS and its programs is available on the Internet at *http://www.aphis.usda.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Albert P. Morgan, Section Leader, Operational Support Section, Center for Veterinary Biologics, Policy Evaluation and Licensing, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road, Unit 148, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; phone (301) 734–8245; fax (301) 734–4314.

For information concerning the regulatory review period determination contact Dr. Patricia L. Foley, Center for Veterinary Biologics, Policy Evaluation and Licensing, VS, APHIS, 510 South 17th Street, Suite 104, Ames, IA 50010; phone (515) 232–5785, fax (515) 232–7120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The provisions of 35 U.S.C. 156, '' Extension of patent term,'' provide, generally, that a patent for a product may be extended for a period of up to 5 years as long as the patent claims a product that, among other things, was subject to a regulatory review period before its commercial marketing or use. (The term ''product'' is defined in that section as ''a drug product'' [which includes veterinary biological products] or ''any medical device, food additive, or color additive subject to regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.'') A product's regulatory review period forms the basis for determining the amount of extension an applicant may receive.

The regulations in 9 CFR part 124, ''Patent Term Restoration'' (referred to below as the regulations), set forth procedures and requirements for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's (APHIS) review of applications for the extension of the term of certain patents for veterinary biological products pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 156. As identified in the regulations, the responsibilities of APHIS include:

- Assisting Patent and Trademark Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce in determining eligibility for patent term restoration;
- Determining the length of a product's regulatory review period;
- If petitioned, reviewing and ruling on due diligence challenges to APHIS' regulatory review period determinations; and
- Conducting hearings to review initial APHIS findings on due diligence challenges.

The regulations are designed to be used in conjunction with regulations issued by the Patent and Trademark Office concerning patent term extension, which may be found at 37 CFR 1.710 through 1.791.

A regulatory review period consists of two periods of time: A testing phase and an approval phase. For veterinary biologics, the testing phase begins on the date the authorization to prepare an experimental veterinary biologic became effective and runs until the approval phase begins. The approval phase begins on the date an application for a license was initially submitted for approval and ends on the date such license was issued. Although only a portion of a regulatory review period

may count toward the actual amount of extension that the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks may award, APHIS' determination of the length of a regulatory review period for a veterinary biologic will include all of the testing phase and approval phase as specified in 35 U.S.C. 156(g)(5)(B).

APHIS recently licensed for production and marketing the veterinary biologic NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine. Subsequent to this approval, the Patent and Trademark Office received a patent term restoration application for NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine (U.S. Patent No. 5, 965, 138) from Schering Plough Animal Health Corporation, and the Patent and Trademark Office requested APHIS' assistance in determining this patent's eligibility for patent term restoration. In a letter dated February 2, 2009, APHIS advised the Patent and Trademark Office that this veterinary biologic had undergone a regulatory review period and that the approval of NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine (Marek's Disease Vaccine, Serotypes 1 & 3, Live Herpesvirus Chimera) represented the first permitted commercial licensing or use of the product. Subsequently, the Patent and Trademark Office requested that APHIS determine the product's regulatory review period.

APHIS has determined that the applicable regulatory review period for NAHVAX® Marek's Disease Vaccine is 1,539 days. Of this time, 0 days occurred during the testing phase of the regulatory review period, and 1,539 days occurred during the approval phase. These periods were derived from the following dates:

1. *The date the application for a license was initially submitted for approval under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act:* July 14, 2004. APHIS has verified the applicant's claim that the application was initially submitted on July 14, 2004.

2. *The date the license was issued:* September 29, 2008. APHIS has verified the applicant's claim that the license for the commercial marketing of the vaccine was issued on September 29, 2008.

This determination of the regulatory review period establishes the maximum potential length of a patent extension. However, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office applies several statutory limitations in its calculations of the actual period for patent extension. In its application for patent extension, this applicant seeks 1,539 days of patent term extension.

Section 124.22 of the regulations provides that any interested person may request a revision of the regulatory review period determination within 30 days of the date of this notice (see **DATES** above). The request must specify the following:

- The identity of the product;
- The identity of the applicant for patent term restoration;
- The docket number of this notice; and
- The basis for the request for revision, including any documentary evidence.

Further, under § 124.30 of the regulations, any interested person may file a petition with APHIS, no later than 180 days after the date of this notice (see **DATES** above), alleging that a license applicant did not act with due diligence in seeking APHIS approval of the product during the regulatory review period. The filing, format, and content of a petition must be as described in the regulations in ''Subpart D–Due Diligence Petitions'' (§§ 124.30 through 124.33).

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 156.

Done in Washington, DC, this 21st day of July 2009.

Kevin Shea,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E9–17795 Filed 7–24–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–951]

Certain Woven Electric Blankets From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 27, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Drew Jackson at (202) 482–4406 or Rebecca Pandolph at (202) 482–3627, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On June 30, 2009, the Department of Commerce (''Department'') received an antidumping duty (''AD'') petition concerning imports of certain woven electric blankets (''woven electric blankets'') from the People's Republic of China (''PRC'') filed in proper form by Jarden Consumer Solutions (''Petitioner'').[1] On July 2, 2009, the Department issued a request to Petitioner for additional information and for clarification of certain areas of the Petition. Based on the Department's request, Petitioner filed a supplement to the Petition on July 8, 2009 (''Supplement to the Petition''). On July 10, 2009, the Department requested further information from Petitioner, including suggested refinements to the scope. Based on the Department's request, Petitioner filed a second supplement to the Petition on July 14, 2009 (''Second Supplement to the Petition''). Based on conversations with Petitioner regarding scope and certain other clarifications, Petitioner filed a supplement to the Petition on July 15, 2009 (''Third Supplement to the Petition'').[2] On July 17, 2009, we received a submission on behalf of a U.S. importer of woven electric blankets and its affiliated Chinese producer and exporter, both interested parties to this proceeding as defined in section 771(9)(A) of the Act. This submission challenged the definition of the domestic like product. Petitioner filed its reply to this challenge on July 20, 2009.

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''Act''), Petitioner alleges that imports of woven electric blankets from the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports materially injure, and threaten further material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party, as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the investigation that it requests the Department to initiate (*see* ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petition'' below).

[1] *See* Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties: Certain Woven Electric Blankets from the People's Republic of China, dated June 30, 2009 (''Petition'').

[2] *See* Memorandum from Dana Griffies to the File, regarding Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Certain Woven Electric Blankets from the People's Republic of China: Suggested Scope Changes, dated July 16, 2009, and Memorandum from Howard Smith to the File, regarding Telephone Conversations with Petitioner, dated July 16, 2009, and Memorandum from Drew Jackson to the File, regarding Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Certain Woven Electric Blankets from the People's Republic of China: Suggested Scope Changes, dated July 17, 2009.