

	May 2009	Jun 2009	Jul 2009	Aug 2009
Fort Belknap	5.35	5.28	5.38	5.39
Fort Berthold	2.98	2.96	2.66	2.83
Fort Peck Reservation	3.99	4.22	3.98	4.56
Navajo Allotted Leases in the Navajo Reservation	2.78	2.80	3.15	3.39
Rocky Boys Reservation	2.15	1.96	1.82	1.61
Ute Tribal Leases in the Uintah and Ouray Reservation	2.19	2.27	2.43	2.69
	Sep 2009	Oct 2009	Nov 2009	Dec 2009
Blackfeet Reservation	2.26	3.81	3.16	4.93
Fort Belknap	4.54	4.95	5.08	5.42
Fort Berthold	2.68	4.20	4.13	4.68
Fort Peck Reservation	4.17	5.98	6.49	6.22
Navajo Allotted Leases in the Navajo Reservation	2.79	3.93	4.41	4.89
Rocky Boys Reservation	1.96	2.95	2.84	3.90
Ute Tribal Leases in the Uintah and Ouray Reservation	2.18	3.22	3.95	3.97

For information on how to report additional royalties due to major portion prices, please refer to our Dear Payor letter dated December 1, 1999, on the ONRR Web site at <http://www.onrr.gov/FM/PDFDocs/991201.pdf>.

Dated: March 7, 2011.

Gregory J. Gould,

Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

[FR Doc. 2011-5591 Filed 3-10-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-765]

In the Matter of Certain Display Devices, Including Digital Televisions and Monitors II; Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on February 9, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Sony Corporation of Tokyo, Japan. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain display devices, including digital televisions and monitors by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,847 ("the '847 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 5,583,577 ("the '577 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,661,472 ("the '472 patent") and U.S. Patent No. RE 40,468 ("the '468 patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the

United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2010).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 7, 2011, *ordered that—*

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a

violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain display devices, including digital televisions and monitors that infringe one or more of claims 41-44 of the '468 patent; claims 1-4, 8, and 11-15 of the '472 patent; claims 13, 15, 19, and 20 of the '577 patent; and claims 11, 12, 16, 27, 33-35, and 39-41 of the '847 patent, 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: Sony Corporation, 1-7-1, Konan, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

(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: LG Electronics, Inc., LG Twin Towers, 20 Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul 150-721, Korea; LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., 1000 Sylvan Avenue, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632.

(c) The 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 Paul J. Luckern, Chief 2 Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

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)-(e) 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.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 7, 2011.

James R. Holbein,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-5670 Filed 3-10-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-700]

In the Matter of Certain Mem Devices and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision To Review-in-Part a Final Initial Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Request for Written Submissions Regarding Remedy, Bonding, and the Public Interest

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 a final initial determination (“ID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) finding a violation of section 337 in the above-captioned investigation, and is requesting written submissions regarding remedy, bonding, and the public interest.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clint Gerdine, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2310. 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: The Commission instituted this investigation on December 31, 2009, based on a complaint filed on December 1, 2009, by Analog Devices, Inc. (“Analog Devices”) of Norwood, Massachusetts. 75 FR 449-50 (Jan. 5, 2010). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 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 certain microelectromechanical systems (“MEMS”) devices and products containing the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,220,614 (“the ‘614 patent’”) and 7,364,942 (“the ‘942 patent’”). The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. The complaint named as respondents Knowles Electronics LLC of Itasca, Illinois and Mouser Electronics, Inc. of Mansfield, Texas.

On December 23, 2010, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337 by respondents with respect to the ‘942 patent, and which also included his recommendation on remedy and bonding during the period of Presidential review. The ALJ found no section 337 violation with respect to the ‘614 patent due to non-infringement of the asserted claims. On January 21, 2011, the Commission issued notice of its determination to extend the deadline to March 7, 2011, for determining whether to review the final ID. On January 18, 2011, Analog Devices, respondents, and the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) filed petitions for review of the final ID, and each party filed responses to the other parties’ petitions on January 26, 2011. On February 4, 2011, Analog Devices and respondents each filed submissions on the public interest.

Upon considering the parties’ filings, the Commission has determined to

review-in-part the ID. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review: (1) The ALJ’s construction of the claim term “oven” relating to both the ‘614 and ‘942 patents; (2) the ALJ’s construction of the claim term “sawing” relating to both the ‘614 and ‘942 patents; (3) the ALJ’s determination that the accused process does not infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, claims 12, 15, 31-32, 34-35, and 38-39 of the ‘614 patent or claim 1 of the ‘942 patent; (4) the ALJ’s finding that U.S. Patent No. 5,597,767 (“the ‘767 patent’”) does not incorporate by reference U.S. Patent Nos. 5,331,454 and 5,512,374 (“the ‘374 patent’”); (5) the ALJ’s finding that claims 2-6 and 8 are infringed by the accused process; (6) the ALJ’s findings that claims 34-35 and 38-39 of the ‘614 patent, and claims 2-6 and 8 of the ‘942 patent, are not anticipated, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), by the ‘767 patent or the ‘374 patent; (7) the ALJ’s findings that claims 34-35 and 38-39 of the ‘614 patent are not obvious, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, in view of the ‘767 patent and the Sakata et al. prior art reference; and (8) the ALJ’s finding that the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement has been satisfied as to both the ‘614 and ‘942 patents. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the ID.

On review, with respect to violation, the parties are requested to submit briefing limited to the following issues:

(1) In arguing that the term “oven” should be construed as “a system that includes a heated chamber,” is it the contention of Complainant and the IA that the system includes elements such as a reservoir, heaters on the reservoir, a delivery line that connects the reservoir and the deposition chamber, a vacuum line, a nitrogen line, and a device (such as a computer) for programming the temperature, gas pressure, etc., of the oven? See Complainant Analog’s Contingent Petition at 25 and the IA’s Contingent Petition at 6.

(2) If the term “oven” as it appears in claim 1 of the ‘942 was construed broadly to encompass the entire system, would the claim cover a method in which the wafer is inserted into, and the anti-stiction compound is heated within, any portion of the system, including the elements listed in the question above, such as a heater, delivery line, or a device for programming? In your response, please address whether the Commission should construe the disputed term in light of the context supplied by the claim, which indicates, for example, that the anti-stiction compound is heated within said oven.