violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Diehl, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3095.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on April 2, 1997, on the basis of a complaint filed by Innovatron S.A. ("Innovatron"). 62 FR 15728. The complaint, as subsequently amended, named two respondents—Thomson Multimedia, S.A. and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.

In its complaint, Innovatron alleged that respondents violated section 337 by importing into the United States, and selling after importation, television receivers and receiver access cards that infringe claim 8 of Innovatron's U.S. Letters Patent 4,404,464 (the "'464 patent'). The presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") held an evidentiary hearing from September 29 to October 7, 1997.

On March 24, 1998, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337. He found that claim 8 of the '464 patent was not invalid due to anticipation or obviousness, that there have been importations and sales after importation of the accused devices, and that the accused devices can be used to practice the method patented in claim 8 of the '464 patent. He also found that respondents actively induced infringement of claim 8 of the '464 patent and that they contributorily infringed that claim as well. Finally, the ALJ found that there is a domestic industry with respect to the '464 patent.

On April 6, 1998, the Commission investigative attorney and the Thomson respondents filed petitions for review of the ALJ's final ID. Complainant Innovatron filed a response in opposition to the petitions. The Commission determined to review the bulk of the ID and directed the parties to file written responses addressing certain questions posed in the Commission's notice of review, and the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. In accordance with the Commission's directions, the parties filed initial briefs on June 11, 1998, and reply briefs on June 18, 1998.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ID, the review briefs, and the responses thereto, the Commission determined that there is no violation of section 337. More specifically, the Commission modified the ALJ's construction of claim 8 of the '464 patent, and found the claim as

properly construed to be valid but not infringed by users of the accused imported products. The Commission found further that the domestic industry requirement is not met in this investigation.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1337) and sections 210.42–.45 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–.45).

Copies of the public version of the ID, the Commission's order and opinion, and all other nonconfidential 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, Û.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. Hearingimpaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205–1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

Issued: July 20, 1998. By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–19869 Filed 7–23–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-373 & 731-TA-769-775 (Final)

Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and Taiwan; Notice of Commission Determination to Conduct a Portion of the Hearing in Camera

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Closure of a portion of a Commission hearing to the public.

summary: Upon request of certain respondents in the above-captioned final investigations, the Commission has unanimously determined to conduct a portion of its hearing scheduled for July 22, 1998 in camera. See Commission rules 207.24(d), 201.13(m) and 201.35(b)(3) (19 CFR 207.24(d), 201.13(m) and 201.35(b)(3)). The remainder of the hearing will be open to the public. The Commission unanimously has determined that the seven-day advance notice of the change

to a meeting was not possible. See Commission rule 201.35(a), (c)(1) (19 CFR 201.35(a), (c)(1)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Sultan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–3152. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter may be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission believes that respondents have justified the need for a closed session. A full discussion regarding the proprietary financial and trade data of all parties in these investigations can only occur if a portion of the hearing is held in camera. Because much of this information is not publicly available, any discussion of issues relating to this information will necessitate disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI). Thus, such discussions can only occur if a portion of the hearing is held in camera. The Commission has determined to deny, however, petitioners' request to allow representatives of the petitioning firms who are not on the administrative protective order to attend the closed session. The Commission believes that petitioners have not justified their request. In making this decision, the Commission nevertheless reaffirms its belief that whenever possible its business should be conducted in public.

The hearing will include the usual public presentations by petitioners and by respondents, with questions from the Commission. In addition, the hearing will include an in camera session for a presentation by respondents that discusses the business proprietary information submitted in this proceeding, and for questions from the Commission relating to the BPI, followed by an in camera presentation by petitioners. For the in camera session the room will be cleared of all persons except those who have been granted access to BPI under a Commission administrative protective order (APO) and are included on the Commission's APO service list in this investigation. See 19 CFR 201.35(b)(1), (2). The Commission is allotting twenty minutes for each in camera session. The time for the parties' presentations and rebuttals in the in camera session will be taken from their respective overall allotments for the hearing. All persons planning to attend the in camera portions of the hearing should be prepared to present proper identification.

Authority: The General Counsel has certified, pursuant to Commission Rule 201.39 (19 CFR 201.39) that, in her opinion, a portion of the Commission's hearing in Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Spain, Sweden and Taiwan, Inv. Nos. 701–TA–373 & 731–TA–767–775 (Final) may be closed to the public to prevent the disclosure of BPI.

Issued: July 20, 1998.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-19870 Filed 7-23-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 C.F.R. 50.7, and Section 122 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622, notice is hereby given that on June 30, 1998, a proposed *De Minimis* Consent Decree in United States v. Arkwright, Inc., Civil Action No. 96-CV-75795, was lodged with the United States District court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division. This consent decree represents a settlement of claims of the United States against Arkwright, Inc. for reimbursement of response costs and injunctive relief in connection with the Metamora Landfill Superfund Site ("Site") pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.

Under this settlement with the United States, Arkwright, Inc. will pay a total of \$793,431 in reimbursement of response costs incurred by the United States Environmental Protection Agency at the Site.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Arkwright, Inc.*, D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–289E.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 211 West Fort Street, Suite 2300, Detroit, MI 48226, at the Region 5 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Street, Chicago, Illinois

60604–3590, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$4.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Bruce Gelber,

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

[FR Doc. 98–19733 Filed 7–23–98; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on July 10, 1998, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *The Town of Milford*, No. 98–430–B (D.N.H.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire.

In this action the United States sought, pursuant to Section 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9607(a), recovery of costs concerning the First Operable Unit of the Fletcher Paint Works and Storage Facility Superfund Site (the "Site"), located in Milford, New Hampshire. The Town of Milford currently owns a portion of the Site and previously operated a burning dump on another portion of the Site. In the proposed consent decree, the settling party, the Town of Milford, New Hampshire, agrees to pay to the United States, \$62,139,00, for past and future response costs incurred at the First Operable Unit at the Site, to provide various in-kind services, including replacement piping material, which is valued at \$16,675.00, to provide access to portions of the Site owned or controlled by the Town of Milford, and to covenant not to sue the United States. This settlement does not address any potential liability for the Second Operable Unit at the Site.

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. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, P.O.

Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044, and should refer to *United States* v. *The Town of Milford*, D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–684A. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, District of New Hampshire, 55 Pleasant Street, Room 312, Concord, New Hampshire 03301–3904, at U.S. EPA Region I, One Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02203, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624-0892. A copy of the consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail for the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$13.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment & Natural Resources Division. [FR Doc. 98–19736 Filed 7–23–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Air Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

In accordance with 28 CFR 50.7, the Department of Justice gives notice that a proposed consent decree in United States v. Refined Metals Corporation, Civil Action No. IP 90-2077-C (S.D. Ind.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, on July 14, 1998. The proposed consent decree would resolve the United States' civil claims against the Refined Metals Corporation under the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq., and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq., for certain of its operations at its facility in Beech Grove, Indiana.

Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, defendant Refined Metals Corporation will comply with all applicable requirements of the CAA and RCRA, perform closure and corrective actions at its plant, and, in the event the company recommences operations, install air pollution control equipment that will prevent emissions of lead and particulate matter in excess of the State Implementation Plan limits. In addition, the Decree provides for the payment of a \$210,000 civil penalty, including