

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the President has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under a bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed.

Written Submissions: Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the January 13, 2004, recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on April 12, 2004. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on April 19, 2004. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* § 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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 §§ 210.43–210.44 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.43–210.44).

Issued: March 30, 2004.

By order of the Commission.
Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 04–7571 Filed 4–2–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–493]

Certain Zero-Mercury-Added Alkaline Batteries, Parts Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation With Respect to Three Respondents on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: 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”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting the joint motion of complainants Energizer Holdings, Inc. and Eveready Battery Co., Inc., and respondents GP Batteries, International, Ltd., GPI, International, Ltd., and Gold Peak Industries (North America), Inc. to terminate the above-captioned investigation with respect to those three respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael K. Haldenstein, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–3041. Copies of the ALJ's ID 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, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. Hearing-impaired 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>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on May 27, 2003, based on a complaint filed by Energizer Holdings, Inc. and Eveready Battery Co., Inc., both of St.

Louis, MO, 68 FR 32771 (2003). The complaint as amended alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain zero-mercury-added alkaline batteries, parts thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of claims 1–12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,464,709. The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. The Commission named as respondents 26 companies located in the United States, China, Indonesia, and Japan.

On February 4, 2004, complainants and respondents GP Batteries, International, Ltd., GPI, International, Ltd., and Gold Peak Industries (North America), Inc. (collectively the “Gold Peak Respondents”) filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation as to the Gold Peak Respondents on the basis of settlement agreement. On February 17, 2004, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the motion. On February 17, 2004, a group of nine Chinese battery companies that are also respondents (“Chinese Respondents”) in the investigation filed a response in opposition to the motion to terminate. They opposed termination of the Gold Peak Respondents because they contended that the settlement agreement did not contain all the terms of the settlement, and therefore the settlement agreement did not comply with Commission rule 210.21(b)(1). They also contended that the settlement agreement is anticompetitive and interferes with the administration of justice because there were some unresolved ethical issues concerning the Gold Peak Respondents' attorney.

On March 3, 2004, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 125) terminating the investigation as to the Gold Peak Respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement. He indicated that the settlement agreement complies with Commission rule 210.21(b)(1). He found that, although the settlement agreement indicates that the parties will try to negotiate a license agreement, there are no other agreements between the Gold Peak Respondents and complainants at this time. The ALJ further noted the Chinese Respondents' arguments concerning anticompetitive effects and some unresolved ethical issues concerning the Gold Peak Respondent's attorney, but he indicated that he did not find that either constituted the extraordinary circumstances that would warrant denying the motion to terminate.

No party petitioned for review of the ID pursuant to 19 CFR 210.43(a), and the Commission found no basis for ordering a review on its own initiative pursuant to 19 CFR 210.44. The ID thus became the determination of the Commission pursuant to 19 CFR 210.42(h)(3).

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 CFR 210.42.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 30, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-7570 Filed 4-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-04-007]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: April 7, 2004 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. Nos. 731-TA-1039-1040 (Final)(Certain Wax and Wax/Resin Thermal Transfer Ribbons from France and Japan)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before April 19, 2004.)

5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission:

Issued: March 31, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-7759 Filed 4-1-04; 12:05 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—AAF Association, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 16, 2004, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), AAF Association, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Disk Stream, Inc., Kitchener, Ontario, Canada; Perspective Media Group, San Francisco, CA; Profound Effects, Middleton, WI; and S/4/M Solutions for Media, Cologne, Germany have been added as parties to this venture. Also, Maximum Throughput, Montreal, Quebec, Canada has been dropped as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and AAF Association, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 28, 2000, AAF Association, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 29, 2000 (65 FR 40127).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 19, 2003. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on January 21, 2004 (69 FR 2945).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 04-7655 Filed 4-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 10, 2004, pursuant to section 6(a) of the

National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Honeywell Technology Solutions Lab, Bangalore, India has been added as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 29, 2001, Interchangeable Virtual Instruments Foundation, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on July 30, 2001 (66 FR 39336).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 12, 2003. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on January 21, 2004 (69 FR 2945).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 04-7654 Filed 4-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—PXI Systems Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 12, 2004, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), PXI Systems Alliance, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Corelis, Cerritos, CA; and