

under APO. In spite of the public reprimand at that time, Mr. Aitken substantially participated in the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations with a lawyer who was inexperienced in Commission title VII investigations, but who, despite his inexperience with Commission investigations, was named lead attorney and APO Compliance Officer for the firm. Although Mr. Aitken participated in the drafting of the confidential version of the brief, he did not participate in the preparation of the public version of the brief where historically his firm has committed most of its APO breaches. The Commission found that as the senior name partner in the firm with many years of experience in title VII investigations, Mr. Aitken failed in his obligations under the APO by not participating in the preparation of the public brief and/or supervising the other attorney more closely to prevent the next in a lengthy series of APO breaches that has been caused by various members of Mr. Aitken's firm.

Business proprietary information received from private parties plays an important role in Commission investigations. The Commission's ability to obtain such information depends on the confidence of the submitting parties that their proprietary information will be protected.

Bruce Aitken is reprimanded for breaching the APO in the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations as stated above and for committing multiple APO breaches over a relatively short period of time.

The Commission determined to suspend Mr. Aitken's access to APO information for a period of six months from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In addition, the Commission directs the law firm of Aitken Irvin Berlin & Vrooman, LLP to have at least two attorneys review all documents to be filed with the Commission for APO compliance, to so certify to the Commission on an annual basis, and to continue that practice for five years commencing with the date of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

The authority for this action is conferred by section 207.7(d) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR 207.7(d)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 9, 2003.

Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-30833 Filed 12-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-481]

In the Matter of Certain Display Controllers With Upscaling Functionality and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision to Review in Part A Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) on October 20, 2003, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3115. 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 October 18, 2002, based on a complaint filed by Genesis Microchip (Delaware) Inc. ("Genesis") of Alviso, California, against Media Reality Technologies, Inc. of Sunnyvale, California; Trumpion Microelectronics, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; and SmartASIC, Inc. ("SmartASIC") of San Jose, California. 67 FR 64411 (October 18, 2002). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation and sale of certain

display controllers with upscaling functionality and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,738,867 ("867 patent").

On January 14, 2003, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 6) terminating respondent SmartASIC from the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. On February 12, 2003, the Commission issued a notice of its decision not to review that ID (Order No. 6).

The evidentiary hearing in this investigation was held from July 14, 2003, through July 25, 2003. On October 20, 2003, the ALJ issued his final ID in which he found that there was no violation of section 337. All the parties to the investigation, including the Commission investigative attorneys filed timely petitions for review of various portions of the final ID, and all of them filed timely responses to the petitions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review:

- (1) The ALJ's construction of the claim term "pixel data";
- (2) The ALJ's construction of the "wherein" clause;
- (3) The ALJ's construction of the claim limitation "receiving means";
- (4) All of the ALJ's non-infringement findings;
- (5) The ALJ's finding that complainant Genesis does not practice any claims of the '867 patent;
- (6) The ALJ's finding that the Spartan reference does not anticipate (*i.e.*, invalidate) the asserted claims of the '867 patent; and
- (7) The ALJ's finding that the ACUTY Application Note does not anticipate the asserted claims of the '867 patent.

The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the final ID.

On review, the Commission requests briefing, based on the evidentiary record, on the issues under review, and is particularly interested in receiving answers to the following questions:

1. What intrinsic and, to the extent it is applicable, extrinsic evidence supports your position on the issue of whether "the time to provide said plurality of destination pixel data" in the "wherein" clause includes the time to provide inactive pixels in a destination image frame?

2. What intrinsic and, to the extent it is applicable, extrinsic evidence supports your position on the issue of whether "a period to receive said source pixel data" in the "wherein" clause

includes a period to receive inactive pixels in a source image frame?

3. What intrinsic and, to the extent it is applicable, extrinsic evidence supports your position on the issue of whether the analog-to-digital converter depicted in Figure 13 is a structure that corresponds to the "receiving means" in claim 12?

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may issue (1) an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) one or more cease and desist orders that could result in respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair action in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry that either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

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: The parties to the investigation are requested to file

written submissions on the issues under review. The submission should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested persons are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the October 20, 2003, recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorneys 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 December 19, 2003. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on December 26, 2003. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file with the Office of the Secretary the original document and 14 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above. 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 section 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 sections 210.42–210.45 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR 210.42–210.45).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 9, 2003.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–30832 Filed 12–12–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[DEA #249E]

Controlled Substances: Established Initial Aggregate Production Quotas for 2004

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Justice.

ACTION: Notice of aggregate production quotas for 2004.

SUMMARY: This notice establishes initial 2004 aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA).

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 15, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine A. Sannerud, Ph.D., Chief, Drug & Chemical Evaluation Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Telephone: (202) 307–7183.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 306 of the CSA (21 U.S.C. 826) requires that the Attorney General establish aggregate production quotas for each basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedules I and II. This responsibility has been delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by section 0.100 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Administrator, in turn, has redelegated this function to the Deputy Administrator, pursuant to section 0.104 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

The 2004 aggregate production quotas represent those quantities of controlled substances that may be produced in the United States in 2004 to provide adequate supplies of each substance for: The estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States; lawful export requirements; and the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks (21 U.S.C. 826(a) and 21 CFR 1303.11). These quotas do not include imports of controlled substances for use in industrial processes.

On November 4, 2003, a notice of the proposed initial 2004 aggregate production quotas for certain controlled substances in Schedules I and II was published in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 62474). All interested persons were invited to comment on or object to these proposed aggregate production quotas on or before November 25, 2003.

Five companies commented on a total of 27 Schedules I and II controlled substances within the published comment period. The companies commented that the proposed aggregate