

Dated: June 2, 1999.

Carol D. Shull,

*Chief, National Historic Landmarks Survey
and Keeper of the National Register of Historic
Places, National Park Service, Washington
Office.*

[FR Doc. 99-14451 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Grand Canyon National Park, Coconino County, AZ

AGENCY: National Park Service, DOI.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a proposal for a cellular communication site at Grand Canyon National Park has been received. The company proposes installing and operating a wireless telecommunications facility on the existing tower of US WEST at Grand Canyon Village of the park.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before July 5, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Superintendent, Attn.: Barbara Nelson, Telecommunications Specialist, Grand Canyon National Park, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandi Perl, Management Assistant, at telephone number 520-638-7885.

Dated: June 1, 1999.

Robert L. Arnberger,

Superintendent.

[FR Doc. 99-14442 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-805 (Final)]

Elastic Rubber Tape From India

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject investigation, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports from India of elastic rubber tape,² classified in

subheading 4008.21.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

Background

The Commission instituted this investigation effective August 18, 1998, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and the Department of Commerce by counsel for Fulflex, Inc., Middletown, RI, and two wholly-owned subsidiaries of M-Tec Corp., Elastomer Technologies Group, Inc., Stuart, VA, and RM Engineered Products, Inc., North Charleston, SC. The final phase of the investigation was scheduled by the Commission following notification of a preliminary determination by the Department of Commerce that imports of elastic rubber tape from India were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's investigation and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of February 10, 1999 (64 FR 6679). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on April 20, 1999, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on June 1, 1999. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3200 (June 1999), entitled Elastic Rubber Tape from India: Investigation No. 731-TA-805 (Final).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 2, 1999.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-14524 Filed 6-7-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-406]

Certain Lens-Fitted Film Packages; Notice of Issuance of General Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission determined to reverse-in-part the presiding administrative law judges (ALJ's) initial determination (ID) of February 24, 1999, in the above-captioned investigation and determine that the design patents in issue are infringed by the respondents. The Commission also determined that the correct standard for the burden of proof on the repair/reconstruction issue is a preponderance of the evidence. The Commission also determined to correct certain technical errors in the ID's infringement findings. Having found a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, the Commission issued a general exclusion order and cease and desist orders directed to 20 domestic respondents, and terminated the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-3104. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This investigation was instituted on March 25, 1998, based on a complaint by Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd. (Fuji) of Tokyo, Japan. 63 FR 14474. Fuji's complaint alleged unfair acts in violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain lens-fitted film packages (i.e., disposable cameras). The complaint alleged that 27 respondents had infringed one or more claims of 15 patents held by complainant Fuji. On October 23, 1998, the Commission determined not to review two IDs finding a total of eight respondents, viz., Boshi Technology Ltd., Fast Shot, Haichi International, Innovative Trading Company, Labelle Time, Inc., Linfa Photographic Ind. Co. Ltd., Forcemam, Inc., and Rino Trading Co. Ltd., in

¹ The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² Commissioner Crawford determines that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of the subject imports from India, and

Commissioner Koplan determines that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of the subject imports from India.

default for failure to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation. An evidentiary hearing was held November 2–13, 1998. Eight respondents participated in the hearing, viz., Achiever Industries Limited, Argus Industries, China Film Equipment, Dynatec International Inc., Jazz Photo Corp., OptiColor Camera, P.S.I. Industries, and Sakar International, Inc. (the participating respondents). On December 4, 1998, the Commission determined not to review an ID granting complainant's oral motion to withdraw a single claim of one patent from the investigation. 63 FR 67918 (December 9, 1998). Ten respondents that had filed responses to the complaint and notice of investigation failed to appear at the hearing, viz., Ad-Tek Specialties Inc., AmerImage, Inc. d/b/a/ Rainbow Products, Boecks Camera LLC, BPS Marketing, E.T. Trading d/b/a Klikit, Penmax, Inc., PhilmEx Photographic Film, T.D.A. Trading Corp., Vantage Sales, Inc., and Vivitar Corp.

On February 24, 1999, the ALJ issued his final ID, finding a violation of section 337 by 26 of 27 named respondents. (Complainant Fuji admitted at closing argument that one named respondent, Opticam Inc, was not violating section 337). He found that Fuji had not carried its burden of proof in showing infringement of three design patents. The ALJ also issued his recommendations on remedy and bonding. He recommended that the Commission issue a general exclusion order directing that disposable cameras that infringe the claims in controversy of the 12 utility patents at issue be excluded from entry into the United States. He also recommended that cease and desist orders be issued directed to the 21 domestic respondents found in violation of section 337. Finally, he recommended a 100 percent bond during the period of Presidential review.

On March 8, 1999, the participating respondents, complainant Fuji, and the Commission investigative attorney (IA) filed petitions for review of the ID. Upon considering the petitions, the Commission, on April 19, 1999, determined to review the following issues: (1) The standard for the burden of proof applied in the ID for establishing repair versus reconstruction of a patented product, (2) the ID's determination that the design patents asserted in this investigation were not infringed, (3) infringement issues insofar as necessary to correct certain clerical errors brought to the Commission's attention by the IA. 64 FR 20324–25 (April 26, 1999).

The Commission received written submissions from the parties that

addressed the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered, the effect of a remedy on the public interest, and the amount of bond that should be imposed during the 60-day Presidential review period.

Having reviewed the record in this investigation, including the written submissions of the parties, the Commission determined (1) to reverse the ALJ's finding that Fuji failed to carry its burden of proof on the issue of design patent infringement; (2) to correct the standard of the burden of proof on the repair/reconstruction issue to be proof by a preponderance of the evidence; and (3) to correct technical errors in the ID's infringement findings. The Commission further determined that the appropriate form of relief is a general exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed entry for consumption of lens-fitted film packages that infringe the claims in issue of the 15 patents asserted by Fuji in this investigation. The Commission also determined to issue 20 cease and desist orders directed to domestic respondents Fast Shot, Haichi International, Innovative Trading Company, Labelle Time, Inc., Forcecam, Inc., Argus Industries, Dynatec International Inc., Jazz Photo Corp., OptiColor Camera, P.S.I. Industries, Sakar International, Inc., Ad-Tek Specialties Inc., AmerImage, Inc. d/b/a/ Rainbow Products, Boecks Camera LLC, BPS Marketing, E.T. Trading d/b/a Klikit, PhilmEx Photographic Film, T.D.A. Trading Corp., Vantage Sales, Inc., and Vivitar Corp. Respondent Penmax made a credible showing that it has no remaining inventory of infringing products, and the Commission therefore determined not to issue a cease and desist order against Penmax.

The Commission also determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsections (d) and (f) of section 337 do not preclude the issuance of the aforementioned general exclusion order and cease and desist orders, and that the bond during the Presidential review period shall be in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of the articles in question.

Copies of the Commission's orders, the public version of the Commission's opinion in support thereof, the public version of the 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.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*, and sections 210.45–210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.45–210.51.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 2, 1999,

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14525 Filed 6–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

[IND No. 1986–99; AG Order No. 2227–99]

RIN 1115–AE 26

Extension and Redesignation of the Province of Kosovo in the Republic of Serbia in the State of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia-Montenegro) Under Temporary Protected Status

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On June 9, 1998 the Attorney General designated Kosovo Province in the Republic of Serbia in the State of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia-Montenegro) under the Temporary Protected Status (TPS) program. This designation allowed eligible nationals of Kosovo Province (and aliens having no nationality who last habitually resided in Kosovo Province) who have continuously resided in the United States since that date to apply for TPS through June 8, 1999. This notice extends the TPS designation for Kosovo Province for 12 months (until June 8, 2000) and provides procedures for nationals of Kosovo Province (and aliens having no nationality who last habitually resided in Kosovo Province) with TPS to re-register for the additional 12-month TPS period. This notice also redesignated Kosovo Province under the TPS program, thereby expanding TPS eligibility to include nationals of Kosovo Province (and aliens having no nationality who last habitually resided in Kosovo Province) who have been “continuously present in the United States”) and who have “continuously resided in the United States” since June 18, 1999.

EFFECTIVE DATES: