

products and hence there is no contributory infringement; (4) the ID's validity conclusions with respect to the '267, '410, and '907 patents, except not to review the ID's validity conclusions when the asserted claims of the '267 and '907 patents are construed apart from 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 6; and (5) the ID's conclusions with respect to the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to the '410, '267, and '907 patents, except not to review the ID's conclusions that complainants have failed to establish the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement when the asserted claims of the '267 and '907 patents are construed apart from 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 6.

The Commission also determined to review the procedural question of whether complainants waived the issue of whether the accused products infringe the asserted claims of the patents in controversy to the extent that the asserted claims are construed under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 6 to cover equivalents of the structure disclosed in the specification, viz., equivalents of a mechanical joint with play, by failing to raise the issue before the ALJ. The Commission determined not to review the remainder of the ID. The Commission also determined to extend the target data for completion of the investigation to March 7, 2002. The Commission subsequently determined to further extend the target date to March 21, 2002. In accordance with the Commission's directions, the parties filed main briefs on January 10, 2002, and reply briefs on January 17, 2002. Having examined the record in this investigation, including the briefs and the responses thereto, the Commission determined that there is no violation of section 337. More specifically, the Commission found that there is no infringement of any claims at issue of the '410, '267, and '907 patents; no domestic industry exists with respect to the '410, '267, and '907 patents; and that the '410, '267, and '907 patents are not invalid. The Commission also determined that the complainants waived the issue of whether the accused products infringe the asserted claims of the '410, '267, and '907 patents to the extent that the asserted claims are construed under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 6 to cover equivalents of the structure disclosed in the specification. Nonetheless, the Commission examined the issue and determined that, even if the argument had been timely raised, it would not have led to a different result. The Commission determined that complainants waived the issue of whether the accused products infringe

the asserted claims of the '410, '267 and '907 patents under the doctrine of equivalents. This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, 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: March 22, 2002.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–7402 Filed 3–28–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–114, Exclusion Order Modification Proceeding]

### In the Matter of Certain Miniature Plug-In Blade Fuses; Notice of Exclusion Order Modification

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that changed conditions have caused the U.S. International Trade Commission to modify the trade dress provision of the general exclusion order issued on January 13, 1983, in the above-captioned investigation. In light of certain judicial decisions, the Commission modified that provision by removing a reference to “product configuration” from the description of “trade dress.” As a result, the modified provision requires the exclusion of imported miniature plug-in blade fuses having a trade dress, *i.e.*, a packaging, simulating that of Littelfuse, Inc.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** P. N. Smitley, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3061. General information concerning the Commission, the above-captioned investigation, and the exclusion order modification proceeding also may be obtained by accessing its Internet server, <http://www.usitc.gov>.

Hearing-impaired individuals can obtain information concerning this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202–205–1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted the subject investigation in 1982 to determine whether there was a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 USC 1337 (1978 and 1981 Supp.)) in the importation or sale of certain miniature plug-in blade fuses that allegedly misrepresented their place of geographic

origin, infringed the complainant's patents and/or trademarks, misappropriated the complainant's trade dress, were passed off as merchandise of the complainant, or were the subject of false advertising. The complainant was the patent and trademark owner, Littelfuse, Inc., of Des Plaines, Illinois, a firm that manufactures and markets electronic devices, including the subject fuses.<sup>1</sup> The Commission named nine firms in Taiwan and three domestic firms as respondents in the investigation, 47 FR 1448, Jan. 13, 1982.

The investigation resulted in the issuance of a general exclusion order in 1983, requiring, among other things, the exclusion of imported miniature plug-in blade fuses having a trade dress, *i.e.*, a product configuration and/or packaging, simulating that of complainant Littelfuse. *Certain Miniature Plug-In Blade Fuses*, Inv. No. 337–TA–114, USITC Publication 1337 (Jan. 1983), Commission Action and Order at page 2, paragraph 2 (Jan. 13, 1983).

As the result of a Commission-initiated modification proceeding under 19 CFR 210.76 (*see* 66 FR 9359, Feb. 7, 2001, and Commission Order (Feb. 1, 2001)), the Commission concluded that conditions which led to the inclusion of product configuration in the trade dress provision of the exclusion order no longer exist. In particular, the product configuration protected by that provision was, by Littelfuse's admission, substantially the same configuration that the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, found to be functional and not entitled to trademark protection. See the unpublished Judgment and the unpublished Order issued on January 7, 1998 in Civil Action No. 1:95–CV–2445–JTC, *Wilhelm Pudenz GmbH [and] Wickmann USA, Inc. v. Littelfuse, Inc.* (The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the District Court's decision. *Wilhelm Pudenz GmbH v. Littlefuse [sic], Inc.*, 177 F.3d 1204, 51 U.S.P.Q.2d 1045 (11th Cir. 1999).)

The Commission accordingly has modified the trade dress provision of its section 337 exclusion order by deleting the reference to product configuration. The modified provision thus requires the exclusion of imported miniature plug-in blade fuses having a trade dress, *i.e.*, a packaging, simulating that of Littelfuse.

<sup>1</sup> Miniature plug-in blade fuses are installed in automobiles as original equipment. They also are sold in the automotive aftermarket, as replacement parts for original equipment.

Upon request, all nonconfidential documents filed or issued in the investigation or the exclusion order modification proceeding will be made available for public inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Commission's Office of the Secretary, Dockets Branch, 500 E Street, SW., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-1802.

In addition, the Final Determination and Commission Order effecting the modification and all nonconfidential documents filed or issued in the modification proceeding are available for inspection on the Commission's Web site. To access them, go to the "ITC RESOURCE PAGE," and then click on "EDIS On-Line for Public File Room."

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 20, 2002.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 02-7404 Filed 3-27-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-457]

### **In the Matter of Certain Polyethylene Terephthalate Yarn and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination To Review in Part an Order Granting-in-Part and Denying-in-Part a Motion for Summary Determination of Invalidity and Non-Infringement of the Only Patent at Issue in the Investigation; Determination To Grant Two Motions To Strike Exhibits**

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part an order (Order No. 61) issued on February 4, 2002, by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation granting-in-part and denying-in-part a motion for summary determination of invalidity and non-infringement of the only patent at issue in the investigation. The Commission has determined to review only the issue of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Commission has also determined to grant two motions to strike certain exhibits attached to pleadings filed in connection with Order No. 61.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jean Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade

Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3104. Copies of the public version of Order No. 61 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 TTD terminal on 202-205-1810. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-ON-LINE) at <http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public>. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server, <http://www.usitc.gov>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this patent-based investigation, which concerns allegations of unfair acts in violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation and sale of certain polyethylene terephthalate yarn and products containing same, on May 17, 2001. 66 FR 27586. The complainant, Honeywell International Inc. of Morris town, New Jersey named Hyosung Corp. of Seoul, Korea as the only respondent. On September 21, 2001, the Commission determined not to review an ID adding Hyosung America, Inc., a wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary of Hyosung Corp., as a respondent.

On December 13, 2001, respondent Hyosung moved for summary determination of patent invalidity and non-infringement. The motion was opposed by Honeywell and supported by the Commission investigative attorney. On February 4, 2002, the ALJ issued an order, Order No. 61, which granted Hyosung's motion for summary determination of non-infringement, but denied the motion as to patent invalidity. Honeywell filed a petition for review of the initial determination portion of the order on February 19, 2002. Hyosung and the Commission investigative attorney (IA) filed appeals of the portion of the order denying summary determination on the same date. Each of these parties filed responses to the February 19, 2002, filings on February 26, 2002.

Although the Commission has determined to review the issue of definiteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it does not wish to receive any further written submissions.

On February 25, 2002, Hyosung moved to strike certain documents that were attached to Honeywell's response to the appeals of the order on the ground that the documents were not before the ALJ when he decided the motion for summary determination. On March 1, 2002, Honeywell opposed the motion. On February 28, 2002, Hyosung moved to strike a document that was attached to Honeywell's response to Hyosung's and the IA's petitions for review on the ground that the document was not of record. This motion was opposed by Honeywell on March 7, 2002. Both motions to strike were supported by the IA on March 7, 2002.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 190, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in sections 210.24 and 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.24, 210.42(h).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 21, 2002.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 02-7403 Filed 3-27-02; 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 and 42 U.S.C. 9622(d)(2), notice is hereby given that on March 13, 2002, a proposed consent decree in a case captioned *United States v. A.O. Smith Corp., et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:02-CV-0168 (W.D. Mich.) was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan. The proposed consent decree relates to the Ionia City Landfill Superfund Site ("Site") in the City of Ionia, Ionia County, Michigan.

In a compliant that was filed simultaneously with the Consent Decree, the United States sought recovery of response costs and performance of response actions at the Site pursuant to Sections 106(a) and 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9606(a), 9607(a), against A.O. Smith Corp., the City of Ionia, Consumers Energy Co., Federal-Mogul Corp., General Motors Corp., Kmart Corp., the Michigan Department of Corrections, and Premiere Agri Technologies, Inc. (the "Defendants").