

Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for “sixty days” until August 30, 2013. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments concerning this information collection should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: DOJ Desk Officer. The best way to ensure your comments are received is to email them to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov) or fax them to 202–395–7285. All comments should reference the 8 digit OMB number for the collection or the title of the collection. If you have questions concerning the collection, please Cathy Poston, Office on Violence Against Women, at 202–514–5430 or the DOJ Desk Officer at 202–395–3176.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Certification of Compliance with the Statutory Eligibility Requirements of the Violence Against Women Act as Amended” for Applicants to the STOP Formula Grant Program.

(2) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: 1122–0001. U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief*

*abstract:* Primary: The affected public includes STOP formula grantees (50 states, the District of Columbia and five territories (Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Northern Mariana Islands). The STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program was authorized through the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and reauthorized and amended by the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 and the Violence Against Women Act of 2005. The purpose of the STOP Formula Grant Program is to promote a coordinated, multi-disciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system’s response to violence against women. It envisions a partnership among law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and victim advocacy organizations to enhance victim safety and hold offenders accountable for their crimes of violence against women. The Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) administers the STOP Formula Grant Program funds which must be distributed by STOP state administrators according to statutory formula (as amended by VAWA 2000 and VAWA 2005).

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* It is estimated that it will take the approximately 56 respondents (state administrators from the STOP Formula Grant Program) less than one hour to complete a Certification of Compliance with the Statutory Eligibility Requirements of the Violence Against Women Act, as Amended.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total annual hour burden to complete the Certification is less than 56 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Room 1407B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 25, 2013.

**Jerri Murray,**

*Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 2013–15568 Filed 6–28–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–18–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

Notice is hereby given that, on May 31, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (“IEEE”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. 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, 26 new standards have been initiated and 19 existing standards are being revised. More detail regarding these changes can be found at <http://standards.ieee.org/about/sba/feb2013.html>, <http://standards.ieee.org/about/sba/mar2013.html> and <http://standards.ieee.org/about/sba/may2013.html>.

On September 17, 2004, IEEE 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 November 3, 2004 (69 FR 64105).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 11, 2013. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 7, 2013 (78 FR 9069).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2013–15639 Filed 6–28–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—OpenDaylight Project, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on May 23, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), OpenDaylight Project, Inc. (“OpenDaylight”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to the

venture and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties to the venture are: Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc., Mountain View, CA; Arista Networks Inc., Santa Clara, CA; Big Switch Networks, Mountain View, CA; Brocade Communications Systems, Inc., San Jose, CA; Ciena Corporation, Hanover, MD; Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA; Citrix Systems, Inc., Santa Clara, CA; Cyan Inc., Petaluma, CA; Dell Inc., Round Rock, TX; Ericsson Inc., San Jose, CA; Fujitsu Limited, Kawasaki, JAPAN; Hewlett Packard Company, Palo Alto, CA; Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd., Shenzhen, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA; International Business Machines Inc., Endicott, NY; Inocybe Technologies Inc., Gatineau, Quebec City, CANADA; Intel Corporation, Santa Clara, CA; Juniper Networks, Sunnyvale, CA; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA; NEC Corporation, Tokyo, JAPAN; PLUMgrid Inc., Sunnyvale, CA; Radware LTD, Telaviv, ISRAEL; Red Hat Inc., Raleigh, NC; and VMware Inc., Palo Alto, CA.

The general area of OpenDaylight's planned activity is to (a) Advance the creation, evolution, promotion, and support of an open source software defined network software platform ("Platform"); (b) support and maintain the strategic framework of the Platform through the technologies made available by the organization to make the Platform a success; (c) support and maintain policies set by the Board; (d) promote such Platform worldwide; and (e) undertake such other activities as may from time to time be appropriate to further the purposes and achieve the goals set forth above.

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2013-15640 Filed 6-28-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—DVD Copy Control Association

Notice is hereby given that, on May 31, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and

Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), DVD Copy Control Association ("DVD CCA") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. 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, Hakuto Taiwan Ltd., Taipei, TAIWAN, has been added as a party to this venture.

Also, Dongguan ChuDong Electronic Technology Co., Ltd., Guangdong, People's Republic of China; Huizhou Aihua Multimedia Co., Ltd., Guangdong, People's Republic of China; and Kentec, Inc., Taipei, Taiwan, have withdrawn as parties 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 DVD CCA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 11, 2001, DVD CCA 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 August 3, 2001 (66 FR 40727).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 20, 2013. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 21, 2013 (78 FR 17431).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2013-15641 Filed 6-28-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 11-63]

#### Bio Diagnostic International; Denial of Application

On June 8, 2011, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Bio Diagnostic International, Inc. (hereinafter, BDI or Respondent), of Brea, California. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Respondent's application for a registration as a distributor of list I chemicals, on the ground that Respondent's registration "would be

inconsistent with the public interest." Show Cause Order at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(h) and 824(a)(4)).

The Show Cause Order specifically alleged that on September 1, 2009, Respondent had applied for a DEA registration as a distributor of iodine, a list I chemical. *Id.* The Order alleged that Mr. Paul Anand, Ph.D., was Respondent's owner and operator, and that during a pre-registration investigation, he had failed to provide a Food and Drug Administration registration, that he had failed to obtain a California Department of Justice Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement Controlled Chemical Substances Permit, and that he had "failed to accurately complete" employee screening forms as requested by Agency Investigators. *Id.* at 1-2. The Order also alleged that during the inspection, "investigators discovered that approximately 50 to 100 expired bottles of Lugol's solution, a product containing . . . [i]odine, were left unsecured on a shelf within BDI's proposed controlled location without a proper registration" and that "BDI failed to record, secure, or dispose of the expired list I chemical products as required by law." *Id.* at 2. Finally, the Order alleged that "[o]n December 8, 2010 . . . state investigators attempted to conduct a site inspection at BDI's business facility" but that they "were not successful because BDI did not cooperate with attempts to conduct this inspection." *Id.*

On June 27, Mr. Anand filed a request for a hearing on behalf of Respondent and the matter was placed on the docket of the Office of Administrative Law Judges (ALJ). Thereafter, the assigned ALJ issued an order for pre-hearing statements; both parties complied with the order.

In its pre-hearing statement, the Government provided notice that one of its witnesses would testify that "Respondent is required to have a valid California Board of Pharmacy license . . . or a California Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement permit . . . and . . . Respondent's state permit expired on June 11, 2011 and was not renewed." Gov. Pre-Hearing Statement, at 6-7. The Government noticed that its witness would further testify that "currently the Respondent is not authorized to handle list I chemicals in the State of California." *Id.* at 7.

Based on the above, the ALJ issued a Memorandum to Parties and Order. Therein, the ALJ ordered the parties to address two issues: (1) whether the "Respondent presently possess[es] a valid . . . state license, registration or other authority to handle listed chemicals, to include list I chemicals,