

become an integral part of the new article. *Belcrest Linens v. United States*, 6 Ct. Int'l Trade 204, 573 F. Supp. 1149 (1983), aff'd, 741 F.2d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1984). If the manufacturing or combining process is a minor one that leaves the identity of the imported article intact, a substantial transformation has not occurred. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. United States*, 3 Ct. Int'l Trade 220, 542 F. Supp. 1026 (1982). Assembly operations that are minimal or simple, as opposed to complex or meaningful, generally will not result in a substantial transformation. See C.S.D. 80–111, C.S.D. 85–25, C.S.D. 89–110, C.S.D. 89–118, C.S.D. 90–51, and C.S.D. 90–97.

CBP has held in a number of cases involving similar merchandise that complex and meaningful operations involving a large number of components result in a substantial transformation. Ricoh states that the toner for the cartridge is the most valuable component citing Headquarters Ruling Letter (HQ) W563548 (Nov. 9, 2009). In that case, CBP considered the country of origin of toner cartridges and image drums which were remanufactured in the U.S. The toner cartridges comprised 52 parts plus toner and 20 new parts were used to remanufacture the toner cartridges: 14 from the U.S., 1 from the U.K., and 5 from China. The remaining 32 parts were salvaged from used cartridges, which were cleaned for reassembly. The components with mechanical function such as the shutters, mixing gear, mixing bar, and spiral attachments were simply cleaned and not replaced. The cartridges were filled with new toner of Japanese origin and tested. CBP found that the cartridges were not substantially transformed in the U.S. because the remanufacturing processes were rather simple. Rather, the toner was the only significant component replaced during the remanufacturing operation. CBP concluded that since the toner imparted the essential character of the remanufactured toner cartridge, the country of origin was Japan. HQ W563548 also considered the remanufacture of image drums in the U.S. The image drums were comprised of 110 parts and 56 new parts were used from various countries: 12 in the U.S., 1 in Canada, 5 in Japan, and 38 in Thailand. Several of the newly manufactured parts were significant to the functionality of the image drum, such as the organic photoreceptor drum (claimed to be the most valuable component of the image drum), the developing roller, the charge roller, and the cleaning blade, which were all manufactured in Japan including new lubricating toner powder. Unlike the toner cartridge in W563548, the remanufacturing of the image drums required replacement of most of the components that contributed to the functionality of the image drum. Based on these facts, CBP concluded that the image drum was substantially transformed in the U.S.

We find that substantial manufacturing operations are performed in Japan in producing the AIO cartridge. While the OPC drum is manufactured in Thailand, the other parts of the cleaning unit originate in Japan. As a result of the assembly of the cleaning unit in Japan, the OPC drum becomes an

integral part of the cleaning unit such that it may be considered a product of Japan. This is analogous to the remanufactured image drum assembly process described in HQ W563548. The development unit is manufactured in China. The toner powder is manufactured in Japan and as found in W563548, it is the most critical element of the AIO cartridge. These three components (two of Japanese origin and one from China) are brought together by the frame assembly also performed in Japan. Therefore, we find that the country of origin of the Ricoh AIO cartridge is Japan.

HOLDING:

Based on the facts of this case, we find that the processing in Japan substantially transforms the non-Japanese components. Therefore, the country of origin of the AIO cartridge is Japan for purposes of U.S. Government procurement.

Notice of this final determination will be given in the **Federal Register**, as required by 19 C.F.R. § 177.29. Any party-at-interest other than the party which requested this final determination may request, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 177.31, that CBP reexamine the matter anew and issue a new final determination. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 177.30, any party-at-interest may, within 30 days of publication of the Federal Register Notice referenced above, seek judicial review of this final determination before the Court of International Trade.

Sincerely,
Sandra L. Bell,
Executive Director, Regulations and Rulings
Office of International Trade.

[FR Doc. 2014–15765 Filed 7–3–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau Of Land Management

[LLORP00000.L10200000.DF0000.14X.
HAG14–0153]

Notice of Public Meeting for the John Day—Snake Resource Advisory Council

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the John Day—Snake Resource Advisory Council (RAC) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The John Day—Snake RAC will hold a public meeting Thursday, July 17, and Friday, July 18, 2014. The meeting will run from 12 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on July 17th, and from 8 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. on July 18th. An agenda will be posted at <http://www.blm.gov/or/rac/>

[jdrac_meetingnotes.php](#) prior to July 11, 2014.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the USFS Wallowa Whitman National Forest, La Grande Ranger District Office at 3502 Hwy. 30 in La Grande, Oregon.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa Clark, Public Affairs Specialist, BLM Prineville District Office, 3050 NE. 3rd Street, Prineville, Oregon 97754, (541) 416–6864, or email lmclark@blm.gov. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1(800) 877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The John Day-Snake RAC consists of 15 members chartered and appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. Their diverse perspectives are represented in commodity, conservation, and general interests. They provide advice to BLM and Forest Service resource managers regarding management plans and proposed resource actions on public land in central and eastern Oregon. Agenda items for the July 2014 meeting include: presentations on the release of the approved John Day Basin Resource Management Plan and the NEPA 2.0 Planning Strategy, a field tour of the Blue Mountains Cohesive Strategy Pilot Project, committee and member updates and any other matters that may reasonably come before the John Day-Snake RAC. This meeting is open to the public in its entirety; however, transportation during the field tour portion of the meeting will not be provided to members of the public. Information to be distributed to the John Day-Snake RAC is requested prior to the start of each meeting. A public comment period will be available on July 18, 2014, at 10 a.m. Unless otherwise approved by the John Day-Snake RAC Chair, the public comment period will last no longer than 30 minutes. Each speaker may address the John Day-Snake RAC for a maximum of 5 minutes. Meeting times and the duration scheduled for public comment periods may be extended or altered when the authorized representative considers it necessary to accommodate business and all who seek to be heard regarding matters before the John Day-Snake RAC.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, please be aware that your

entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Michael P. Campbell,

Associate Deputy State Director for Communications.

[FR Doc. 2014–15754 Filed 7–3–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–33–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–Ta–823 (Advisory Opinion Proceeding)]

Certain Kinesiotherapy Devices and Components Thereof; Commission Decision To Adopt a Report Issued by the Office of Unfair Import Investigations as an Advisory Opinion

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has decided to adopt the report prepared by the Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) as the Commission’s advisory opinion in the above-captioned proceeding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Haldenstein, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2737. Copies of non-confidential 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. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <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>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on January 10, 2012, based on a complaint filed by Standard Innovation Corporation of Ottawa, ON, Canada and Standard Innovation (US) Corp. of

Wilmington, Delaware (collectively, “Standard Innovation”). 77 FR 1504–05 (Jan. 10, 2012). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), by reason of infringement of certain claims of United States Patent Nos. 7,931,605 (“the ‘605 patent”) and D605,779 (“the ‘779 patent”). The complaint named twenty-one business entities as respondents, including Lelo Inc. and Lelo AB (collectively, “Lelo”). On July 25, 2012, the Commission determined not to review an ID (Order No. 25) granting complainants’ motion to withdraw the ‘779 patent from the investigation.

On June 17, 2013, the Commission issued its final determination finding that Standard Innovation had proven a violation of section 337 based on the infringement of the asserted claims of the ‘605 patent. Based on evidence of a pattern of violation and difficulty ascertaining the source of the infringing products, the Commission issued a general exclusion order against certain kinesiotherapy devices and components thereof that infringe the asserted claims of the ‘605 patent. The Commission also issued cease and desist orders against certain respondents, including Lelo Inc.

On September 30, 2013, Lelo filed a request with the Commission asking for institution of an advisory opinion proceeding to declare that its new kinesiotherapy devices are not covered by the general exclusion order or the cease and desist order issued against Lelo Inc. Standard Innovation filed a response on November 12, 2013, opposing Lelo’s request.

On February 7, 2014, the Commission determined that Lelo’s request complied with the requirements for institution of an advisory opinion proceeding under Commission Rule 210.79. The Commission therefore determined to institute an advisory opinion proceeding and assigned the proceeding to OUII. 79 FR 8731–32 (Feb. 13, 2014). The Commission assigned OUII the task of investigating and preparing a report concerning Lelo’s new kinesiotherapy devices, and it named Standard Innovation and Lelo as parties to the proceeding.

On May 5, 2014, OUII issued a report concluding that the new kinesiotherapy devices developed by Lelo are not covered by the general exclusion order and cease and desist order against Lelo, Inc. issued in the underlying investigation. In so doing, OUII concluded, *inter alia*, that (1) Lelo met its burden of showing non-infringement with respect to the claim term “elongate outer arm;” (2) Lelo failed to meet its burden of showing non-infringement

with respect to the claim element “at least one of the inner and outer arms are generally tear-drop shaped.” On May 15, 2014, Standard Innovation and Lelo filed comments on the report prepared by OUII. On May 22, 2014, Standard Innovation and Lelo filed replies to the comments.

After reviewing the report and the submissions of Standard Innovation and Lelo, the Commission has decided to adopt the report issued by OUII as its advisory opinion in this proceeding.

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 part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 30, 2014.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014–15717 Filed 7–3–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Certain Devices Containing Non-Volatile Memory and Products Containing the Same, DN 3020*; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant’s filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission’s Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS,¹ and 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

¹ Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): <http://edis.usitc.gov>.