

Commerce's affirmative critical circumstances determinations are not likely to undermine seriously the remedial effect of the countervailing and antidumping duty orders on hot-rolled steel from Brazil and the antidumping duty order on imports from Japan.

### Background

The Commission, pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)), instituted these investigations effective August 11, 2015, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by AK Steel Corporation (West Chester, Ohio), ArcelorMittal USA, LLC (Chicago, Illinois), Nucor Corporation (Charlotte, North Carolina), SSAB Enterprises, LLC (Lisle, Illinois), Steel Dynamics, Inc. (Fort Wayne, Indiana), and United States Steel Corporation (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania). The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of hot-rolled steel from Brazil<sup>3</sup> were subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)) and that imports from Australia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom were dumped within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission's investigations 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** on April 15, 2016 (81 FR 22310). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on August 4, 2016, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on September 26, 2016. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4638 (September 2016), entitled *Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Australia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom*

<sup>3</sup> The Commission also scheduled final-phase countervailing duty investigations concerning hot-rolled steel from Korea and Turkey, although Commerce preliminarily determined that *de minimis* countervailable subsidies were being provided to hot-rolled steel producers and exporters from Korea and Turkey.

(Investigation Nos. 701-TA-545-547 and 731-TA-1291-1297 (Final)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 26, 2016.

**Katherine Hiner,**

*Acting Supervisory Attorney.*

[FR Doc. 2016-23572 Filed 9-28-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-965]

### Certain Table Saws Incorporating Active Injury Mitigation Technology and Components Thereof; Notice of Request for Statements on the Public Interest

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") has issued a recommended determination on remedy and bonding in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission is soliciting comments on public interest issues raised by the recommended relief, specifically limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders, against certain table saws incorporating active injury mitigation and components thereof, imported by respondents Robert Bosch Tool Corporation of Mount Prospect, Illinois, and Robert Bosch GmbH of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany. Parties are to file public interest submissions pursuant to Commission regulations.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>, 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 Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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:** Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 provides that if the Commission finds a violation it shall exclude the articles concerned from the United States:

unless, after considering the effect of such exclusion upon the public health and welfare, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, and United States consumers, it finds that such articles should not be excluded from entry.

19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1). A similar provision applies to cease-and-desist orders. 19 U.S.C. 1337(f)(1).

The Commission is interested in further development of the record on the public interest in these investigations. Accordingly, members of the public are invited to file, pursuant to 19 CFR 210.50(a)(4), submissions of no more than five (5) pages, inclusive of attachments, concerning the public interest in light of the administrative law judge's recommended determination on remedy and bonding issued in this investigation on September 20, 2016. Comments should address whether issuance of limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

- (i) explain how the articles potentially subject to the recommended limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders are used in the United States;
- (ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the recommended limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders;
- (iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;
- (iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the recommended limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders within a commercially reasonable time; and
- (v) explain how the recommended limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders would impact consumers in the United States.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business on October 18, 2016.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document

electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the investigation number ("Inv. No. 965") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, [https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed\\_reg\\_notices/rules/handbook\\_on\\_electronic\\_filing.pdf](https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf)). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202–205–2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) By the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel,<sup>[1]</sup> solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

This action is taken under the authority of 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: September 26, 2016.

**Katherine Hiner,**

*Acting Supervisory Attorney.*

[FR Doc. 2016–23571 Filed 9–28–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

<sup>[1]</sup> All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–833]

### Certain Digital Models, Digital Data, and Treatment Plans for Use in Making Incremental Dental Positioning Adjustment Appliances, the Appliances Made Therefrom, and Methods of Making the Same Rescission of Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of an Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to rescind the cease and desist orders issued in this investigation and to terminate the investigation with a finding of no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 ("Section 337").

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2532. 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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:** This investigation was instituted on April 5, 2012, based upon a complaint filed on behalf of Align Technology, Inc., of San Jose, California ("Align"), on March 1, 2012, as corrected on March 22, 2012. 77 FR 20648 (April 5, 2012). The complaint alleged violations of Section 337 in the sale for importation, importation, or sale within the United States after importation of certain digital models, digital data, and treatment plans for use in making incremental dental positioning adjustment appliances, the appliances made therefrom, and methods of making the

same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,217,325 ("the '325 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,471,511 ("the '511 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,626,666 ("the '666 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,705,863 ("the '863 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,722,880 ("the '880 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,134,874 ("the '874 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 8,070,487 (the '487 patent"). The notice of institution named as respondents ClearCorrect Pakistan (Private), Ltd. of Lahore, Pakistan ("CCPK") and ClearCorrect Operating, LLC of Houston, Texas ("CCUS") (collectively, "the Respondents"). A Commission investigative attorney ("IA") participated in the investigation.

On May 6, 2013, the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") issued his final initial determination ("ID"), finding a violation of Section 337 with respect to the '325 patent, the '880 patent, the '487 patent, the '511 patent, the '863 patent, and the '874 patent. He found no violation as to the '666 patent. The ALJ recommended the issuance of cease and desist orders directed to the Respondents.

After receiving briefing from the parties and the public, on April 3, 2014, the Commission issued notice of its determination to affirm-in-part, modify-in-part, and reverse-in-part the final ID and to find a violation of Section 337. 79 FR 19640–41 (Apr. 9, 2014). The Commission found a violation of Section 337 with respect to (i) claims 1 and 4–8 of the '863 patent; (ii) claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 of the '666 patent; (iii) claims 1, 3, and 5 of the '487 patent; (iv) claims 21, 30, 31 and 32 of the '325 patent; and (v) claim 1 of the '880 patent. On the same day, the Commission issued an opinion, with a dissenting opinion from Commissioner Johanson, and also issued cease and desist orders directed to CCUS and CCPK. The Commission terminated the investigation.

On May 2, 2014, the Respondents filed a motion to stay the cease and desist orders pending appeal. On May 14, 2014, Complainant Align and the IA filed responses in opposition. On June 2, 2014, the Commission issued a notice and order granting the motion.

ClearCorrect and Align each took appeals of the Commission's determination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. In ClearCorrect's appeal, the Federal Circuit reversed the Commission's decision that the electronic transmission of the digital models could constitute an imported "article" within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1337, and remanded the case to the Commission. *ClearCorrect Operating, LLC v. ITC*, 810 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015), *reh'g en banc denied*,