

Dated: April 26, 2013.  
**Roseann Gonzales,**  
*Director, Policy and Administration, Denver Office.*  
 [FR Doc. 2013-10357 Filed 5-1-13; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Bureau of Reclamation**

[A10-1412-0001-009-01-0-4, 8453000]

**OMB Control Number 1006-0006; Agency Information Collection Activities Under OMB Review; Renewal of a Currently Approved Information Collection**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.  
**ACTION:** Notice of renewal and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Reclamation has forwarded the following Information Collection Request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval: Certification Summary Form and Reporting Summary Form for Acreage Limitation, 43 CFR part 426 and 43 CFR part 428 (OMB Control Number 1006-0006).

**DATES:** OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove this information collection request but may respond after 30 days; therefore, public comments must be received on or before June 3, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, via facsimile to (202) 395-5806, or email to *oira\_submission@omb.eop.gov*. A copy of your comments should be directed to the Bureau of Reclamation, Attention: 84-53000, P.O. Box 25007, Denver, CO 80225-0007. Please reference OMB Control Number 1006-0006 in your comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephanie McPhee, Bureau of Reclamation, at (303) 445-2897. You may also view the Information Collection Request at *www.reginfo.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Abstract**

This information collection is required under the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (RRA), Acreage Limitation Rules and Regulations, 43 CFR part 426, and Information Requirements for Certain Farm Operations In Excess of 960 Acres and the Eligibility of Certain Formerly Excess Land, 43 CFR part 428. The forms in this information collection are to be used by district offices to summarize individual landholder (direct or indirect landowner or lessee) and farm operator certification and reporting forms. This information allows us to establish water user compliance with Federal reclamation law.

**II. Changes to the RRA Forms and Their Instructions**

The changes made to the currently approved RRA forms and the corresponding instructions are of an editorial nature, and are designed to assist the respondents by increasing their understanding of the forms, clarifying the instructions for completing the forms, and clarifying the information that is required to be on the forms. The proposed revisions to the RRA forms will be effective in the 2014 water year.

**III. Data**

- OMB Control Number:* 1006-0006.
- Title:* Certification Summary Form and Reporting Summary Form for Acreage Limitation, 43 CFR part 426 and 43 CFR part 428.
- Form Number:* Form 7-21SUMM-C and Form 7-21SUMM-R.
- Frequency:* Annually.
- Respondents:* Contracting entities that are subject to the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law.
- Estimated Annual Total Number of Respondents:* 182.
- Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.25.
- Estimated Total Number of Annual Responses:* 228.
- Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 9,120 hours.
- Estimated Completion Time per Respondent:* See table below.
- Estimated non-hour cost burden:* \$159,660.

Form No.	Burden estimate per form (in hours)	Number of respondents	Annual number of responses	Annual burden on respondents (in hours)
7-21SUMM-C and associated tabulation sheets .....	40	172	215	8,600
7-21SUMM-R and associated tabulation sheets .....	40	10	13	520
Totals .....	.....	182	228	9,120

**IV. Request for Comments**

We invite your comments on:  
 (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of our functions, including whether the information will have practical use;  
 (b) the accuracy of our burden estimate for the proposed collection of information;  
 (c) ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and  
 (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Reclamation will display a valid OMB control number on the RRA forms.

A **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 57587, September 18, 2012). No comments were received.

OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove this information collection, but may respond after 30 days; therefore, public comment should be

submitted to OMB within 30 days in order to assure maximum consideration.

**V. Public Disclosure**

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should 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.

Dated: April 26, 2013.

**Roseann Gonzales,**

*Director, Policy and Administration, Denver Office.*

[FR Doc. 2013-10358 Filed 5-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-792]

### Certain Static Random Access Memories and Products Containing Same; Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the remand initial determination ("RID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on February 25, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. 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 July 28, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Cypress Semiconductor Corporation of San Jose, California ("Cypress"). 76 FR 45295 (July 28, 2011). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain static random access memories

and products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,534,805; 6,651,134; 6,262,937 and 7,142,477. The notice of investigation named the following entities as respondents: GSI Technology, Inc. of Sunnyvale, California ("GSI"); Alcatel-Lucent of Paris, France ("Alcatel-Lucent"); Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc. of Murray Hill, New Jersey ("Alcatel-Lucent USA"); Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson of Stockholm, Sweden ("Ericsson LM"); Ericsson, Inc. of Plano, Texas ("Ericsson"); Motorola Solutions, Inc. of Schaumburg, Illinois ("Motorola"); Motorola Mobility, Inc. of Libertyville, Illinois ("MMI"); Arrow Electronics, Inc. of Melville, New York ("Arrow"); Nu Horizons Electronics Corp. of Melville, New York ("Nu Horizons"); Cisco Systems, Inc. of San Jose, California ("Cisco"); Hewlett Packard Company/Tipping Point of Palo Alto, California ("HP"); Avnet, Inc. of Phoenix, Arizona ("Avnet"); Nokia Siemens Networks US, LLC of Irving, Texas ("Nokia US"); Nokia Siemens Networks B.V. of Zoetermeer, Netherlands ("Nokia"); and Tellabs of Naperville, Illinois ("Tellabs"). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to this investigation.

The following respondents were terminated from the investigation based on settlement agreements, consent orders, or withdrawal of allegations from the complaint: Alcatel-Lucent, Alcatel-Lucent USA, Ericsson, Arrow, Nu Horizons, Nokia US, and Nokia. The following respondents were terminated from the investigation based upon grant of summary determination of no violation of section 337: MMI, HP, Motorola, Tellabs, and Ericsson LM. The following respondents remain in the investigation: GSI, Cisco, and Avnet (collectively, "Respondents").

On October 25, 2012, the ALJ issued his final ID ("ID"), finding no violation of section 337 by the remaining respondents. Specifically, the ALJ found that the Commission has subject matter jurisdiction, *in rem* jurisdiction over the accused products, and *in personam* jurisdiction over the Respondents. ID at 8. The ALJ also found that the importation requirement of section 337 (19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)(B)) has been satisfied. *Id.* The ALJ, however, found that the accused products do not infringe the asserted patent claims. *See* ID at 16, 24, 39, and 55. The ALJ also found that Cypress failed to establish the existence of a domestic industry that practices the asserted patents under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(2) for failure to establish the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement. *See* ID at 20, 31,

45, and 58. The ALJ did not consider the validity or enforceability of the asserted patents despite Respondents' assertion in both their pre-hearing and post-hearing briefs that the asserted patents are invalid and unenforceable. *See* ID at 20, 31, 45-46, and 59.

On November 7, 2012, Cypress filed a petition for review of the ID. That same day, Respondents filed a contingent petition for review. On November 15, 2012, the parties filed responses to the petition and contingent petition for review.

On December 21, 2012, the Commission determined to review the ID in its entirety (without requesting further briefing) and remanded the investigation to the ALJ to make findings on invalidity and unenforceability, issues he did not rule on. On February 25, 2012, the ALJ issued his RID, finding that the asserted patents are enforceable and not invalid.

On March 11, 2013, Respondents filed a petition for review of the RID, challenging the ALJ's findings that the asserted patents are enforceable and not invalid. On March 19, 2013, Cypress filed a response to the petition for review.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID and RID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the RID in part, *i.e.*, with respect to validity. The final ID remains under Commission review.

The Commission declines Respondents' request to take judicial review of the on-going reexamination proceedings at the United States Patent and Trademark Office regarding the '805 patent and admit filings in that case into evidence in this investigation.

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 sections 210.42-46 and 210.50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42-46 and 210.50).

Issued: April 26, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-10354 Filed 5-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**