

F.2d at 1577 (quotation marks omitted). “The court should bear in mind the flexibility of the public interest inquiry: the court’s function is not to determine whether the resulting array of rights and liabilities is one that will best serve society, but only to confirm that the resulting settlement is within the reaches of the public interest.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460 (quotation marks omitted). More demanding requirements would “have enormous practical consequences for the government’s ability to negotiate future settlements,” contrary to congressional intent. *Id.* at 1456. “The Tunney Act was not intended to create a disincentive to the use of the consent decree.” *Id.*

The United States’ predictions about the efficacy of the remedy are to be afforded deference by the Court. *See, e.g., Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (recognizing courts should give “due respect to the Justice Department’s . . . view of the nature of its case”); *United States v. Iron Mountain, Inc.*, 217 F. Supp. 3d 146, 152–53 (D.D.C. 2016) (“In evaluating objections to settlement agreements under the Tunney Act, a court must be mindful that [t]he government need not prove that the settlements will perfectly remedy the alleged antitrust harms[;] it need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.”) (internal citations omitted); *United States v. Republic Servs., Inc.*, 723 F. Supp. 2d 157, 160 (D.D.C. 2010) (noting “the deferential review to which the government’s proposed remedy is accorded”); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (“A district court must accord due respect to the government’s prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case”). The ultimate question is whether “the remedies [obtained by the Final Judgment are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the ‘reaches of the public interest.’” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (quoting *W. Elec. Co.*, 900 F.2d at 309).

Moreover, the Court’s role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its complaint, and does not authorize the Court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75 (noting that the court must simply determine whether there is a factual foundation for the government’s decisions such that its

conclusions regarding the proposed settlements are reasonable); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *20 (“the ‘public interest’ is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged”). Because the “court’s authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government’s exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60.

In its 2004 amendments to the APPA, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of using consent judgments proposed by the United States in antitrust enforcement, Public Law 108–237 § 221, and added the unambiguous instruction that “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(2); *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (indicating that a court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing or to permit intervenors as part of its review under the Tunney Act). This language explicitly wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it first enacted the Tunney Act in 1974. As Senator Tunney explained: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Sen. Tunney). “A court can make its public interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone.” *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (citing *Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d at 17).

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: November 18, 2019
Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy Evans, (DC Bar #478097),
Barbara W. Cash,
William M. Martin,
*United States Department of Justice,
Antitrust Division, Transportation,
Energy, and Agriculture Section, Liberty*

*Square Building, 450 Fifth Street NW,
Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530,
Telephone: (202) 598–8193.*

[FR Doc. 2019–25600 Filed 11–25–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

[F.C.S.C. Meeting and Hearing Notice No. 08–19]

Sunshine Act Meeting

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, pursuant to its regulations (45 CFR part 503.25) and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice in regard to the scheduling of open meetings as follows:

TIME AND DATE: Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: All meetings are held at the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 441 G St NW, Room 6234, Washington, DC.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 10:00 a.m.—Issuance of Proposed Decisions under the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, Title XVII, Public Law 114–328.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Requests for information, or advance notices of intention to observe an open meeting, may be directed to: Patricia M. Hall, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 441 G St NW, Room 6234, Washington, DC 20579. Telephone: (202) 616–6975.

Brian Simkin,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2019–25713 Filed 11–22–19; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–BA–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1190–0019]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection; eComments Requested; Extension Without Change of a Currently Approved Collection. Requirement That Movie Theaters Provide Notice as to the Availability of Closed Movie Captioning and Audio Description

AGENCY: Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (the Department), Civil Rights Division, Disability Rights Section (DRS), will

submit the following information collection extension request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA).

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 30 days until December 26, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments (especially on the estimated public burden or associated compliance time) or need additional information, please contact: Rebecca B. Bond, Chief, Disability Rights Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, by mail at 4CON, 950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20530; send an email to DRS.PRA@usdoj.gov; or call (800) 514-0301 (voice) or (800) 514-0383 (TTY) (the Division's Information Line). Written comments and/or suggestions can also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov. Include the title of this proposed collection: "Requirement that Movie Theaters Provide Notice as to the Availability of Closed Movie Captioning and Audio Description," in the subject line of all written comments. You may obtain copies of this notice in an alternative format by calling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information Line at (800) 514-0301 (voice) or (800) 514-0383 (TTY).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Civil Rights Division, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- 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;
- Evaluate whether, and if so, how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- 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 Information Collection

1. *Type of information collection:* Extension of Currently Approved Collection.

2. *The title of the form/collection:* Requirement that Movie Theaters Provide Notice as to the Availability of Closed Movie Captioning and Audio Description.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* Form Number: OMB Number 1190-0019.

Component: The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Disability Rights Section in the Civil Rights Division.

4. *Affected public who will be required to comply, as well as a brief abstract:*

Affected Public (Primary): Businesses and not-for-profit institutions that own, operate, or lease a movie theater that has one or more auditoriums showing digital movies with closed movie captioning and audio description, and that provide notice of movie showings and times. Under the relevant regulation, "movie theater" means a facility other than a drive-in theater that is used primarily for the purpose of showing movies to the public for a fee.

Affected Public (Other): None.

Abstract: The Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, Disability Rights Section (DRS), is seeking to extend its information collection arising from a regulatory provision that requires covered movie theaters to disclose information to the public regarding the availability of closed movie captioning and audio description for movies shown in their auditoriums.

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), at 42 U.S.C. 12182, prohibits public accommodations from discriminating against individuals with disabilities. The existing ADA title III regulation, at 28 CFR 36.303(a)–(g), requires covered entities to ensure effective communication with individuals with disabilities. The title III regulation clarifies that movie theaters that provide captioning or audio description for digital movies must ensure "that all notices of movie showings and times at the box office and other ticketing locations, on websites and mobile apps, in newspapers, and over the telephone, inform potential patrons of the movies or showings that are available with captioning and audio description." 28 CFR 36.303(g). This requirement does

not apply to any third-party providers of films, unless they are part of or subject to the control of the public accommodation. *Id.* Movie theaters' disclosure of this information will enable individuals with hearing and vision disabilities to readily find out where and when they can have access to movies with these features.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:*

Estimated total number of respondents: The Department's initial PRA request for this collection relied on U.S. Census Bureau data from 2012 and estimated that there was a total of 1,876 firms owning one or more movie theaters in the United States that were potentially subject to this disclosure. See 81 FR 37643 (June 10, 2016). The most recent U.S. Census Bureau data, from 2016, estimated that there was a total of 1,790 firms owning one or more movie theaters. See U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 SUSB Annual Data Tables by Establishment Industry, Data by Enterprise Employment Size, U.S., 6-digit NAICS. As the vast majority of U.S. movie theaters now show digital movies, which typically allow for closed captioning and audio description, to the extent that each of these movie theater firms that shows digital movies provides notices of movie showings and times to the public about those films, they must provide information concerning the availability of closed movie captioning and audio description in their communications.

Estimated average time to respond: The Department acknowledges that the amount of time it will take a respondent to comply with this requirement may vary depending on the number of movies that the respondent is showing at any given time. Based on information gathered during the initial rulemaking process, the Department estimates that respondents will take an average of up to 10 minutes each week to update existing notices of movie showings and times with closed captioning and audio description information. Therefore, the Department estimates that each firm owning one or more theaters offering digital movies with closed captioning or audio description will spend approximately $((10 \text{ minutes/week} \times 52 \text{ weeks/year}) \div 60 \text{ minutes/hour})$ 8.7 hours each year to comply with this requirement.

The Department anticipates that firms owning one or more movie theaters will likely update their existing listings of movie showings and times to include information concerning the availability of closed movie captioning and audio

description on a regular basis. The Department's research suggests that this information would only need to be updated whenever a new movie with these features is added to the schedule. This will vary as some movies stay on the schedule for longer periods of time than others, but the Department estimates that respondent firms will update their listings to include this information weekly. In the future, if all movies are distributed with these accessibility features, specific notice on a movie-by-movie basis may no longer be necessary and firms owning movie theaters may only need to advise the public that they provide closed captioning and audio description for all of their movies.

6. *An estimate of the total annual public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated public burden associated with this collection is 15,573 hours. The Department estimates that respondents will take an average of 10 minutes each week to update their existing listings of movie showings and times with the required information about closed captions and audio description. If each respondent spends 10 minutes each week to update its notices of moving showings and times to include this information, the average movie theater firm will spend 8.7 hours annually ((10 minutes/week × 52 weeks/year) ÷ 60 minutes/hour) complying with this requirement. The Department expects that the annual public burden hours for disclosing this information will total (1,790 respondents × 8.7 hours/year) 15,573 hours.

If additional information is required, contact: Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 3E.405A, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: November 21, 2019.

Melody Braswell,

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

[FR Doc. 2019-25640 Filed 11-25-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1105-0099]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension With Change, of a Previously Approved Collection; USMS Medical Forms

AGENCY: U.S. Marshals Service, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 30 days until December 26, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments, particularly with respect to the estimated public burden or associated response time, have suggestions, need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or desire any additional information, please contact Nicole Timmons either by mail at CG-3, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20530-0001, by email at Nicole.Timmons@usdoj.gov, or by telephone at 202-236-2646. Written comments and/or suggestions can also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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:

- 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;
- 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;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- 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:* Extension and revision of a currently approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* USMS Medical Forms.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* Form Numbers:

- USM-522A Physician Evaluation Report for USMS Operational Employees
- USM-522P Physician Evaluation Report for USMS Operational Employees—Pregnancy Only
- USM-600 Physical Requirements of USMS District Security Officers
- CSO-012 Request to Reevaluate Court Security Officer's Medical Qualification

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

- USM-522A Physician Evaluation Report for USMS Operational Employees.
 - Affected public: Private sector (Physicians).
 - Brief abstract: This form is completed by an USMS operational employee's treating physician to report any illness/injury (other than pregnancy) that requires restriction from full performance of duties for longer than 80 consecutive hours.
- USM-522P Physician Evaluation Report for USMS Operational Employees (Pregnancy Only).
 - Affected public: Private sector (Physicians).
 - Brief abstract: Form USM-522P must be completed by the OB/GYN physician of pregnant USMS operational employees to specify any restrictions from full performance of duties.
- USM-600 Physical Requirements of USMS District Security Officers.
 - Affected public: Private sector (Physicians).
 - Brief abstract: It is the policy of the USMS to ensure a law enforcement work force that is medically able to safely perform the required job functions. All applicants for law enforcement positions must have pre-employment physical examinations; existing District Security Officers