

notice of review. On February 1, 2018, the parties each filed respective replies.

Having considered the record in this investigation and the parties' submissions, the Commission finds that no violation of section 337 has occurred. The Commission (1) reverses the ID's finding on standing and finds that Andrea has standing to assert the '345 patent; (2) affirms, with additional reasoning, the ID's finding of no domestic industry; and (3) takes no position on the remaining issues under review.

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: March 22, 2018.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–06158 Filed 3–27–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1061]

### Certain Bar Code Readers, Scan Engines, Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof; Commission Decision Not to Review an Initial Determination Granting an Amended Joint Motion To Terminate the Investigation Based on a License and Settlement Agreement; Termination of the Investigation

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 22) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting an amended joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a license and settlement agreement. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Houada Morad, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–4716. 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

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 <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:** The Commission instituted this investigation on June 27, 2017, based on a complaint filed by Honeywell International, Inc. of Morris Plains, New Jersey; Hand Held Products, Inc. d/b/a Honeywell Scanning & Mobility of Fort Mill, South Carolina; Metrologic Instruments, Inc. d/b/a Honeywell Scanning & Mobility of Fort Mill, South Carolina (collectively, “Complainants” or “Honeywell”). See 82 FR 29095–96 (June 27, 2017). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain bar code readers, scan engines, products containing the same, and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,725; U.S. Patent No. 8,511,572; U.S. Patent No. 7,148,923; U.S. Patent No. 7,527,206; U.S. Patent No. 8,646,692; and U.S. Patent No. 9,323,969. See *id.* The notice of investigation names The Code Corporation (“Code”) of Draper, Utah and Cortex Pte Ltd. (“Cortex”) of Singapore as respondents in this investigation. See *id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to this investigation. See *id.*

On December 8, 2017, the ALJ issued an initial determination partially terminating the investigation as to Cortex as a respondent. See Order No. 12, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice (Jan. 8, 2018).

On February 21, 2018, Honeywell and Code filed an amended joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a license and settlement agreement (*Motion*). On the same day, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 22) granting the *Motion* and terminating the investigation. The ID finds that: “[t]he [*Motion*] complies with the Commission Rules . . . .” See ID at 1. In particular, the ID notes that “[p]ursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1)[, 19 CFR 210.21(b)(1)], the movants state: ‘There

express or implied, between Honeywell and Code regarding the subject matter of this proceeding.’” See ID at 1 (citing *Motion* at 2). In addition, the ID “does not find any evidence” indicating that terminating the investigation would be “contrary” to the public interest. See ID at 2 (citing *Motion* at 2; 19 CFR 210.50(b)(2)). No petition for review of the ID was filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is terminated.

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: March 22, 2018.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–06142 Filed 3–27–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1094]

### Certain IOT Devices and Components Thereof (IOT, The Internet of Things)—Web Applications Displayed on a Web Browser; Termination of Investigation

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review the presiding administrative law judge's (“ALJ”) initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 10), which terminated the investigation for good cause on the basis of the imminent expiration of the asserted patent. On review, the Commission has determined to affirm the termination based upon the actual expiration of the asserted patent.

**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

may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <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 TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on January 22, 2018, based upon an amended and supplemented complaint filed by Lakshmi Arunachalam, Ph.D. and WebXchange, Inc., both of Menlo Park, California. 83 FR 3021 (Jan. 22, 2018). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), by a number of proposed respondents in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain IOT devices and components thereof (IOT, the Internet of Things)—web applications displayed on a web browser by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,930,340 (“the ‘340 patent”), as well as unfair methods of competition and unfair acts (criminal and civil RICO violations, breach of contract, theft of intellectual property, antitrust violations, and trade secret misappropriation), the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States. 83 FR at 3021. The Commission determined to institute the investigation only as to infringement of the ‘340 patent, and named as respondents Apple Inc. of Cupertino, California; Facebook, Inc. of Menlo Park, California; Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey; and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Seoul, South Korea. *Id.* at 3022. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) was also named as a party. *Id.*

On January 29, 2018, the respondents moved to terminate the investigation based upon the then-imminent expiration of the ‘340 patent. The complainants responded in opposition to the motion. The ALJ denied the motion for failure to comply with Commission rules. Order No. 8 at 2 & n.1 (Feb. 20, 2018). On February 21, 2018, the respondents filed a renewed motion to terminate, which corrected the omission in their previous motion. The complainants renewed their opposition to the motion. OUII supported the motion.

On February 27, 2018, the ALJ granted

cause exists for terminating the investigation. The ID finds that given “the structure of section 337 investigations” there was insufficient time for the Commission to “reach a final determination or issue any relief before the March 5, 2018 expiration date” of the ‘340 patent. Order No. 10 at 6.

On March 5, 2018, the ‘340 patent expired. That same day, the complainants filed a “Motion for Rehearing and Reinstating the Investigation” (“Compl’ts Submission”). The Commission determined to treat that submission as a petition for Commission review of the ID under 19 CFR 210.43. The petition seeks an advisory ruling on certain issues. Compl’ts Submission 6.

On March 12, 2018, the respondents and OUII filed responses in opposition to the complainants’ submission. The responses explain, *inter alia*, that the complainants’ submission does not provide an adequate basis for Commission review under Commission Rule 210.43(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.43(b)(1). Resp’ts Resp. 3; OUII Resp. 1, 3.

Having considered the record of the investigation, including the parties’ submissions to the Commission, the Commission decides as follows. The Commission “can issue only an exclusion order barring future importation or a cease and desist order barring future conduct,” neither of which can issue as to an expired patent. *Texas Instruments Inc. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 851 F.2d 342, 344 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Because the ‘340 patent has now actually expired, the ID’s good cause (the imminent expiration of the patent) is now moot. Accordingly, the Commission has determined to review the ID, and, on review, to affirm the termination based upon the actual expiration of the ‘340 patent. The Commission declines the complainants’ invitation to issue advisory rulings, and terminates the 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 part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 23, 2018.

**Katherine M. Hiner,**  
*Supervisory Attorney.*

[FR Doc. 2018-06220 Filed 3-27-18; 8:45 am]

## JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

### Meeting of The Judicial Conference; Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

**AGENCY:** Judicial Conference of the United States, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

**ACTION:** Notice of open meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure will hold a meeting on June 12, 2018. The meeting will be open to public observation but not participation. An agenda and supporting materials will be posted at least 7 days in advance of the meeting at: <http://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/records-and-archives-rules-committees/agenda-books>.

**DATES:** June 12, 2018.

*Time:* 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, Mechem Conference Center, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, One Columbus Circle NE, Washington, DC 20544.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Rebecca A. Womeldorf, Rules Committee Secretary, Rules Committee Staff, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1820.

Dated: March 22, 2018.

**Rebecca A. Womeldorf,**  
*Rules Committee Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2018-06157 Filed 3-27-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 2210-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[CPCLO Order No. 004-2018]

### Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of a new system of records.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-108, notice is hereby given that the Office of Justice Programs (hereinafter OJP), a component within the United States Department of Justice (DOJ or Department), proposes to develop a new system of records titled National Missing and Unidentified Persons System, JUSTICE/OJP-015. The OJP proposes to establish this system of records to improve the quantity and