

Comments received during the above public comment period were incorporated into the final document. This current notice of availability informs the public that the Trustees have formally selected Alternative D of the Plan through the signing of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

#### Authority

This notice is provided pursuant to Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration (NRDAR) regulations (43 CFR 11.81(d)(4)) and NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: June 26, 2014.

#### Charles Wooley,

Acting Regional Director, Midwest Region,  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2014-17408 Filed 7-23-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[F-14874-K; LLA940000-L1410000-HY0000-P]

#### Alaska Native Claims Selection

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Decision Approving Lands for Conveyance.

**SUMMARY:** As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that an appealable decision will be issued by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to NANA Regional Corporation, Inc. Successor in Interest to Katyaak Corporation. The decision approves the surface estate in the lands described below for conveyance pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601, *et seq.*). The subsurface estate in these lands will be conveyed to NANA Regional Corporation, Inc. when the surface estate is conveyed to NANA Regional Corporation, Inc., as Successor in Interest to Katyaak Corporation. Katyaak Corporation was the original ANCSA corporation for the village of Kiana, but merged with the NANA Regional Corporation in 1976 under the authority of PL 94-204. The lands are in the vicinity of Kiana, Alaska, and are located in:

#### Kateel River Meridian, Alaska

T. 17 N., R. 8 W.,  
Sec. 18.

Containing 365.34 acres.

Notice of the decision will also be published once a week for four

consecutive weeks in the *Arctic Sounder*.

**DATES:** Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4 within the following time limits:

1. Unknown parties, parties unable to be located after reasonable efforts have been expended to locate, parties who fail or refuse to sign their return receipt, and parties who receive a copy of the decision by regular mail which is not certified, return receipt requested, shall have until August 25, 2014 to file an appeal.

2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4 shall be deemed to have waived their rights. Notices of appeal transmitted by electronic means, such as facsimile or email, will not be accepted as timely filed.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of the decision may be obtained from: Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, AK 99513-7504.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The BLM by phone at 907-271-5960 or by email at [blm\\_ak\\_akso\\_public\\_room@blm.gov](mailto:blm_ak_akso_public_room@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 BLM during normal business hours. In addition, the FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the BLM. The BLM will reply during normal business hours.

#### Joe J. Labay,

Land Transfer Resolution Specialist, Division of Lands and Cadastral.

[FR Doc. 2014-17423 Filed 7-23-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-879]

### Certain Sleep-Disordered Breathing Treatment Systems and Components Thereof; Commission Determination To Review an Initial Advisory Opinion in its Entirety; Issuance of Commission Advisory Opinion

**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 ("ALJ")'s initial advisory opinion, and to issue a modified advisory opinion in the above-captioned investigation.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cathy Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2392. 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 (<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 April 25, 2013, based on a complaint filed on March 28, 2013, and supplemented on April 19, 2013, on behalf of ResMed Corp. of San Diego, California; ResMed Inc. of San Diego, California; and ResMed Ltd. of Australia (collectively, "ResMed"). 78 FR 25475 (May 1, 2013). The complaint alleged violations of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the sale for importation, importation, or sale within the United States after importation of certain sleep-disordered breathing treatment systems and components thereof by reason of infringement of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,691; claims 1 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,935,337 ("the '337 patent"); claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,159,587 ("the '587 patent"); claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 18-20, 35, and 36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,487,772; claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,614,398; claims 59, 60, 63, and 72-75 of U.S. Patent No. 7,743,767; and claims 17, 21-24, 29, and 32-37 of U.S. Patent No. 7,997,267. The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents Apex Medical Corp. of New Taipei City, Taiwan and Apex Medical USA Corp. of Brea, California (collectively, "Apex"), and Medical Depot Inc., d/b/a Drive Medical Design & Manufacturing of Port Washington, New York. The Office of

Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) participated in the original investigation.

Medical Depot Inc. and Apex were terminated from the original investigation on the basis of consent orders. Order Nos. 8 (unreviewed by the Commission, July 18, 2013) and 11 (unreviewed by the Commission, Aug. 8, 2013).

On September 23, 2013, Apex filed a request for an advisory opinion under Commission Rule 210.79 (19 CFR 210.79) that would declare that its redesigned iCH and XT CPAP humidifiers and WiZARD 220 mask are outside the scope of the Commission’s August 8, 2013 Consent Order. On December 11, 2013, the Commission determined to institute an advisory opinion proceeding based on Apex’s request. 78 FR 76320–21 (Dec. 17, 2013). ResMed and OUII both participated in the advisory opinion proceeding.

On June 3, 2014, the ALJ issued an initial advisory opinion (“IAO”) finding that Apex’s redesigned iCH and XT CPAP humidifiers are covered, and Apex’s redesigned WiZARD 220 mask is not covered, by the Consent Order. Even though Apex requested the advisory opinion, the ALJ placed the burden of proof on the patent owner, ResMed, in view of the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Family Ventures, LLC*, 134 S. Ct. 843 (2014). However, the ALJ stated that the outcome of this particular advisory opinion proceeding was not dependent on which party carried the burden of proof. In addition, the ALJ found that the iCH CPAP humidifier infringes claim 20 of the ’337 patent both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents, and that the XT CPAP humidifier infringes claim 20 of the ’337 patent under the doctrine of equivalents. The ALJ also found that the WiZARD 220 mask does not infringe claim 15 of the ’587 patent.

ResMed, Apex, and OUII each filed a petition for review of the IAO on June 16, 2014. They each filed a response to the other petitions for review on June 23, 2014.

Having reviewed the IAO, the record evidence, and the parties’ submissions, the Commission has determined to continue to place the burden of proof in an advisory opinion proceeding on the party that requested the advice. Accordingly, in this proceeding, Apex must carry the burden of proving that its redesigned products are outside the scope of the Consent Order. The Commission has also determined to adopt, with modified reasoning, the ALJ’s finding that Apex’s redesigned iCH CPAP humidifier is covered, and

the ALJ’s finding that Apex’s redesigned WiZARD 220 mask is not covered, by the Consent Order. The Commission has further determined Apex’s redesigned XT CPAP humidifier is not covered by the Consent Order, thereby reversing the ALJ’s finding on this point. A modified advisory opinion will follow shortly.

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

Issued: July 18, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–17394 Filed 7–23–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–613]

### **Certain 3g Mobile Handsets and Components Thereof; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting in Part Motion of Nokia Corporation, Nokia Inc., and Microsoft Mobile OY To Substitute Parties and Amend Notice of Investigation and Motion of Microsoft Mobile OY To Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Filing the Motion To Substitute Parties and Amend the Notice of 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 the presiding administrative law judge’s (“ALJ”) initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 49) granting in part a motion of respondents Nokia Corporation (“Nokia Corp.”) and Nokia Inc. (collectively “Nokia”) and non-party Microsoft Mobile OY (“MMO”) to substitute parties and amend the notice of investigation and a motion of MMO to intervene for the limited purpose of filing the motion to substitute parties and amend the notice of investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Megan M. Valentine, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2301. 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 Inv. No. 337–TA–613 on September 11, 2007, based on a complaint filed by InterDigital Communications Corp. of King of Prussia, Pennsylvania and InterDigital Technology Corp. of Wilmington, Delaware (collectively, “InterDigital”) on August 7, 2007. 72 FR 51838 (Sept. 11, 2007). The complaint, as amended, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (19 U.S.C. 1337) (“section 337”) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain 3G mobile handsets and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,117,004; 7,190,966 (“the ’966 patent”); 7,286,847 (“the ’847 patent”); and 6,973,579. The notice of investigation named Nokia Corporation of Espoo, Finland and Nokia Inc. of Irving, Texas (collectively, “Nokia”) as respondents. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was named as a participating party. *Id.*

On August 14, 2009, the ALJ issued his final ID, finding no violation of section 337. On October 16, 2009, the Commission determined to review the Final ID in part and terminated the investigation with a finding of no violation. 74 FR 55068–69 (Oct. 26, 2009).

InterDigital timely appealed the Commission’s final determination of no violation of section 337 as to all of the asserted claims of the ’966 patent and claim 5 of the ’847 patent to the Federal Circuit. On August 1, 2012, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”) reversed the Commission’s construction of two claim limitations found in the appealed patents-in-suit, reversed the Commission’s determination of non-infringement as to the asserted claims of those patents, and remanded to the Commission for further proceedings. *InterDigital Commc’ns, LLC v. Int’l*