

Compact for Regulation of Class III Gaming between the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon and the State of Oregon governing Class III gaming; this notice announces approval of the amended Compact.

**DATES:** This compact takes effect on December 13, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Paula L. Hart, Director, Office of Indian Gaming, Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Washington, DC 20240, (202) 219–4066.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) requires the Secretary of the Interior to publish in the **Federal Register** notice of approved Tribal-State compacts that are for the purpose of engaging in Class III gaming activities on Indian lands. *See* Public Law 100–497, 25 U.S.C. 2701 *et seq.* All Tribal-State Class III compacts, including amendments, are subject to review and approval by the Secretary under 25 CFR 293.4. The Amendment to the Amended and Restated Tribal-State Compact for Regulation of Class III Gaming between the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon and the State of Oregon amends the previous compact, revises parts of the definition section, clarifies procedures for offering new types of video lottery terminals, and moves certain language regarding cooperation between Tribal and State law enforcement to another section of the Compact. The Amendment to the Amended and Restated Tribal-State Compact for Regulation of Class III Gaming between the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon and the State of Oregon is approved. *See* 25 U.S.C. 2710(d)(8)(A).

Dated: November 9, 2017.

**John Tahsuda,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 2017–26816 Filed 12–12–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4337–15–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigation Nos. 337–TA–565/946; (Advisory Opinion Proceeding)]**

### **Certain Ink Cartridges and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not to Review an Initial Determination Granting a Joint Motion To Terminate the Advisory Opinion Proceeding Based on a Settlement Agreement; Termination of the Advisory Opinion Proceeding**

**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. 6) granting a joint motion to terminate the consolidated advisory opinion proceeding in the above-captioned investigations based on a settlement agreement. The consolidated advisory opinion proceeding is terminated.

#### **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 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 Inv. No. 337–TA–565 on March 23, 2006, based on a complaint filed by Epson Portland, Inc. of Hillsboro, Oregon, Epson America, Inc. of Long Beach, California, and Seiko Epson Corporation of Nagano-Ken, Japan (collectively, “Epson”). 71 FR 14720 (Mar. 23, 2006). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S.

Patent Nos. 5,615,957; 5,622,439; 5,158,377; 5,221,148; 5,156,472; 5,488,401; 6,502,917; 6,550,902; 6,955,422; 7,008,053; and 7,011,397. The Commission’s notice of investigation named 24 respondents including Ninestar Technology Company Ltd. of Montclair, California (“Ninestar”). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) participated in the investigation. Several respondents were terminated from the investigation on the basis of settlement agreements or consent orders or were found in default. On October 19, 2007, the Commission issued a general exclusion order (“GEO”) and a limited exclusion order. The Commission also issued cease and desist orders (“CDO”) directed to several domestic respondents.

The Commission instituted Inv. No. 337–TA–946 on January 27, 2015, based on a complaint filed by Epson. 80 FR 4314–16 (Jan. 27, 2015). That complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,366,233; 8,454,116; 8,794,749; 8,801,163; and 8,882,513. The Commission’s notice of investigation named numerous respondents. OUII participated in the investigation. All the participating respondents were terminated from the investigation as a result of settlement agreements and/or consent motion stipulations. A number of the named respondents defaulted. On October 28, 2015, the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) issued an initial determination granting Epson’s motion for summary determination of violation of section 337 by the defaulting respondents. Based on evidence of a pattern of violation and difficulty ascertaining the source of the infringing products, the Commission issued a GEO and CDOs directed to two defaulted domestic respondents on May 26, 2016.

On April 26, 2017, Ninestar, Ninestar Image Tech. Ltd., and Apex Microtech Ltd. (collectively, “Requesters”) filed a request for a consolidated advisory opinion proceeding in both investigations pursuant to Commission Rule 210.79 (19 CFR 210.79). Specifically, Requesters seek an advisory opinion that will declare that their refurbished Epson ink cartridges remanufactured using empty Epson ink cartridges collected from the United States are outside the scope of the GEOs and CDOs issued in both investigations. Requesters also ask that the consolidated advisory opinion proceeding be conducted in an expedited manner pursuant to

Commission Rule 210.2 (19 CFR 210.2), without a formal hearing or discovery. Epson filed a timely response opposing the request. Thereafter, Requesters filed a motion for leave to file a reply to Epson's response.

On June 16, 2017, the Commission determined to institute a consolidated advisory opinion proceeding in both investigations and referred the request to the Chief ALJ to designate a presiding ALJ. 82 FR 27723 (Jun. 16, 2017). Epson, the Requesters, and OUII were named as parties to the proceeding. The Commission also determined to deny Requesters' motion for leave to file a reply.

On November 17, 2017, Epson and the Requesters filed a joint motion to terminate the consolidated advisory opinion proceeding based on a settlement agreement. The joint motion included a confidential version of the settlement agreement. A public version of the agreement was filed with the public version of the joint motion. That same day, OUII filed a response in support of the joint motion. On November 22, 2017, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 6) granting the joint motion to terminate the consolidated advisory opinion proceeding. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The Commission agrees with the ALJ that the joint motion to terminate the consolidated advisory opinion proceeding complies with the Commission's rules for termination and that there is no evidence that termination of the proceeding will adversely affect the public interest. Order No. 6 at 2–3.

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.

Dated: December 7, 2017.

**William R. Bishop,**  
*Supervisory Hearings and Information  
Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2017–26826 Filed 12–12–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

### Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committees on the Federal Rules of Appellate and Criminal Procedure and Rules of Evidence

**AGENCY:** Advisory Committees on the Federal Rules of Appellate and Criminal Procedure, and Rules of Evidence, Judicial Conference of the United States.

**ACTION:** Notice of cancellation of public hearings.

**SUMMARY:** The January 5, 2018 public hearings in Phoenix, Arizona, on proposed amendments to the Appellate, Criminal and Evidence Rules, the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts have been canceled.

**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.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Announcement for this hearing was previously published in 82 FR 37610.

Dated: December 7, 2017.

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

[FR Doc. 2017–26789 Filed 12–12–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 2210–55–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—DVD Copy Control Association

Notice is hereby given that, on November 21, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), DVD Copy Control Association (“DVD CCA”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Cinram GmbH, Oliphant, PA; Kaleidescape, Inc., Mountain View, CA; and Lite-On Technology Corp., Taipei, TAIWAN, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, ArcSoft Inc., Fremont, CA; ASD Electronics, Kowloon, HONG KONG–CHINA; EDC GmbH, Langenhagen, GERMANY; Orion Electric Co., Ltd., Fukui, JAPAN; Pixela Corporation, Osaka, JAPAN; TEAC Corporation, Tokyo, JAPAN; and Yamaha Corporation, Hamamatsu, JAPAN, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and DVD CCA intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 11, 2001, DVD CCA filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on August 3, 2001 (66 FR 40727).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 23, 2017. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 29, 2017 (82 FR 45611).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust  
Division.*

[FR Doc. 2017–26891 Filed 12–12–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cooperative Research Group on CHEDE–VII

Notice is hereby given that, on November 8, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on CHEDE–VII (“CHEDE–VII”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, General Motors, Detroit, MI, has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research