this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at http://edis.usitc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kevin G. Baer, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2221.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2010).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on July 1, 2010, ordered that—

- (1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain caskets that infringe one or more of claims 1, 13, 27, and 44-53 of the '124 patent; claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, and 21 of the '291 patent; claims 1 and 2 of the '936 patent; claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, and 12 of the '294 patent; and claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the '810 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337:
- (2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:
- (a) The complainant is: Batesville Services, Inc., One Batesville Boulevard, Batesville, Indiana 47006.
- (b) The respondent is the following entity alleged to be in violation of section 337, and is the party upon which the complaint is to be served: Ataudes Aguilares, S. de R.L. de C.v., Volcan Osorno 5829 C.P. 44250, Huentitan El Bajo, Guadalajara, Jal., Mexico.
- (c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Kevin G. Baer, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and
- (3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern, Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent in accordance with section 210.13 of the

Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)–(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of the respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission. Issued: July 2, 2010.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2010–16638 Filed 7–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–44 (Third Review)]

Sorbitol From France; Determination

On the basis of the record ¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675d(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on sorbitol from France, would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted this review on July 1, 2009 (74 FR 31762, July 2, 2009) and determined on October 6, 2009 that it would conduct a full review. Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's review and of a public

hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on December 17, 2009 (74 FR 66992). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on May 11, 2010, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on July 1, 2010.² The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4164 (June 2010), entitled *Sorbitol from France (Inv. No. 731–TA–44 (Third Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 1, 2010.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-16649 Filed 7-7-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-1070B (Review)]

Certain Tissue Paper Products From China

Determination

On the basis of the record ¹ developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain tissue paper products from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.²

¹The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

 $^{^2}$ The Commission determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675 (c)(5) (B).

¹The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

² Chairman Okun and Commissioner Pearson found two domestic like products—consumer tissue paper and bulk tissue paper. They determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on bulk tissue paper would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. They also determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on consumer tissue paper would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.