period on the Capital Market, unless it does not appear to Nasdaq staff that it is possible for the Company to cure the deficiency.

The Commission believes that requiring a company to affirmatively state its intent to cure the bid price deficiency and Nasdaq staff to determine whether it is possible for the company to cure that deficiency, provides further protections to investors, by helping to ensure that only companies that are serious and capable of gaining compliance with the Capital Market listing standards within the timeframe provided qualify for the second compliance period. In this regard, the Commission would expect a thorough review to ensure that it is possible for the bid price deficiency to be cured at the end of the second 180 day compliance period and, if not, would expect Nasdaq to immediately commence delisting proceedings.

In approving the Nasdaq's proposal, the Commission recognizes that certain companies that do not currently qualify for the second compliance period could receive additional time to remain listed on a public market. The proposal, however, does not extend the overall maximum time of 360 days that a company may remain listed before delisting proceedings will commence. Moreover, the proposal eliminates the automatic nature of the second 180 day bid price compliance period that exists under the current rules. Further, notwithstanding the change in eligibility criteria for a second compliance period, the Commission expects Nasdaq to monitor companies closely that are out of compliance and use its authority to delist issuers in a prompt, efficient, and fair manner where necessary and appropriate, in accordance with Nasdaq Rule 5100, including where there are public interest or other concerns such as low price or market value, that make continued listing unwarranted.

Finally, the Commission finds that Nasdaq's proposal to remove language in Rule 5810(c)(3) will reduce confusion regarding the application of the rule by clarifying that there are no fees applicable to a company which transfer to the Capital Market. The additional changes proposed by Nasdaq to the text of Rule 5810(c)(3)(A)(i)–(ii) conform the rule language and format of the two paragraphs and clarify that Nasdaq will assess a company for compliance with applicable listing requirements based on the company's most recent public filings and market information. The Commission believes that these changes either clarify the rule or are nonsubstantive.

## **IV. Conclusion**

*It is therefore ordered,* pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>16</sup> that the proposed rule change (SR–NASDAQ–2010–107), be, and hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>17</sup>

## Florence E. Harmon,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–26474 Filed 10–20–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

# SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

In the Matter of Cape Systems Group, Inc., Caribbean Cigar Company, Casual Male Corp., Cell Power Technologies, Inc., Cellmetrix, Inc. (f/k/a BCAM International, Inc.), Cellular Products, Inc. (n/k/a 872 Main Street Corp.), Ceptor Corp., CGS Scientific Corp., and Ciprico, Inc., File No. 500–1; Order of Suspension of Trading

October 19, 2010.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Cape Systems Group, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2006.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Caribbean Cigar Company because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 1998.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Casual Male Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended February 3, 2001.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Cell Power Technologies, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended April 30, 2006.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Cellmetrix, Inc. (f/k/a BCAM International, Inc.) because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended June 30, 2000.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a

lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Cellular Products, Inc. (n/k/a 872 Main Street Corp.) because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 1994.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Ceptor Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2007.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of CGS Scientific Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended February 29, 2000.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Ciprico, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2007.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the above-listed companies.

Therefore, it is ordered, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in the securities of the above-listed companies is suspended for the period from 9:30 a.m. EDT on October 19, 2010, through 11:59 p.m. EDT on November 1, 2010.

By the Commission.

# Elizabeth M. Murphy,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–26698 Filed 10–19–10; 11:15 am] BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

## Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

The Social Security Administration (SSA) publishes a list of information collection packages requiring clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with Public Law (Pub. L.) 104–13, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, effective October 1, 1995. This notice includes a new information collection for OMB approval.

SSA is soliciting comments on the accuracy of the agency's burden estimate; the need for the information; its practical utility; ways to enhance its quality, utility, and clarity; and ways to minimize burden on respondents, including the use of automated

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>17 17</sup> CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Mail, e-mail, or fax your comments and recommendations on the information collection to the OMB Desk Officer and SSA Reports Clearance Officer to the following addresses or fax numbers.

- (OMB), Office of Management and Budget, Attn: Desk Officer for SSA. Fax: 202–395–6974. E-mail address: OIRA\_Submission@omb.eop.gov.
- (SSA), Social Security Administration, DCBFM, Attn: Reports Clearance Officer, 1333 Annex Building, 6401 Security Blvd., Baltimore, MD 21235. Fax: 410–965–6400. E-mail address: OPLM.RCO@ssa.gov.

SSA has submitted the information collection listed below to OMB for clearance. Your comments on the information collection would be most useful if OMB and SSA receive them within 30 days from the date of this publication. To be sure we consider your comments, we must receive them no later than November 22, 2010. You can obtain a copy of the OMB clearance package by calling the SSA Reports Clearance Officer at 410–965–8783 or by writing to the above e-mail address.

Benefit Offset National Demonstration—0960–NEW. SSA is undertaking the Benefit Offset National Demonstration (BOND)—a demonstration and evaluation of policy

changes and services on the Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) program—in an effort to produce strong evidence about the effectiveness of potential solutions that would improve the historically very low rate of return to work among SSDI beneficiaries. Under current law, Social Security beneficiaries lose their SSDI benefit if they have earnings and/or work activity above the threshold of Substantial Gainful Activity after completing the Trial Work Period and two-month grace period. The benefit-offset component of this demonstration will reduce benefits by \$1 for each \$2 in earnings above the BOND threshold, resulting in a gradual reduction in benefits as earnings increase.

The experimental design for BOND will test a benefit offset alone and in conjunction with enhanced work incentives counseling. The central research questions include:

• What is the effect of the benefit offset alone on employment and other outcomes?

• What is the effect of the benefit offset in combination with enhanced work incentives counseling on employment and other outcomes?

The proposed public survey data collections will have four components an impact study, a cost-benefit analysis, a participation analysis, and a process

study. The data collections are a primary source for data to measure the effects of a more generous benefit offset and the provision of enhanced work incentives counseling on SSDI beneficiaries' work efforts and earnings. Ultimately, these data will benefit researchers, policy analysts, policy makers and the United States Congress in a wide range of program areas. The effects of BOND on the well-being of SSDI beneficiaries could manifest themselves in many dimensions and could be relevant to an array of other public programs. This project offers the first opportunity to obtain reliable measures of these effects based upon a nationally representative sample. The long-term indirect benefits of this research are therefore likely to be substantial. Respondents are SSDI beneficiaries and concurrent SSDI and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries who we randomly assign to the study (Stage 1), and SSDI beneficiaries who agree to participate in the study (Stage 2).

*Type of Request:* Request for a new information collection.

**Note:** This is a correction notice. We updated the burden figures, shown below, since we published the 60-day **Federal Register** Notice for this collection on August 12, 2010 at 75 FR 49013.

Survey	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Number of responses	Average burden per response (minutes)	Total annual burden (hours)
Participation Agreement	12,600	1	12,600	20	4,200
Baseline Survey	12,600	1	12,600	41	8,610
Interim Survey	10,080	1	10,080	29	4,872
Stage 1 36-month Survey	8,000	1	8,000	49	6,533
Stage 2 36-month Survey	10,080	1	10,080	60	10,080
Enhanced Work Incentives Assessment	3,000	1	3,000	35	1,750
Key Informant Interviews	100	7	700	60	700
Stage 2 Participant Focus Groups	600	1	600	90	900
Totals	57,060		57,660		37,645

Dated: October 15, 2010.

#### Faye Lipsky,

Reports Clearance Officer, Center for Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration. [FR Doc. 2010–26384 Filed 10–20–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Docket No. AB 33 (Sub-No. 289X)]

# Union Pacific Railroad Company— Abandonment Exemption—in Pulaski County, AR

Union Pacific Railroad Company (UP) filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR part 1152 subpart F– *Exempt Abandonments* to abandon a 4.04-mile portion of its Camp Robinson Spur extending from milepost 345.64 to the end of the line at milepost 349.68, in Pulaski County, Ark.<sup>1</sup> The line traverses United States Postal Service Zip Code 72118.

UP has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the line for at least 2 years; (2) there is no overhead traffic on the line to be rerouted; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the line (or by a State or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of complainant within

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  On October 7, 2010, UP supplemented its notice of exemption.