

between the remedy secured and the specific allegations in the government's Complaint, whether the proposed Final Judgment is sufficiently clear, whether its enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether it may positively harm third parties. *See Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1458–62. With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the proposed Final Judgment, a court may not “make de novo determination of facts and issues.” *United States v. W. Elec. Co.*, 993 F.2d 1572, 1577 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (quotation marks omitted); *see also Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460–62; *United States v. Alcoa, Inc.*, 152 F. Supp. 2d 37, 40 (D.D.C. 2001); *United States v. Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 16 (D.D.C. 2000); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *3. Instead, “[t]he balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General.” *W. Elec. Co.*, 993 F.2d at 1577 (quotation marks omitted). “The court should also bear in mind the flexibility of the public interest inquiry: the court’s function is not to determine whether the resulting array of rights and liabilities is the one that will best serve society, but only to confirm that the resulting settlement is within the reaches of the public interest.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460 (quotation marks omitted); *see also United States v. Deutsche Telekom AG*, No. 19–2232 (TJK), 2020 WL 1873555, at *7 (D.D.C. Apr. 14, 2020). More demanding requirements would “have enormous practical consequences for the government’s ability to negotiate future settlements,” contrary to congressional intent. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1456. “The Tunney Act was not intended to create a disincentive to the use of the consent decree.” *Id.*

The United States’ predictions about the efficacy of the remedy are to be afforded deference by the Court. *See, e.g., Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (recognizing courts should give “due respect to the Justice Department’s . . . view of the nature of its case”); *United States v. Iron Mountain, Inc.*, 217 F. Supp. 3d 146, 152–53 (D.D.C. 2016) (“In evaluating objections to settlement agreements under the Tunney Act, a court must be mindful that [t]he government need not prove that the settlements will perfectly remedy the alleged antitrust harms[;] it need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.” (internal citations omitted)); *United States v. Republic Servs., Inc.*, 723 F. Supp. 2d 157, 160 (D.D.C. 2010)

(noting “the deferential review to which the government’s proposed remedy is accorded”); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (“A district court must accord due respect to the government’s prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case.”). The ultimate question is whether “the remedies [obtained by the Final Judgment are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the ‘reaches of the public interest.’” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (quoting *W. Elec. Co.*, 900 F.2d at 309).

Moreover, the Court’s role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its Complaint, and does not authorize the Court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75 (noting that the court must simply determine whether there is a factual foundation for the government’s decisions such that its conclusions regarding the proposed settlements are reasonable); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *20 (“[T]he ‘public interest’ is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged”). Because the “court’s authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government’s exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60.

In its 2004 amendments to the APPA, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of using judgments proposed by the United States in antitrust enforcement, Public Law 108–237 § 221, and added the unambiguous instruction that “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(2); *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (indicating that a court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing or to permit intervenors as part of its review under the Tunney Act). This language explicitly wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it first enacted the Tunney Act in 1974. As Senator Tunney explained: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to

engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Sen. Tunney). “A court can make its public interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone.” *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (citing *Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d at 17).

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: June 17, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

For Plaintiff United States of America:

Daniel Monahan,
 United States Department of Justice,
 Antitrust Division, Defense, Industrials, and
 Aerospace Section, 450 Fifth St. NW, Suite
 8700, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone:
 202–598–8774, Email: daniel.monahan@
 usdoj.gov.

[FR Doc. 2025–12329 Filed 7–1–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1125–0007]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection eComments Requested; Extension and Revision of a Previously Approved Collection; Immigration Practitioner/Organization Complaint Form

AGENCY: Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), Department of Justice (DOJ), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until September 2, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Justine Fuga, Associate General

Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, 5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600, Falls Church, VA 22041, telephone: (703) 305–0265, Justine.Fuga@usdoj.gov, eoir.pra.comments@usdoj.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms

of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Abstract: Any individual may file a complaint against an immigration practitioner authorized to practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) and the immigration courts of EOIR. *See* 8 CFR 1003.102. An individual filing a complaint regarding a practitioner’s behavior in proceedings before EOIR must file the complaint in writing by mail or email to EOIR’s Office of the General Counsel’s Attorney Discipline Unit (ADU) using Form EOIR–44. The completed form must state in detail certain information supporting the complaint, including the name and address of both the complainant and the practitioner, the date and nature of the alleged conduct or behavior at issue, the individuals involved, the harm to or damages incurred by the complainant, and any other relevant information. *See* 8 CFR 1003.104(a)(2). The information on this form will be used to determine whether the ADU should conduct a preliminary disciplinary inquiry, request additional information from the complainant, refer the matter to a state bar disciplinary authority or other law enforcement agency, or take no further action. EOIR has revised the Privacy Act Notice on

the form to update citations to legal authority and clarify how EOIR uses the collected information.

Overview of This Information Collection

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension and Revision of a previously approved collection.
2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Immigration Practitioner Complaint Form.
3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* The agency form number is EOIR–44, and the sponsoring component is EOIR.
4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as the obligation to respond:* The affected public are individuals and households. The obligation to respond is voluntary.
5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that an average of 100 respondents will complete the form annually with an average of 2 hours per response.
6. *An estimate of the total annual burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* EOIR estimates an average of 200 total annual burden hours associated with this collection.

Activity	Number of respondents	Frequency (annually)	Total annual responses	Time per response (hours)	Total annual burden (hours)
EOIR–44—individuals or households	100	1	100	2	200

7. *An estimate of the total annual cost burden associated with the collection, if applicable:* The total estimated annual public cost is \$1,020. There are no capital or start-up costs associated with this information collection. There are no fees associated with filing the form. Most responses are printed and submitted by mail to the agency. The total annual printing cost to individuals is estimated at \$10.00 (\$0.10 per page × 1 page × 100 respondents). The total postage cost to individuals is estimated at \$1,010.00 (\$10.10 Priority Mail flat rate envelope × 100 respondents). However, the printing and postage costs may be avoided by electronically completing the form and submitting the form by email.

If additional information is required contact: Darwin Arceo, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and

Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE, 4W–218, Washington, DC.

Dated: June 27, 2025.

Darwin Arceo,
Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.
[FR Doc. 2025–12291 Filed 7–1–25; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410–30–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Office of Federal Procurement Policy

Cost Accounting Standards Board Meeting Agenda

AGENCY: Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice of agenda for closed Cost Accounting Standards Board meetings.

SUMMARY: The Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), Cost Accounting Standards Board (CAS Board) is publishing this notice to advise the public of its upcoming meetings. The meetings are closed to the public.

ADDRESSES: New Executive Office Building, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John L. McClung, Manager, Cost Accounting Standards Board (telephone: 202–881–9758; email: john.l.mcclung2@omb.eop.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The CAS Board is issuing this notice to inform the public of the discussion topics for a monthly meeting that was held in June and for meetings scheduled for July, August, and September 2025. The list of