

directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) Identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) Identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) Indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) Explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 2925") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be

treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 21, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-31332 Filed 12-28-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-805]

Certain Devices for Improving Uniformity Used in a Backlight Module and Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Commission Decision To Review a Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Remand-in-Part of the Investigation to the Administrative Law Judge

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's ("ALJ") final initial determination ("ID") issued on October 22, 2012, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, (as amended), 19 U.S.C. 1337 ("section 337"), in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has also determined to remand-in-part the investigation to the ALJ.

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 this investigation on September 14, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Industrial Technology Research Institute of Hsinchu, Taiwan and ITRI International Inc. of San Jose, California (collectively "ITRI"). 76 FR 56796-97 (Sept. 14, 2011). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain devices for improving uniformity used in a backlight module and components thereof and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,883,932 ("the '932 patent"). The complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry. The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents LG Corporation of Seoul, Republic of South Korea; LG Electronics, Inc. of Seoul, Republic of South Korea; and LG Electronics, U.S.A., Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. The Office of Unfair Import Investigation was named as a participating party. The complaint was later amended to add respondents LG Display Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Republic of South Korea and LG Display America, Inc. of San Jose, California to the investigation. Notice (Feb. 2, 2012); Order No. 11 (Jan. 19, 2012). The Commission later terminated LG Corporation from the investigation. Notice (July 13, 2012); Order No. 18 (June 22, 2012).

On October 22, 2012, the ALJ issued his ID, finding no violation of section 337 as to the '932 patent. The ID included the ALJ's recommended determination ("RD") on remedy and bonding. In particular, the ALJ found that claims 6, 9 and 10 of the '932 patent are not infringed literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents by the accused products under his construction of the claim limitation "structured arc sheet" found in claim 6. The ALJ also found that ITRI's domestic industry product does not satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement. The ALJ did find, however, that ITRI has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(A) and (B). Because he found no infringement and no domestic industry, the ALJ did not reach the issues of patent validity or

enforceability. In the event the Commission found a violation of section 337, the ALJ recommended that the appropriate remedy is a limited exclusion order barring entry of LG's infringing products. The ALJ also recommended issuance of cease and desist orders against LG Electronics USA and LG Display America. The ALJ further recommended that LG be required to post a bond of one percent of the entered value of each infringing product for the importation of products found to infringe during the period of Presidential review.

On November 5, 2012, ITRI filed a petition for review of certain aspects of the final ID. Also on November 5, 2012, participating respondents LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., LG Display Co., Ltd., and LG Display America, Inc. (collectively "LG") filed a contingent petition for review of certain aspects of the ID. On November 13, 2012, ITRI filed a response to LG's contingent petition for review. Also on November 13, 2012, LG filed a response to ITRI's petition for review. Further on November 13, 2012, the Commission investigative attorney filed a combined response to ITRI's and LG's petitions. No post-RD statements on the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4) or in response to the post-RD Commission Notice issued on October 24, 2012, were filed. See 77 FR 65579 (Oct. 29, 2012).

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in its entirety. The Commission does not seek further briefing at this time. The Commission also remands the investigation to the ALJ to consider parties' invalidity and unenforceability arguments and make appropriate findings.¹ In light of the remand, the ALJ shall set a new target date consistent with the Remand Order.

Briefing, if any, on remanded and reviewed issues will await Commission consideration of the remand ID. The current target date for this investigation is February 28, 2013.

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 sections 210.42–46 and 210.50 of the

Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–46 and 210.50).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 21, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–31330 Filed 12–28–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–799]

Certain Computer Forensic Devices and Products Containing Same; Commission Determination Not To Review the Final Initial Determination of the Administrative Law Judge; Termination of the 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 final initial determination ("final ID" or "ID") of the presiding administrative law judge in the above-identified investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James A. Worth, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3065. 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 August 29, 2011, based on a complaint filed by MyKey Technology Inc. ("MyKey") of Gaithersburg, Maryland. 76 FR 53695 (Aug. 29, 2011). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), in the importation into the United States, the

sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain computer forensic devices and products containing the same by reason of infringement of claims 1–8, 11–13, 16–38 and 40–45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,682 (the "'682 patent"), claims 1–9, 13–18 and 20–21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,159,086 and claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,228,379 (the "'379 patent"). The notice of investigation named as respondents Data Protection Solutions by Arco of Hollywood, Florida; CRU Acquisitions Group LLC of Vancouver, Washington d/b/a CRU-DataPort LLC of Vancouver, Washington ("CRU"); Digital Intelligence, Inc. of New Berlin, Wisconsin ("Digital Intelligence"); Diskology, Inc. of Chatsworth, California; Guidance Software, Inc. of Pasadena, California and Guidance Tableau LLC of Pasadena, California (collectively, "Guidance"); Ji2, Inc. of Cypress, California; MultiMedia Effects, Inc. of Markham, Ontario; Voom Technologies, Inc. of South Lakeland, Minnesota; and YEC Co. Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan.

Only respondents Guidance, CRU, and Digital Intelligence remain in the investigation. The complainant has also narrowed the claims asserted to claims 1–8, 11–13, 16–21, 24–36, and 40–45 of the '682 patent and claim 2 of the '379 patent.

An evidentiary hearing was held from August 6 to August 10, 2012.

On October 26, 2012, the ALJ issued the final ID, finding no violation of Section 337. The ALJ found that MyKey had failed to satisfy the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission would ordinarily remand this investigation to the ALJ to address in the final ID all material issues presented because a hearing has concluded and all issues have been fully briefed before the ALJ. 19 CFR 210.42(d); see also *Certain Video Game Systems and Wireless Controllers and Components Thereof*, Inv. 337–TA–770, Comm'n Op. at n.1 (Nov. 6, 2012). However, the Commission has determined not to review the ID in this investigation based upon the extraordinary factual situation and the parties' failure to file petitions for review. This investigation is hereby terminated.

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).

¹ The ALJ should have resolved these issues given the procedural posture of this investigation (*i.e.*, post-hearing), and the absence of an extraordinary fact situation that would weigh heavily against resolving these material issues presented in the record. See *Certain Video Game Systems and Wireless Controllers and Components Thereof*, Inv. 337–TA–770, Comm'n Op. at n.1 (Nov. 6, 2012).