INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–742]

In the Matter of Certain Digital Televisions and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion To Terminate The Investigation In Its Entirety


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. 7) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting the private parties’ motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3152. Copies of the ID and all other nonconfidential 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. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–3193. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov). The public record for these reviews may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at http://edis.usitc.gov.

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731–TA–825 and 826 (Second Review)]

Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From Korea and Taiwan


ACTION: Institution five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on certain polyester staple fiber from Korea and Taiwan.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on certain polyester staple fiber from Korea and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time. It will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct full reviews or expedited reviews. The Commission’s determinations in any expedited reviews will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to these reviews:

consideration, the deadline for responses is March 31, 2011. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by May 16, 2011. For further information regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436.
(1) **Subject Merchandise** is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year reviews, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The **Subject Countries** in these reviews are Korea and Taiwan.

(3) The **Domestic Like Product** is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the Subject Merchandise. In its original determinations, the Commission found that there were two Domestic Like Products corresponding to (1) low-melt fiber and (2) conventional polyester staple fiber (all subject polyester staple fiber except for low-melt fiber). However, the Commission made a negative original determination with respect to low-melt fiber. One Commissioner defined the Domestic Like Product differently in the original determinations. In its full first five-year review determinations, the Commission defined the Domestic Like Product to be all certain conventional polyester staple fiber, coextensive with the scope of the reviews.

(4) The **Domestic Industry** is the U.S. producers as a whole of the Domestic Like Product, or those producers whose collective output of the Domestic Like Product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determinations, the Commission defined two Domestic Industries: (1) All domestic producers of low-melt fiber and (2) all domestic producers of conventional polyester staple fiber. However, the Commission made a negative determination with respect to low-melt fiber in the original investigations. One Commissioner defined the Domestic Industry differently in the original determinations. In its full first five-year review determinations, the Commission defined the Domestic Industry as all domestic producers of certain conventional polyester staple fiber, coextensive with the scope of the reviews.

(5) An **Importer** is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the Subject Merchandise into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

**Participation in the reviews and public service list.**—Persons, including industrial users of the Subject Merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consommateurs, wishing to participate in the reviews as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11(b)(4) of the Commission’s rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the *Federal Register*. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the reviews.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are advised that they may appear in a review even if they participated personally and substantially in the corresponding underlying original investigation. The Commission’s designated agency ethics official has advised that a five-year review is not considered the “same particular matter” as the corresponding underlying original investigation for purposes of 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees, and Commission rule 201.15(b) (19 CFR 201.15(b)), 73 FR 24609 (May 5, 2008). This advice was developed in consultation with the Office of Government Ethics. Consequently, former employees are not required to seek Commission approval to appear in a review under Commission rule 19 CFR 201.15, even if the corresponding underlying original investigation was pending when they were Commission employees. For further ethics advice on this matter, contact Carol McCue Verratti, Deputy Agency Ethics Official, at 202–205–3088.

**Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and APO service list.**—Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission’s rules, the Secretary will make BPI submitted in these reviews available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the reviews, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the *Federal Register*. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the reviews. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

**Certification.**—Pursuant to section 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, any person submitting information to the Commission in connection with these reviews must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter’s knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will be deemed to consent, unless otherwise specified, for the Commission, its employees, and contract personnel to use the information provided in any other reviews or investigations of the same or comparable products which the Commission conducts under Title VII of the Act, or in internal audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Commission pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3.

**Written submissions.**—Pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission’s rules, each interested party response to this notice must provide the information specified below. The deadline for filing such responses is March 31, 2011. Pursuant to section 207.62(b) of the Commission’s rules, eligible parties (as specified in Commission rule 207.62(b)(1)) may also file comments concerning the adequacy of responses to the notice of institution and whether the Commission should conduct expedited or full reviews. The deadline for filing such comments is May 16, 2011. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of sections 201.8 and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules and any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6 and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002). Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or APO service list as applicable), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the reviews you do not need to serve your response).

**Inability to provide requested information.**—Pursuant to section 207.61(c) of the Commission’s rules, any interested party that cannot furnish the information requested by this notice in the requested form and manner shall notify the Commission at the earliest possible time, provide a full explanation of why it cannot provide the requested information, and indicate alternative forms in which it can provide equivalent information. If an interested party does not provide this notification (or the Commission finds the explanation provided in the notification inadequate) and fails to provide a complete response to this notice, the Commission may take an adverse inference against that party pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act in making its determinations in the reviews.
Information to be Provided In Response to this Notice of Institution: If you are a domestic producer, union/worker group, or trade/business association; import/export Subject Merchandise from more than one Subject Country; or produce Subject Merchandise in more than one Subject Country, you may file a single response. If you do so, please ensure that your response to each question includes the information requested for each pertinent Subject Country. As used below, the term “firm” includes any related firms.

(1) The name and address of your firm or entity (including World Wide Web address) and name, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the certifying official.

(2) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, a U.S. union or worker group, a U.S. importer or exporter of the Subject Merchandise, a foreign producer or exporter of the Subject Merchandise, a U.S. or foreign trade or business association, or another interested party (including an explanation). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, identify the firms in which your workers are employed or which are members of your association.

(3) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is willing to participate in these reviews by providing information requested by the Commission.

(4) A statement of the likely effects of the revocation of the antidumping duty orders on the Domestic Industry in general and/or your firm/entity specifically. In your response, please discuss the various factors specified in section 752(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) including the likely volume of subject imports, likely price effects of subject imports, and likely impact of imports of Subject Merchandise on the Domestic Industry.

(5) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. producers of the Domestic Like Product. Identify any known related parties and the nature of the relationship as defined in section 771(4)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677(4)(B)).

(6) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise and producers of the Subject Merchandise in each Subject Country that currently export or have exported Subject Merchandise to the United States or other countries after 2004.

(7) A list of 3–5 leading purchasers in the U.S. market for the Domestic Like Product and the Subject Merchandise (including street address, World Wide Web address, and the name, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of a responsible official at each firm).

(8) A list of known sources of information on national or regional prices for the Domestic Like Product or the Subject Merchandise in the U.S. or other markets.

(9) If you are a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, provide the following information on your firm’s operations on that product during calendar year 2010, except as noted (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant).

If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. production of the Domestic Like Product accounted for by your firm(s’)

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Domestic Like Product (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix);

(c) the quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s);

(d) the quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s).

(e) the value of (i) net sales, (ii) cost of goods sold (COGS), (iii) gross profit, (iv) selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and (v) operating income of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s) (include both U.S. and export commercial sales, internal consumption, and company transfers) for your most recently completed fiscal year (identify the date on which your fiscal year ends).

(10) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country(ies), provide the following information on your firm’s(s’) operations on that product during calendar year 2010 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars).

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of Subject Merchandise from each Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) imports;

(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of Subject Merchandise imported from each Subject Country; and

(c) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of Subject Merchandise imported from each Subject Country.

(11) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country(ies), provide the following information on your firm’s(s’) production:

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of Subject Merchandise in each Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) production; and

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Subject Merchandise in each Subject Country (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix).

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the Domestic Like Product that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the Subject Merchandise in each Subject Country after 2004, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology.
production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the Domestic Like Product produced in the United States, Subject Merchandise produced in the Subject Country(ies), and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (OPTIONAL) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the Domestic Like Product and Domestic Industry; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission’s rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 23, 2011.

William R. Bishop,

Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.

[FR Doc. 2011–4447 Filed 2–28–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–694]

In the Matter of Certain Multimedia Display and Navigation Devices and Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination To Review-in-Part a Final Determination of No Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review certain portions of the final initial determination (“ID”) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) on December 16, 2010 finding no violation of section 337 in the above-captioned investigation.


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 the instant investigation on December 16, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Pioneer Corporation of Tokyo, Japan and Pioneer Electronics (USA) Inc. of Long Beach, California (collectively, “Pioneer”), 74 FR 66676 (Dec. 16, 2009). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 multimedia display and navigation devices and systems, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 5,365,448 (“the ‘448 patent”), 5,424,951 (“the ‘951 patent”), and 6,122,592 (“the ‘592 patent”). The complaint names Garmin International, Inc. of Olathe, Kansas, Garmin Corporation of Taiwan (collectively, “Garmin”) and Honeywell International Inc. of Morristown, New Jersey (“Honeywell”) as the proposed respondents. Honeywell was subsequently terminated from the investigation, leaving only the Garmin respondents remaining.

On December 16, 2010, the ALJ issued a final ID, including his recommended determination on remedy and bonding. In his final ID, the ALJ found no violation of section 337 by Garmin. Specifically, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe claims 1 and 2 of the ‘448 patent, claims 1 and 2 of the ‘951 patent, or claims 1 and 2 of the ‘592 patent. The ALJ further found that neither Garmin nor the Commission investigative attorney (“IA”) has established that claims 1 and 2 of the ’592 patent are invalid for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 or for failing to comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112. With respect to remedy, the ALJ recommended that if the Commission disagrees with the finding of no violation, the Commission should issue a limited exclusion order directed to multimedia display and navigation devices and systems, and the components of such devices and systems, as well as a cease and desist order. The ALJ recommended that the limited exclusion order contain a certification provision. In addition, the ALJ recommended, in the event that a violation is found, that Garmin be required to post a bond equal to 0.5 percent of the entered value of any accused products that Garmin seeks to import during the Presidential review period.

On January 5, 2011, Pioneer, Garmin, and the IA each filed a petition for review of the ALJ’s final ID. On January 9, 2011, Pioneer filed a consolidated reply to Garmin’s and the IA’s petitions for review. On the same day, Garmin filed a reply to Pioneer’s petition for review and a separate reply to the IA’s petitions for review. Also on the same day, the IA filed a consolidated reply to Pioneer and Garmin’s petitions for review.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ’s final ID and the submissions of the parties, the Commission has determined to review (1) The claim construction of the limitation “second memory means” recited in claim 1 of the ‘951 patent, (2) infringement of claims 1 and 2 of the ‘951 patent, (3) the claim construction of the limitations “extracting means” and “a calculating device” recited in claim 1 of the ‘592 patent, (4) infringement of claims 1 and 2 of the ‘592 patent, (5) validity of the ‘592 patent under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, and (6) the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. No other issues are being reviewed.

The parties should brief their positions on the issues on review with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record. In connection with its review, the Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

1. With respect to claim 1 of the ‘951 patent, does the claimed function of the limitation “second memory means” require “the read display pattern data” stored on the “second memory means” to be in the same data format with “said display pattern data * * * from said