

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 30, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim McClure, Office of Investigations, telephone 202-205-3191, or David Goldfine, Office of General Counsel, telephone 202-708-5452, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. In June 2006, the Commission determined that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on ball bearings from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission's determinations for Japan and the United Kingdom were appealed to the Court of International Trade (the "Court"). On September 9, 2008, the Court issued a decision remanding the matter to the Commission for further proceedings. *NSK v. United States*, Slip Op. 08-95 (Ct. Int'l Trade, Sept. 9, 2008). In its opinion, the Court issued an order instructing the Commission to (1) "conduct a *Bratsk* analysis of non-subject imports as outlined in this opinion;" (2) "reassess supply conditions within the domestic industry," *i.e.*, the industry's restructuring efforts during the period of review, and (3) "reexamine its findings with regard to likely impact and its decision to cumulate imports from the United Kingdom in light of changes in its determinations that may result as a consequence of the foregoing remand instructions."

On October 8, 2008, in accordance with the Court's order, the Commission initiated remand proceedings in the above-captioned reviews. The notice of initiation for the remand proceeding was published in the **Federal Register** at 73 FR 63217 (Oct. 20, 2008). The Commission noted that it was re-opening the record to obtain information to conduct an analysis of non-subject imports as outlined in the Court's opinion. The Commission also noted that it was permitting parties to file comments pertaining to the specific issues that are the subject of the Court's

remand instructions and to comment on the new information obtained on remand. *Id.*

On October 9, 2008, the Commission filed a motion for reconsideration with the Court. In the motion, the Commission requested that the Court reconsider its decision in light of the Federal Circuit's decision, *Mittal Steel Point Lisas Limited v. United States*, Court No. 2007-1552 (September 18, 2008) ("*Mittal*"). In its motion, the Commission also requested that the Court issue a stay of the remand proceeding pending the Court's disposition of the Commission's motion for reconsideration. Defendant-Intervenor The Timken Company ("*Timken*") filed a similar motion for reconsideration and a motion to stay the remand proceeding.

On October 29, 2008, the Court granted the requests of the Commission and Timken to stay the Commission's remand proceeding pending its reconsideration of the Commission's and Timken's motions for reconsideration. Accordingly, the Commission stayed its remand proceeding on November 17, 2008 pending the Court's ruling on the motions for reconsideration.

On December 29, 2008, the Court denied the motions for reconsideration by the Commission and Timken. The Court has ordered the Commission to file its remand determination with the Court by May 4, 2009. Accordingly, the Commission is hereby resuming the remand proceeding in this review and announcing an amended schedule for the proceeding, as set forth herein.

Participation in the proceeding. Only those persons who were interested parties to the reviews (*i.e.*, persons listed on the Commission Secretary's service list) and parties to the appeal may participate in the remand proceeding. Such persons need not make any additional filings with the Commission to participate in the remand proceeding. Business proprietary information ("*BPI*") referred to during the remand proceeding will be governed, as appropriate, by the administrative protective order issued in the reviews.

Written submissions. The Commission is re-opening the record in this proceeding to obtain information to conduct an analysis of non-subject imports as outlined in the Court's opinion. The Commission will permit the parties to file comments pertaining to the specific issues that are the subject of the Court's remand instructions and, in this regard, may comment on the new information obtained on remand. Comments should be limited to no more

than fifteen (15) double-spaced and single-sided pages of textual material. The parties may not themselves submit any new factual information in their comments and may not address any issue other than those that are the subject of the Court's remand instructions. Any such comments must be filed with the Commission no later than March 23, 2009.

All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, 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 (Nov. 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the remand proceeding must be served on all other parties to the remand proceeding (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Parties are also advised to consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subpart A (19 CFR part 207) for provisions of general applicability concerning written submissions to the Commission.

Issued: January 30, 2009.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E9-2402 Filed 2-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-654]

In the Matter of Certain Peripheral Devices and Components Thereof and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Joint Motion To Terminate the Investigation in Its Entirety on the Basis of Settlement and Terminating 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 an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 4) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) terminating the above-captioned investigation in its entirety based upon a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michelle Walters, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. 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 3, 2008, based on a complaint filed by Microsoft Corp. (“Microsoft”). The complaint alleged 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 peripheral devices, components thereof, and products containing the same by reason of infringement of various claims of seven United States patents. The complaint named Primax Electronics Ltd. (“Primax”) as the sole respondent.

On December 15, 2008, complainant Microsoft and respondent Primax filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement. On December 23, 2008, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion.

On January 5, 2009, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting the joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of the settlement agreement. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is 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 section 210.42 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

Issued: January 29, 2009.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E9-2404 Filed 2-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-605]

In the Matter of Certain Semiconductor Chips With Minimized Chip Package Size and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision To Review in Part a Final Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the presiding administrative law judge’s (“ALJ”) final initial determination (“ID”) issued on December 1, 2008 finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337 in the above-captioned investigation.

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 May 21, 2007, based on a complaint

filed by Tessera, Inc. of San Jose, California against Spansion, Inc. and Spansion, LLC, both of Sunnyvale, California; QUALCOMM, Inc. of San Diego, California; AT1 Technologies of Thornhill, Ontario, Canada; Motorola, Inc. of Schaumburg, Illinois; STMicroelectronics N.V. of Geneva, Switzerland; and Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. of Austin, Texas. 72 FR 28522 (May 21, 2007). 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 semiconductor chips with minimized chip package size or products containing same by reason of infringement of one or more claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,852,326, and 6,433,419.

On December 1, 2008, the ALJ issued his final ID finding no violation of section 337 by Respondents. The ID included the ALJ’s recommended determination on remedy and bonding. In his ID, the ALJ found that Respondents’ accused products do not infringe asserted claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 16-19, 21, 24-26, and 29 of the ‘326 patent. The ALJ also found that Respondents’ accused products do not infringe asserted claims 1-11, 14, 15, 19, and 22-24 of the ‘419 patent. The ALJ additionally found that the asserted claims of the ‘326 and ‘419 patents are not invalid for failing to satisfy the enablement requirement or the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 1. The ALJ further found that the asserted claims of the ‘326 and ‘419 patents are not invalid as indefinite of 35 U.S.C. 112 2. The ALJ also found that the asserted claims of the ‘326 and ‘419 patents are not invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102 for anticipation or under 35 U.S.C. 103 for obviousness. Finally, the ALJ found that an industry in the United States exists with respect to the ‘326 and ‘419 patents as required by 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(2) and (3).

On December 15, 2008, Tessera and the Commission Investigative Attorney (“IA”) filed separate petitions seeking review of the ALJ’s determination concerning non-infringement of the asserted claims of the ‘326 and ‘419 patents. Also on December 15, 2008, Respondents filed various contingent petitions seeking review of certain aspects of the ALJ’s findings as concern both the ‘326 and ‘419 patents in the event that the Commission determines to review the ID’s findings concerning non-infringement. On December 23, 2008, Respondents filed an opposition to Tessera’s and the IA’s petitions for review and Tessera and the IA filed