

following respondents: Coby Electronics Corp. (“Coby”) of Lake Success, NY; Curtis International LTD (“Curtis”) of Ontario, Canada; E&S International Enterprises, Inc. of Van Nuys, CA; MStar Semiconductor, Inc. of ChuPei Hsinchu Hsien, Taiwan; On Corp US, Inc. of San Diego, California; Renesas Electronics Corporation of Kanagawa, Japan, Renesas Electronics America, Inc. of Santa Clara, California; Sceptre Inc. (“Sceptre”) of City of Industry, California; and Westinghouse Digital, LLC of Orange, California. All respondents except for Coby, Curtis, and Sceptre have been terminated from the investigation.

On June 11, 2012, Vizio and respondent Sceptre filed a joint motion under Commission Rule 210.21(a)(2) to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement that resolves their litigation. On the same day, Vizio and respondent Coby filed a joint motion under Commission Rule 210.21(a)(2) to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement that resolves their litigation. On June 12, 2012, Vizio and Curtis filed a joint motion under Commission Rule 210.21(a)(2) to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement that resolves their litigation. Public and confidential versions of the agreements were attached to the motions. The motions stated that there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties concerning the subject matter of this investigation. The Commission investigative attorney supported the motions. On June 25, 2012, the ALJ issued Order No. 69 granting the joint motion filed by Vizio and Sceptre. On the same day, the ALJ issued Order No. 70 granting the joint motion filed by Vizio and Coby. On June 26, 2012, the ALJ issued Order No. 71 granting the joint motion filed by Vizio and Curtis and terminating the investigation in its entirety. The ALJ found that no extraordinary circumstances exist that would prevent the requested terminations and that the motions fully comply with Commission Rule 210.21. No petitions for review were received.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject IDs. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and Part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR Part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 25, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–18597 Filed 7–30–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 337–TA–741/749]

Certain Liquid Crystal Display Devices, Including Monitors, Televisions, Modules, and Components Thereof; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation as to U.S. Patent No. 6,121,941; Termination of 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 initial determinations (“ID”) (Order No. 31) granting a joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,121,941. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jia Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–4737. 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 Inv. No. 337–TA–741 on October 18, 2010, based on a complaint filed by Thomson Licensing SAS of France and Thomson Licensing LLC of Princeton, New Jersey (collectively “Thomson”). 75 FR. 63856 (Oct. 18, 2010). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended 19 U.S.C. 1337,

by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,121,941 (“the ‘941 patent”); 5,978,063 (“the ‘063 patent”); 5,648,674 (“the ‘674 patent”); 5,621,556 (“the ‘556 patent”); and 5,375,006 (“the ‘006 patent”). The Commission instituted Inv. No. 337–TA–749 on November 30, 2010, based on a complaint filed by Thomson. 75 FR 74080 (Nov. 30, 2010). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 by reason of infringement of various claims of the ‘063, ‘556, and ‘006 patents. On January 5, 2011, the Commission consolidated the two investigations. The respondents are Chimei InnoLux Corporation of Taiwan and InnoLux Corporation of Austin, Texas (collectively, “CMI”); MStar Semiconductor Inc. of Taiwan (“MStar”); Qisda Corporation of Taiwan and Qisda America Corporation of Irvine, California (collectively, “Qisda”); BenQ Corporation of Taiwan, BenQ America Corporation of Irvine, California, and BenQ Latin America Corporation of Miami, Florida (collectively “BenQ”); Realtek Semiconductor Corp. of Taiwan (“Realtek”); and AU Optronics Corp. of Taiwan and AU Optronics Corp. America of Houston, Texas.

On January 12, 2012, the ALJ issued his final ID finding no violation with respect to the ‘941, ‘063, ‘556, and ‘006 patents and a violation with respect to the ‘674 patent. On June 14, 2012, the Commission affirmed the ALJ’s finding of no violation with respect to the ‘063, ‘556, and ‘006 patents. 77 FR 47067 (June 20, 2012). The Commission reversed the ALJ’s finding of violation with respect to the ‘674 patent and remanded the investigation to the ALJ to determine whether the ‘941 patent is anticipated. *Id.*

On July 6, 2012, complainant Thomson and respondents Qisda, BenQ, CMI, Realtek, and MStar filed a joint motion under Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1) to terminate the investigation with respect to the ‘941 patent. The motion stated that there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties concerning the subject matter of this investigation. On July 9, 2012, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the joint motion. The ALJ found that no extraordinary circumstances exist that would prevent the requested termination and that the motion fully complies with Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1). No petitions for review were received.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is terminated in its entirety.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

William R. Bishop,

Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.

[FR Doc. 2012-18671 Filed 7-30-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-852]

Certain Video Analytics Software, Systems, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same Institution of Investigation Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on June 27, 2012, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of ObjectVideo, Inc. of Reston, Virginia. A letter supplementing the complaint was filed on July 9, 2012. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain video analytics software, systems, components thereof, and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,696,945 ("the '945 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,970,083 ("the '083 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,868,912 ("the '912 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 7,932,923 ("the '923 patent"). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

ADDRESSES: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information

on this matter can be obtained 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 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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2012).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on July 24, 2012, *ordered that*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain video analytics software, systems, components thereof, and products containing same that infringe one or more of claims 1-8, 11, 12, 25, 30, 33, and 35-37 of the '945 patent; claims 1-24 and 28 of the '083 patent; claims 12-16 and 18-21 of the '912 patent; and claim 20 of the '923 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: ObjectVideo, Inc., 11600 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 290, Reston, VA 20191.

(b) The respondent is the following entity alleged to be in violation of section 337, and is the party upon which the complaint is to be served: Pelco, Inc., 3500 Pelco Way, Clovis, CA 93612-5999.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge,

U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondent in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)-(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of the respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 25, 2012.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-18595 Filed 7-30-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-12-023]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: August 9, 2012 at 1:00 p.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: None
2. Minutes
3. Ratification List
4. Vote in Inv. No. 731-TA-1189 (Final)(Large Power Transformers from Korea). The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the