

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–253 and 731–TA–132, 252, 271, 273, 532–534, and 536 (Fourth Review)]

Certain Circular Welded Pipe and Tube from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey

Determination

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on certain circular welded pipe and tube from Turkey and revocation of the antidumping duty orders on certain circular welded pipe and tube from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), instituted these reviews on June 1, 2017 (82 FR 25328) and determined on September 5, 2017 that it would conduct expedited reviews (82 FR 49423, October 25, 2017).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on January 18, 2018. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4754 (January 2018), entitled *Circular Welded Pipe and Tube from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–253 and 731–TA–132, 252, 271, 273, 532–534, and 536 (Fourth Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 19, 2018.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–01255 Filed 1–23–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1070]

Certain Periodontal Laser Devices and Components Thereof Termination of Investigation on the Basis of Withdrawal of the Complaint

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 presiding administrative law judge’s (“ALJ”) initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 7), which terminated the investigation on the basis of withdrawal of the complaint.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2532. 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 <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on September 15, 2017, based upon a complaint filed by Millennium Dental Technologies, Inc. of Cerritos, California (“Millennium”). 82 FR 43401, 43402 (Sept. 15, 2017). The complaint alleged 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, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain periodontal laser devices and components thereof by reason of false advertising, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States. 82 FR at 43401. The notice of investigation named as respondents Fotona d.o.o. of Ljubljana, Slovenia, and Fotona, LLC of Dallas Texas (collectively, “Fotona”). The

Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also named as a party.

On December 28, 2017, Millennium moved to terminate the investigation based upon withdrawal of the complaint. The Commission investigative attorney responded in support of the motion. Fotona responded that while it did not oppose termination, it intended to reserve the right to seek sanctions against Millennium.

On January 3, 2018, the presiding ALJ granted the motion as the subject ID. The ID finds that the motion complies with Commission Rules, that no extraordinary circumstances prevent the termination of the investigation, and that termination is in the public interest. ID at 1–2; see 19 CFR 210.21(a)(1).

No petitions for review of the ID were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 19, 2018.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–01295 Filed 1–23–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1049]

Certain Digital Cable and Satellite Products, Set-Top Boxes, Gateways and Components Thereof; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Joint Unopposed Motion To Terminate the Investigation Based on a License Agreement; 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 an initial determination (Order No. 37) granting a joint unopposed motion to terminate the investigation based on a license agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lucy Grace D. Noyola, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

205–3438. 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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 April 18, 2017, based on a complaint filed by Sony Corporation of Tokyo, Japan and Sony Electronics Inc. of San Diego, California (collectively, “Sony”), alleging a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337. 82 FR 18310 (Apr. 18, 2017). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 in the sale for importation, importation and sale after importation of certain digital cable and satellite products, set-top boxes, gateways, and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,467,093; 8,032,919; 6,556,221; 6,915,525; and RE45,126. The notice of investigation names as respondents ARRIS International plc, ARRIS Group, Inc., ARRIS Enterprises LLC, and ARRIS Solutions, Inc., all of Suwanee, Georgia; ARRIS Technology, Inc. of Horsham, Pennsylvania; ARRIS Global Ltd. (formerly Pace Ltd.) of Saitaere, England; and Pace Americas, LLC, Pace Americas Holdings, Inc., Pace USA LLC, and Pace Americas Investments LLC, all of Boca Raton, Florida (collectively, “ARRIS”). *Id.* at 18310–11. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also named as a party. *Id.* at 18311.

On December 15, 2017, Sony and ARRIS filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a patent cross license agreement. On December 18, 2017, OUII filed a response supporting the motion.

On December 27, 2017, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued the subject initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 37), granting the motion. The ALJ found that the cross license agreement is not contrary to the public interest, that good cause has been shown for termination of the investigation, and that termination of

the investigation is in the public interest. No petitions for review of the subject ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 19, 2018.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018–01302 Filed 1–23–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1083]

Certain Personal Computers, Mobile Devices, Digital Media Players, and Microconsoles Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination (Order No. 7) Terminating the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (the “Commission”) has determined not to review a January 2, 2018, initial determination (Order No. 7) (the “ID”) granting a joint motion to terminate this investigation based on a settlement agreement and withdrawal of the complaint. This investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Traud, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3427. 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 (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by

contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202–205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 14, 2017, the Commission instituted this investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), based on a complaint filed by Aqua Connect, Inc. of Orange, CA; and Strategic Technology Partners, LLC of Orange, CA (collectively, “Aqua Connect”). 82 FR 55117, 55117–18 (Nov. 14, 2017). The complaint alleges a violation of section 337 by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. RE46,386 and 8,924,502. The complaint named as a respondent Apple Inc. of Cupertino, CA (“Apple”). The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also a party in this investigation.

On December 20, 2017, Aqua Connect and Apple filed a confidential joint motion to terminate this investigation based on a settlement agreement (the “Agreement”) and withdrawal of the complaint. On December 21, 2017, the private parties filed a public version of this motion. OUII filed a response supporting the motion.

On January 2, 2018, the administrative law judge issued the ID, which grants the motion. The ID finds that the private parties' motion complies with Commission Rule 210.21(b), particularly finding that the parties have provided a confidential and a public version of the Agreement, and also finding that the parties' motion states that “[t]here are no other agreements, written, oral, express or implied, between Aqua Connect and Apple concerning the subject matter of this investigation.” The ID additionally finds that “there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant denying the motion.” The ID further considers the public interest, as is required under Commission Rule 210.50(b)(2), and determines that “there is no evidence indicating that terminating this investigation based on the Agreement would be contrary to the public interest.” Accordingly, the ID grants the motion. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID. This 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 part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.