

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN PRODUCTS CONTAINING
INTERACTIVE PROGRAM GUIDE AND
PARENTAL CONTROL TECHNOLOGY**

Investigation No. 337-TA-845

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW TWO INITIAL
DETERMINATIONS GRANTING COMPLAINANTS' MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL
TERMINATION OF THE INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN CLAIMS
OF U.S. PATENT NOS. 7,225,455 AND 6,898,762 AND ALL ASSERTED CLAIMS OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,493,643.**

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 two initial determinations ("ID") (Order Nos. 17 and 19) granting motions for partial termination of the investigation with respect to certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,225,455 and 6,898,762, and all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,493,643, respectively.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Chen, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-2392. 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, S.W., Washington, D.C. 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 June 6, 2012, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Index Systems, Inc. of the British Virgin Islands; Rovi Corporation; Rovi Guides, Inc.; Rovi Technologies Corporation; Starsight Telecast, Inc.; and United Video Properties, Inc., all of Santa Clara, California on May 1, 2012. *77 Fed. Reg.* 33487 (June 6, 2012). 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 certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,523; U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762 (“the ’762 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709; U.S. Patent No. 7,103,906; U.S. Patent No. 7,225,455 (“the ’455 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 7,493,643 (“the ’643 patent”); and U.S. Patent No. 8,112,776. The respondents named in the Commission’s notice of investigation are LG Electronics, Inc. of Seoul, Korea; LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Mitsubishi Electric Corp. of Tokyo, Japan; Mitsubishi Electric US Holdings, Inc. of Cypress, California; Mitsubishi Electric and Electronics USA, Inc. of Vernon Hills, Illinois; Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc. of Irvine, California; Mitsubishi Digital Electronics America, Inc. of Irvine, California; Netflix Inc. of Los Gatos, California; Roku, Inc. of Saratoga, California; and Vizio, Inc. of Irvine, California.

On December 19, 2012, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 17) granting complainants’ motion for partial termination of the investigation as to claims 10-18 of the ’455 patent and claims 7 and 12 of the ’762 patent. The ID states that the complainants represent that the respondents do not oppose the motion. The ALJ noted that the complainants satisfied Rule 210.21(a)(1) by representing that there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied that concern the subject matter of the investigation. The ALJ determined that there were no extraordinary circumstances that would prevent the termination requested by the complainants.

On December 20, 2012, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 19) granting complainants’ motion for partial termination of the investigation as to all asserted claims of the ’643 patent. The ID states that the complainants represent that the respondents do not oppose the motion. The ALJ noted that the complainants satisfied Rule 210.21(a)(1) by representing that there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied that concern the subject matter of the investigation. The ALJ determined that there were no extraordinary circumstances that would prevent the termination requested by the complainants.

No petitions for review of either of the two IDs were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the two IDs.

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 C.F.R. § 210.42).

By order of the Commission.



Lisa R. Barton
Acting Secretary to the Commission

Issued: January 18, 2013