

**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 INITIAL
DETERMINATIONS GRANTING MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL TERMINATION OF THE
INVESTIGATION AS TO MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC VISUAL SOLUTIONS AMERICA,
INC., MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORP., LG ELECTRONICS, INC., AND LG
ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC. BASED ON SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS**

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. 34 and 36) granting joint motions for partial termination of the investigation as to respondents Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc., Mitsubishi Electric Corp., LG Electronics, Inc., and LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., based on settlement agreements.

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; U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709; U.S. Patent No. 7,103,906; U.S. Patent No. 7,225,455; U.S. Patent No. 7,493,643; and U.S. Patent No. 8,112,776. The notice of investigation named, among others, Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc., Mitsubishi Electric Corp. (collectively, “Mitsubishi”), LG Electronics, Inc., and LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. (collectively, “LGE”) as respondents.

On February 8, 2013, the complainants and Mitsubishi jointly filed a motion for partial termination of the investigation as to Mitsubishi based on a settlement agreement. The movants represented that the other respondents did not oppose the motion. On February 27, 2013, the ALJ issued the first of the two subject IDs (Order No. 34) granting the motion. The ALJ found that the motion complied with Commission Rules, and was in the public interest. The ALJ noted that the movants satisfied Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1) by filing public and confidential versions of the settlement agreement, and representing that there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between them concerning the subject matter of the investigation.

On February 27, 2013, the complainants and LGE jointly filed an expedited motion for partial termination of the investigation as to LGE based on a settlement agreement. The movants represented that the other respondents did not oppose the termination of LGE from this investigation. On March 1, 2013, the ALJ issued the second of the two subject IDs (Order No. 36) granting the motion. The ALJ found that the motion complied with Commission Rules, and was in the public interest. The ALJ noted that the movants satisfied Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1) by filing public and confidential versions of the settlement agreement, and representing that there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between them concerning the subject matter of the investigation.

No petitions for review of the subject IDs were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the subject 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: March 22, 2013