

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN COLD CATHODE FLUORESCENT
LAMP ("CCFL") INVERTER CIRCUITS AND
PRODUCTS CONTAINING THE SAME**

Inv. No. 337-TA-666

**NOTICE REGARDING ISSUANCE OF FINAL INITIAL DETERMINATION AND
RECOMMENDED DETERMINATION ON REMEDY AND BOND**

(April 19, 2010)

On this date, the undersigned issued an Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 and Recommended Determination on Remedy and Bond in the above-referenced Investigation. Attached are pages 1-3 from said filing, which are a matter of public record. A complete public version of the Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 and Recommended Determination on Remedy and Bond will be issued when all the parties have submitted, and the undersigned has had an opportunity to review, the proposed redactions.

SO ORDERED.


E. James Gildea
Administrative Law Judge

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

CERTAIN COLD CATHODE FLUORESCENT
LAMP ("CCFL") INVERTER CIRCUITS AND
PRODUCTS CONTAINING THE SAME

Inv. No. 337-TA-666

INITIAL DETERMINATION ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337 AND
RECOMMENDED DETERMINATION ON REMEDY AND BOND

Administrative Law Judge E. James Gildea

(April 19, 2010)

Appearances:

For the Complainants O2 Micro International Ltd. and O2 Micro Inc.:

Burt C. Reiser, Esq.; Margaret MacDonald, Esq.; and Mark L. Whitaker, Esq. of Howrey LLP of Washington, D.C.

Henry C. Bunsow, Esq.; K.T. Cherian, Esq.; Duane Mathiowetz, Esq.; and Robert Harkins, Esq. of Howrey LLP of San Francisco, C.A.

For the Respondents ASUSTeK Computer Inc., ASUS Computer International and Monolithic Power Systems, Inc.:

Smith R. Brittingham, IV, Esq.; Amanda L. Blaurock, Esq. of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. of Washington, D.C.

Lionel M. Lavenue, Esq.; Darren M. Jiron, Esq.; and John M. Mulcahy, Esq. of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. of Reston, V.A.

Stephen E. Kabakoff, Esq. of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. of Atlanta, G.A.

Mark A. Flagel, Esq.; Robert Steinberg, Esq.; and Franklin D. Kang, Esq. of Latham & Watkins LLP of Los Angeles, C.A.

Dean G. Dunlavey, Esq. of Latham & Watkins LLP of Costa Mesa, C.A.

For the Respondent Microsemi Corporation:

Joel D. Covelman, Esq. and Paul Kim, Esq. of The Yocca Law Firm, LLP of Irvine, C.A.

Fred T. Grasso, Esq. of Grasso, PLLC of Reston, V.A.

For the Commission Investigative Staff:

Lynn I. Levine, Esq., Director; T. Spence Chubb, Esq., Supervisory Attorney; David O. Lloyd, Esq., Investigative Attorney, of the Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, of Washington, D.C.

Pursuant to the Notice of Investigation, 74 Fed. Reg. 2099 (2009), this is the Initial Determination of the Investigation in the Matter of Certain Cold Cathode Fluorescent Lamp (“CCFL”) Inverter Circuits and Products Containing Same, United States International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-666. *See* 19 C.F.R. § 210.42(a).

With respect to Respondents ASUSTeK Computer Inc. and ASUS Computer International, it is held that no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. § 1337), has occurred in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation, of certain CCFL inverter circuits by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 14 of United States Patent No. 7,417,382.

With respect to Respondent Monolithic Power Systems, Inc., it held that no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has occurred in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation, of certain CCFL inverter circuits by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 14 of United States Patent No. 7,417,382.

With respect to Respondent Microsemi Corporation, it held that no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has occurred in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation, of certain CCFL inverter circuits by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11 of United States Patent No. 7,417,382.

It is further held that a domestic industry does not exist that practices U.S. Patent No. 7,417,382.