

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN MOBILE TELEPHONES AND
WIRELESS COMMUNICATION DEVICES
FEATURING DIGITAL CAMERAS, AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF**

**Inv. No. 337-TA-703
(Remand)**

Notice Regarding Initial Determination On Remand on Violation of Section 337

(May 21, 2012)

On this date, I issued an Initial Determination On Remand on violation of section 337 in the above-referenced investigation. Attached are the first page and the conclusions of law from said filing, which are a matter of public record. A complete public version of the Initial Determination On Remand will issue when all the parties have submitted their redactions and I have had an opportunity to review the redactions.

SO ORDERED.

Thomas B. Pender
Administrative Law Judge

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN MOBILE TELEPHONES AND
WIRELESS COMMUNICATION DEVICES
FEATURING DIGITAL CAMERAS, AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF**

Inv. No. 337-TA-703
(Remand)

INITIAL DETERMINATION ON REMAND ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337

Administrative Law Judge Thomas B. Pender

(May 21, 2012)

Pursuant to the Notice of Investigation and Rule 210.42(a) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the United States International Trade Commission, this is my Initial Determination on Remand in the matter of Certain Mobile Telephones and Wireless Communication Devices Featuring Digital Cameras, and Components Thereof, No. 337-TA-703.

I hereby reaffirm on remand that no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has been found in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile telephones and wireless communication devices featuring digital cameras, and components thereof, in connection with claim 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,218.

VI. Conclusions of Law

1. The accused Apple iPhone 3G infringes claim 15 of the '218 patent.
2. The accused Apple iPhone 3GS and iPhone 4 do not infringe claim 15 of the '218 patent.
3. The accused RIM products infringe claim 15 of the '218 patent.
4. Claim 15 of the '218 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness.
5. Apple has not violated 19 U.S.C. § 1337(a)(1) with respect to the '218 patent.
6. RIM has not violated 19 U.S.C. § 1337(a)(1) with respect to the '218 patent.