

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN INK CARTRIDGES AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF**

Inv. No. 337-TA-565

**Consolidated Enforcement Proceeding and
Enforcement Proceeding II**

**NOTICE OF A COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN INITIAL
DETERMINATION FINDING THREE RESPONDENTS IN DEFAULT**

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 (“ID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) in the above-captioned proceeding finding three respondents in default, and to have waived their respective rights to appear, to be served with documents, and to contest the allegations at issue in the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Haldenstein, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-3041. Copies of all nonconfidential 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, D.C. 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<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 the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted the underlying investigation in this matter on March 23, 2006, based on a complaint filed by Epson Portland, Inc. of Oregon; Epson America, Inc. of California; and Seiko Epson Corporation of Japan (collectively, “Epson”). 71 *Fed. Reg.* 14720 (March 23, 2006). The complaint, as amended, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (“section 337”) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain ink cartridges and components thereof by reason of infringement of claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 5,615,957; claims 18, 81, 93, 149, 164, and 165 of U.S. Patent No. 5,622,439; claims 83 and 84 of U.S. Patent No. 5,158,377; claims 19 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 5,221,148; claims 29, 31, 34, and 38 of U.S. Patent No. 5,156,472; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,488,401; claims 1-

3 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,917; claims 1, 31, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,902; claims 1, 10, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,955,422; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,008,053; and claims 21, 45, 53, and 54 of U. S. Patent No. 7,011,397. The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. The complainants requested that the Commission issue a general exclusion order and cease and desist orders. The Commission named as respondents 24 companies located in China, Germany, Hong Kong, Korea, and the United States. Several respondents were terminated from the investigation on the basis of settlement agreements or consent orders or were found in default.

On October 19, 2007, after review of the ALJ's final ID, the Commission made its final determination in the investigation, finding a violation of section 337. The Commission issued a general exclusion order, a limited exclusion order, and cease and desist orders directed to several domestic respondents. The Commission also determined that the public interest factors enumerated in 19 U.S.C. § 1337(d), (f), and (g) did not preclude issuance of the aforementioned remedial orders, and that the bond during the Presidential period of review would be \$13.60 per cartridge for covered ink cartridges. Certain respondents appealed the Commission's final determination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("Federal Circuit"). On January, 13, 2009, the Federal Circuit affirmed the Commission's final determination without opinion pursuant to Fed. Cir. R. 36. *Ninestar Technology Co. et al. v. International Trade Commission*, Appeal No. 2008-1201.

On February 8, 2008, Epson filed two complaints for enforcement of the Commission's orders pursuant to Commission rule 210.75. Epson proposed that the Commission name five respondents as enforcement respondents. On May 1, 2008, the Commission determined that the criteria for institution of enforcement proceedings were satisfied and instituted consolidated enforcement proceedings, naming the five following proposed respondents as enforcement respondents: Ninestar Technology Co., Ltd.; Ninestar Technology Company, Ltd.; Town Sky Inc.; Mipo America Ltd.; and Mipo International, Ltd. On March 18, 2008, Epson filed a third enforcement complaint against two proposed respondents: Ribbon Tree USA, Inc. (dba Cana-Pacific Ribbons) and Apex Distributing Inc. On June 23, 2008, the Commission determined that the criteria for institution of enforcement proceedings were satisfied and instituted another formal enforcement proceeding naming the two proposed respondents as the enforcement respondents. On September 18, 2008, the ALJ issued Order No. 37, consolidating the two proceedings.

On November 7, 2008, Epson filed a motion pursuant to Commission rules 210.16 and 210.75 for an order directed to three of the enforcement respondents (Mipo International Ltd., Ribbon Tree USA, Inc. (dba Cana-Pacific Ribbons) and Apex Distributing Inc.) to show cause why they should not be found in default. The Commission investigative attorney supported the motion. None of the respondents filed a response to the motion. The ALJ issued a show cause order (Order No. 46) on December 12, 2008. The order required the three respondents to show cause why they should not be held in default, having not responded to the complaint and notice of investigation or the motion for a show cause order. None of the three respondents responded to Order No. 46.

On January 9, 2009, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 48) finding the three respondents in default pursuant to Commission rules 210.16 and 210.75. No petitions for review of the ID were filed, and 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 sections 210.16 and 210.75 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. §§ 210.16 and 210.75).

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: February 5, 2009