

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN ROBOTIC VACUUM
CLEANING DEVICES AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF SUCH AS
SPARE PARTS**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1057

**NOTICE OF A COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN INITIAL
DETERMINATION GRANTING COMPLAINANT’S MOTIONS TO TERMINATE THE
INVESTIGATION AS TO RESPONDENTS BISSELL HOMECARE, INC. AND
MATSUTEK ENTERPRISES CO., LTD**

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”) (Order No. 34) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) granting complainant’s motions to terminate the investigation as to respondents Bissell Homecare, Inc. (“Bissell”) and Matsutec Enterprises Co., Ltd. (“Matsutec”).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-3115. 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 <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://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 under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337 (“section 337”), on May 23, 2017, based on a complaint filed by iRobot Corporation of Bedford, MA (“iRobot”). 82 F.R. 23592-93 (May 23, 2017). The complaint alleges a violation of section 337 by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,809,490; 7,155,308; 8,474,090; 8,600,553; 9,038,233; and 9,486,924. The complaint named as respondents Bissell Homecare, Inc. of Grand Rapids, MI; Hoover, Inc. of Glenwillow, OH; Royal Appliance Manufacturing Co., Inc. d/b/a

TTI Floor Care North America, Inc. of Glenwillow, OH; Bobsweep, Inc. of Toronto, Canada; Bobsweep USA of Henderson, NV; The Black & Decker Corporation of Towson, MD and Black & Decker (U.S.) Inc. of Towson, MD (collectively, “Black & Decker”); Shenzhen ZhiYi Technology Co., Ltd., d/b/a iLife of Shenzhen, China; Matsutek Enterprises Co., Ltd. of Taipei City, Taiwan; Suzhou Real Power Electric Appliance Co., Ltd. of Suzhou, China; and Shenzhen Silver Star Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen, China. *Id.* at 23593. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party in this investigation. *Id.* Subsequently, the investigation was terminated with respect to respondents Black and Decker. Order No. 31 (Jan. 9, 2018) (*not reviewed*, Notice, Jan. 31, 2018).

On January 16, 2018, complainant iRobot moved to terminate the investigation with respect to all accused products from respondent Bissell under 19 C.F.R. § 210.21(a). On the same day, iRobot moved, in a separate motion, to terminate the investigation with respect to all accused products from respondent Matsutek under 19 C.F.R. § 210.21(b). iRobot explains the terminations are due to iRobot’s entering into a settlement agreement with Matsutek (hereafter “the Agreement”), a supplier of Bissell. *See* Bissell Mot. at 1; Matsutek Mot. at 1.

On January 25, 2018, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 34). The ALJ found that termination of this investigation is in the public interest and will conserve public and private resources. Order No. 34 at 3 (citing *Certain Consumer Elecs., Including Mobile Phones and Tablets*, Inv. No. 337-TA-839, Order No. 35, 2013 WL 453756, *2 (Feb. 4, 2013)). Based on the foregoing, the ALJ granted complainant’s motions. No party petitioned for review of the subject ID, and the Commission has determined not to review it.

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 Part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. Part 210).

By order of the Commission.



Lisa R. Barton
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: February 16, 2018