

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN FIBER-OPTIC
CONNECTORS, ADAPTERS, JUMP
CABLES, PATCH CORDS, PRODUCTS
CONTAINING THE SAME, AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1399

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN INITIAL
DETERMINATION GRANTING A MOTION TO DECLASSIFY DISCOVERY
RESPONSES**

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. 18) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) declassifying certain discovery responses with respect to certain name and address information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Needham, 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 may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <https://www.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: On April 26, 2024, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint, as supplemented, filed on behalf of US Conec, Ltd., of Hickory, North Carolina (“US Conec”). 89 FR 32459-60 (May 24, 2022). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain fiber-optic connectors, adapters, jump cables, patch cords, products containing the same, and components thereof that infringe certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 11,733,466; 11,808,994; 11,906,794; 11,880,075; 11,385,415 and 10,495,823. *Id.* at 32459. The complaint also alleged that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Commission’s notice of investigation names as respondents Senko Advance Co., Ltd. of Yokkaichi City, Japan and Senko Advanced Components, Inc. of Hudson, Massachusetts (together, “the Senko Respondents”); Eaton Corp. of Dublin, Ireland; Tripp Lite Holdings, Inc. of Woodridge, Illinois;

FS.com Inc. of New Castle, Delaware; Infinite Electronics, Inc. of Irvine, California; L-com, Inc. of North Andover, Massachusetts; Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd. of Osaka, Japan; Sumitomo Electric Lightwave Corp. of Raleigh, North Carolina; Sumitomo Electric U.S.A., Inc. of Torrance, California; EZconn Corp. of New Taipei City, Taiwan; Flexoptix GmbH of Darmstadt, Germany; Shenzhen UnitekFiber Solution Ltd. of Shenzhen, China; Hubbell Inc. of Shelton, Connecticut; Hubbell Premise Wiring, Inc. of Shelton, Connecticut; Shenzhen IH Optics Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen, China; Rayoptic Communication Co., Ltd., of Shenzhen, China; and HuNan Surfiber Technology Co., Ltd. of Changsha, China. *Id.* at 32460. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is participating in this investigation. *Id.*

On June 14, 2024, US Conec moved to declassify the Senko Respondents’ interrogatory responses with respect to certain names and addresses on the grounds that the names and addresses of potential respondents are not confidential business information (“CBI”). On June 26, 2024, in its response to the motion, the Senko Respondents contended that the names and addresses are not confidential, but that the relationships between the Senko Respondents and those entities are CBI entitled to confidential treatment. Also on June 26, 2024, OUII filed a response supporting the motion and agreeing that names and addresses are not CBI. On July 1, 2024, US Conec filed a reply clarifying that the motion sought only to declassify certain names and addresses and did not seek to declassify the Senko Respondents’ relationship with those entities.

On July 11, 2024, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting the motion and declassifying name and address information. The ID finds that, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.20(a) (19 CFR 210.20(a)), the Senko Respondents did not establish that the names and addresses were CBI as defined in Commission Rule 201.6(a) (19 CFR 201.6(a)). No petitions for review of the subject ID were received.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on August 16, 2024.

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 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.



Lisa R. Barton
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: August 16, 2024