

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**In the Matter of**

**CERTAIN SMART TELEVISIONS**

**Investigation No. 337-TA-1420**

**NOTICE OF A COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN INITIAL  
DETERMINATION GRANTING AN UNOPPOSED MOTION TO TERMINATE THE  
INVESTIGATION AS TO CERTAIN ASSERTED CLAIMS**

**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 the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 11) granting an unopposed motion to terminate the investigation as to all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 11,924,502 ("the '502 patent").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. 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](mailto: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, telephone (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 27, 2024, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint filed by Maxell, Ltd. of Kyoto, Japan ("Maxell"). 89 FR 79,307-08 (Sept. 27, 2024). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 based on the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain smart televisions by reason of infringement of one or more of claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 8,549,109; claims 7-11 of U.S. Patent No. 11,451,860; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 10,958,971; and claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 22 of the '502 patent. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named the following respondents: TCL Electronics Holdings Ltd. (f/k/a TCL, Multimedia Technology Holdings, Ltd.) of New Territories, Hong Kong; TCL Industries Holdings Co., Ltd. of Guangdong, China; T.C.L. Industries Holdings (H.K.) Limited of New Territories, Hong Kong; TTE Technology, Inc. (d/b/a TCL North America) of Corona, California; TTE Corporation of New Territories, Hong Kong; TCL King Electrical Appliances, (Huizhou) Co. Ltd. of Huizhou, China; Manufacturas Avanzadas S.A. de C.V. of Juarez, Mexico; TCL Smart Device (Vietnam) Co., Ltd. of Binh Duong Province, Vietnam; Shenzhen TCL New Technology Co., Ltd. of Nanshan, China; TCL Optoelectronics

Technology (Huizhou) Co., Ltd. of Huizhou, China; TCL Overseas Marketing Ltd. of New Territories, Hong Kong; and TCL Technology Group Corporation, (f/ k/a TCL Corp.) of Huizhou, China. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) was also named as a party in this investigation. *Id.*

On March 25, 2025, Maxell filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to all asserted claims of the ’502 patent. Maxell stated that the respondents do not oppose the motion. On April 4, 2025, OUII filed a response in support of the motion.

On April 7, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 11) granting the motion. The ID noted that Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1) provides that “[a]ny party may move at any time prior to the issuance of an initial determination on violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate an investigation in whole or in part as to any or all respondents, on the basis of withdrawal of the complaint or certain allegations contained therein . . . .” ID at 1-2. The ID found that the motion complies with Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1), and that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant denying the motion. *Id.* at 2. The ID further found that, in accordance with Commission Rule 210.21(a), the motion states that apart from a joint discovery stipulation in this investigation, “there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied between the parties concerning the subject matter of the Investigation.” *Id.* No one petitioned for review of the ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is hereby terminated as to all asserted claims, claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 22, of the ’502 patent.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on April 29, 2025.

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: April 29, 2025