UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C.  20436

In the Matter of

CERTAIN DIGITAL PHOTO FRAMES  
AND IMAGE DISPLAY DEVICES AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF  

Investigation No. 337-TA-807

NOTICE OF A COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN
INITIAL DETERMINATION FINDING AIPTEK INTERNATIONAL INC. IN
DEFAULT


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. 17) of the presiding
administrative law judge (“ALJ”) finding respondent Aiptek International Inc. (“Aiptek”) of
Hsinchu, Taiwan in default in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:  Clint Gerdine, Esq., Office of the General
Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436,
telephone (202) 708-2310.  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 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 this
matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:  The Commission instituted this investigation on
September 27, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Technical Properties Limited, LLC (“TPL”)
of Cupertino, California.  76 Fed. Reg. 59737-38.  The complaint alleges a violation of section
States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain
digital photo frames and image display devices and components thereof by reason of
infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,976,623; 7,162,549; 7,295,443; and
7,522,424.  The complaint further alleges the existence of a domestic industry.  The
Commission’s notice of investigation named twenty respondents including Aiptek.  The
complaint and notice of investigation were served on Aiptek on September 22, 2011.  Aiptek
failed to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation.
On November 7, 2011, TPL moved, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 210.16, for the following: (1) an order directing respondent Aiptek to show cause why it should not be found in default for failure to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation as required by 19 C.F.R. § 210.13; and (2) the issuance of an ID finding Aiptek in default upon its failure to show cause.

On November 18, 2011, the ALJ issued Order No. 13 which required several respondents, including Aiptek, to show cause no later than December 2, 2011, as to why they should not be held in default and judgment rendered against them pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 210.16. Aiptek responded to the show cause order with a request for an additional two weeks to consider whether to enter into a settlement agreement with TPL or respond to the complainant and notice of investigation.

The ALJ issued Order No. 15 on December 6, 2011. This order, which was served on Aiptek on the same date, provided Aiptek with a two week extension of time, until December 20, 2011, to either move to terminate the investigation as to itself or respond to the complaint and notice of investigation. Order No. 15 made clear that the ALJ would find Aiptek in default if it failed to meet the December 20, 2011 deadline. No response was received from Aiptek to Order No. 15.

The ALJ issued the subject ID on December 22, 2011, finding Aiptek in default, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. §§ 210.13 and 210.16, because it did not respond to the complaint and notice of investigation, or to Order No. 15. No party petitioned for review of the ID pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 210.43(a), and the Commission found no basis for ordering a review on its own initiative pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 210.44.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID. Accordingly, Aiptek has defaulted.


By order of the Commission.

/s/
James R. Holbein
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: January 9, 2012