

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN DIGITAL VIDEO
RECEIVERS AND RELATED
HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE
COMPONENTS**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1103

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW AN INITIAL
DETERMINATION TERMINATING THE INVESTIGATION AS TO U.S. PATENT NO.
9,621,956 AND CERTAIN PATENT CLAIMS OF OTHER ASSERTED PATENTS**

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (the "Commission") has determined not to review a July 2, 2018, initial determination (the "ID") (Order No. 12) terminating the investigation as to U.S. Patent No. 9,621,956 and as to certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,779,011; 7,937,394; 7,827,585; 9,294,799; 9,369,741; 9,578,363; and 9,668,014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Traud, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3427. 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 SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Docket Information System ("EDIS") (<https://edis.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 March 16, 2018, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint filed on behalf of Rovi Corporation of San Jose, CA; Rovi Guides, Inc. of San Jose, CA; Rovi Technologies Corporation of San Jose, CA; and Veveo, Inc. of Andover, MA (collectively, "Rovi"). Supplements to the complaint were filed on February 13, 2018, and February 28, 2018. The complaint alleges 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 digital

video receivers and related hardware and software components by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, and 21-24 of U.S. Patent No. 7,779,011 (“the ’011 patent”); claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,937,394 (“the ’394 patent”); claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,827,585 (“the ’585 patent”); claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16, 18, and 28 of U.S. Patent No. 9,294,799 (“the ’799 patent”); claims 1-3, 5-10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,396,741 (“the ’741 patent”); claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,578,363 (“the ’363 patent”); claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 12, and 14-16 of U.S. Patent No. 9,621,956 (“the ’956 patent”); and claims 1-4, 7-13, and 17-20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,668,014 (“the ’014 patent”). 83 FR 11792 (Mar. 16, 2018). The Commission’s Notice of Investigation named as respondents Comcast Corporation of Philadelphia, PA; Comcast Cable Communications, LLC of Philadelphia, PA; Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC of Philadelphia, PA; Comcast Business Communications, LLC of Philadelphia, PA; Comcast Holdings Corporation of Philadelphia, PA; and Comcast Shared Services, LLC of Chicago, IL. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also named as a party in this investigation. *Id.*

On July 2, 2018, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued Order No. 12, the subject ID, which granted Rovi’s unopposed motion to terminate the investigation as to the ’956 patent; claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the ’011 patent; claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the ’394 patent; claims 3, 4, 10, 17, 18, 24, and 25 of the ’585 patent; claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 28 of the ’799 patent; claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, and 20 of the ’741 patent; claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, and 20 of the ’363 patent; and claims 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, and 20 of the ’014 patent. The ALJ found that granting the motion is in the public interest and that no extraordinary circumstances warrant denying the motion. No party filed a petition seeking review of the subject ID. 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 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: July 24, 2018