

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN GYRO-STABILIZED ELECTRIC
UNICYCLES AND COMPONENTS
THEREOF AND PRODUCTS
CONTAINING THE SAME**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1488

**NOTICE OF A COMMISSION DETERMINATION NOT TO REVIEW
AN INITIAL DETERMINATION GRANTING A JOINT MOTION
TO TERMINATE THE INVESTIGATION AS TO RESPONDENT INMOTION
TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD. D/B/A INMOTION BASED ON SETTLEMENT**

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 a joint motion to terminate respondent Inmotion Technologies Co., Ltd. d/b/a Inmotion ("Inmotion") from the above-identified investigation based on a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, 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: The Commission instituted this investigation on March 5, 2026, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Inventist, Inc. of Camas, WA and Alien Technology Group, Inc. d/b/a Alien Rides. of San Francisco, CA (collectively, "Complainants"). 91 FR 10,827 (Mar. 5, 2026). The complaint, as amended, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain gyro-stabilized electric unicycles and components thereof and products containing the same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,807,250 and the claim of U.S. Patent No. D729,698. *Id.* The complaint, as amended, further alleged that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by the applicable Federal Statute. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named the following respondents:

Inmotion; Guangzhou Veteran Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a LeaperKim; Dong Guan BEGODE Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a BEGODE; Shenzhen King Song Intelligence Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a Kingsong; Guangzhou JiDongTai Intelligent Equipment Co., Ltd. d/b/a Nosfet, all of Guangdong, China. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) was also named as a party in this investigation. *Id.*

On May 12, 2026, Complainants and Respondent Inmotion moved to terminate Inmotion from the investigation based on a settlement agreement between Complainants and Inmotion. *See* Order No. 11 at 1 (May 21, 2026). Additionally, Complainants and Inmotion moved to limit service of the agreement. *Id.* That same day, the ALJ issued Order No. 9, finding the motion did not comply with Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1) because “the public version of the Motion was redacted in its entirety, in violation of Commission Rule 210.21(b)(1).” Order No. 9 at 1 (May 12, 2026; *see* 19 CFR 210.21(b)(1)). The ALJ directed Complainants and Inmotion to file an amended public version of the agreement. Order No. 9 at 2. On May 18, 2026, an amended public version of the agreement was filed. Thereafter, OUII filed a statement in support of the motion.

On May 21, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 11), granting the joint motion to terminate the above-captioned investigation as to Inmotion based on a settlement agreement. The ID found the motion with the amended public version of the settlement agreement complies with the Commission Rules. Order No. 11 at 3-4. The ID also found that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant denying the motion and there is no evidence indicating that terminating this investigation based on the agreement would be contrary to the public interest. *Id.* at 4. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. Respondent Inmotion is terminated from the investigation.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 18, 2026.

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: June 18, 2026