INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–630]

In the Matter of Certain Semiconductor Chips With Minimized Chip Package Size and Products Containing Same (III); Notice of the Commission’s Final Determination of No Violation of Section 337; Termination of the Investigation


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that there has been no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in this investigation, and has terminated the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Panyin A. Hughes, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436; and Modular Technologies, Inc. of Fremont, CA. The ’681 patent was terminated from the investigation prior to the hearing.

On August 28, 2009, the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued his final Initial Determination (“ID”), finding no violation of section 337 by Respondents with respect to any of the asserted claims of the asserted patents. Specifically, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’106 patent. The ALJ also found that none of the cited references anticipates the asserted claims and that none of the cited references renders the asserted claims obvious. The ALJ further found that the asserted claims of the ’106 patent satisfy the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first, second and fourth paragraphs. Likewise, the ALJ found that the accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’977 and ’627 patents and that none of the cited references anticipates the asserted claims of the patents. The ALJ further found that the asserted claims of the ’977 and ’627 patents satisfy the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that Respondents waived their argument with respect to obviousness. The ALJ also found that all chips Respondents purchased from Tessera licensees were authorized to be sold by Tessera and, thus, Tessera’s rights in those chips became subject to exhaustion, but that Respondents, except Elpida, did not purchase all their chips from Tessera licensees.

On September 17, 2009, Tessera and the Commission investigative attorney filed petitions for review of the ID. That same day, Respondents filed contingent petitions for review of the ID. On the parties’ exs pec ted responses to the various petitions and contingent petitions for review.
On October 30, 2009, the Commission determined to review the final ID in part and requested briefing on several issues it determined to review, and on remedy, the public interest and bonding. 74 FR 57192 (Nov. 4, 2009). The Commission determined to review (1) the finding that the claim term “top layer” recited in claim 1 of the ’106 patent means “an outer layer of the chip assembly upon which the terminals are fixed,” the requirement that “the ‘top layer’ is a single layer,” and the effect of the findings on the infringement analysis, invalidity analysis and domestic industry analysis; (2) the finding that the claim term “thereon” recited in claim 1 of the ’106 patent requires “disposing the terminals on the top surface of the top layer,” and its effect on the infringement analysis, invalidity analysis and domestic industry analysis; (3) the finding that the Direct Loading testing methodology employed by Tessera’s expert is unreliable; and (4) the finding that the 1989 Motorola OMPAC 68-pin chip package fails to anticipate claims 17 and 18 of the ’977 patent. Id.

On November 13, 2009, the parties filed written submissions on the issues under review, remedy, the public interest, and bonding. On November 20, 2009, the parties filed response submissions on the issues on review, remedy, the public interest and bonding.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ’s final ID, the Commission has determined that there is no violation of section 337. Specifically, the Commission has determined to (1) modify the ALJ’s construction of the claims terms “top layer” and “thereon” recited in claim 1 of the ’106 patent; (2) reverse the ALJ’s finding that the accused wBGA products do not meet all of the limitations of the asserted claims of the ’106 patent but affirm his finding that there is no infringement due to patent exhaustion; (3) affirm the ALJ’s finding that the accused wBGA products do not infringe the asserted claims of the ’106 patent; (4) affirm the ALJ’s validity and domestic industry analyses pertaining to the asserted claims of the ’106 patent; (5) affirm the ALJ’s finding that the Direct Loading testing methodology employed by Tessera’s expert fails to prove infringement; and (6) affirm the ALJ’s finding that the 1989 Motorola OMPAC 68-pin chip package fails to anticipate claims 17 and 18 of the ’977 patent under the on-sale bar provision of 35 U.S.C. 102(b), but modify a portion of the ID.


By order of the Commission.
Issued: December 29, 2009.
Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E9–31253 Filed 1–4–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–687]

In the Matter of: Certain Authentication Systems, Including Software and Handheld Electronic Devices; Notice of Investigation


ACTION: Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.


The complaint requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: The complaint and supplement, except for any confidential information contained therein, are 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 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.


Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on December 29, 2009, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of authentication systems, including software and handheld electronic devices, that infringe one or more of claims 31–35, 38, 41, 51, 54, 56, 58, 59, 61, 87–92, 95, 98, 109–113, 115, 117, 119–126, 129–132, 143–145, 149, 150, 152–159, 164–167, 178–180, and 184–187 of U.S. Patent No. 7,290,288, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is: Prism Technologies LLC, 2323 South 171st Street, Suite 106, Omaha, Nebraska 68130.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served: Research In Motion, Ltd., 295 Phillip Street, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 2W6. Research In Motion Corp., 122 W. John Carpenter Parkway, Suite 430, Irving, Texas 75039.

(c) The Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation, is Vu Q. Bui, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and