

that infringe certain claims of the '809 patent. The Commission also entered cease and desist orders against several respondents, including defaulting domestic and foreign respondents: Menard, Inc., of Eau Claire, Wisconsin; Garvin Industries, Inc., of Franklin Park, Illinois; Aubuchon Co., Inc., of Westminster, Massachusetts; Westside Wholesale Electric & Lighting, Inc., of Los Angeles, California; New Aspen Devices Corporation, of Brooklyn, New York; American Ace Supply Inc., of San Francisco, California; Contractor Lighting & Supply, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio; Littman Bros. Energy Supplies, Inc. of Schaumburg, Illinois; Safety Plus, Inc., of McFarland, Wisconsin; Norcross Electric Supply Co. of Suwanee, Georgia; Royal Pacific Ltd. of Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Zhejiang Easting House Electric Co. of Zhejiang, China.

On November 1, 2012, the Commission instituted a proceeding for the enforcement of the Commission's remedial orders based on an enforcement complaint filed by Leviton. 77 FR 66080 (Nov. 1, 2012). The enforcement complaint alleged that domestic respondent American Electric Depot Inc. ("AED"); and foreign respondents Shanghai ELE Manufacturing Corp. ("Shanghai ELE"), and Shanghai Jia AO Electrical Co., Ltd. ("Shanghai Jia AO") violated the general exclusion order. The enforcement complaint also alleged that other respondents violated cease and desist orders. On February 14, 2013, the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") issued an initial determination finding AED, Shanghai ELE, and Shanghai Jia AO in default. All other respondents settled. On April 10, 2013, the Commission determined not to review the initial determination with respect to the defaulting respondents.

On April 16, 2013, complainant Leviton filed a motion requesting that the Commission issue (1) a cease and desist order against AED; and (2) seizure and forfeiture orders against ground fault circuit interrupters imported or sold by AED, Shanghai ELE, and Shanghai Jia AO. On April 26, 2013, the Commission investigative attorney ("IA") filed a response supporting Leviton's motion with respect to a cease and desist order against AED. None of the defaulting respondents filed a response.

On May 22, 2013, the ALJ issued a recommended determination ("RD") on remedy. The ALJ drew an inference from AED's refusal to participate in the enforcement proceeding that AED has commercially significant inventories of infringing articles. Accordingly, the ALJ

recommended that the Commission issue a cease and desist order prohibiting AED from selling or distributing infringing articles in the United States. The ALJ declined to recommend seizure and forfeiture orders because he found Leviton failed to show evidence that infringing articles were previously denied entry, as required under Commission Rule 210.75(b)(6)(ii).

On July 31, 2013, the Commission requested briefing on the remedy, bonding and the public interest. On August 16, 2013, the Commission received submissions from Leviton and the IA. The Commission did not receive any comments from the defaulting respondents or the public. On August 30, 2013, the IA filed a reply submission. On September 3, 2013, the IA filed an unopposed motion to file a substitute submission. The Commission hereby grants the IA's motion to file a substitute submission.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief consists of cease and desist orders prohibiting defaulting respondents AED, Shanghai ELE, and Shanghai Jia AO from conducting any of the following activities in the United States: importing, selling, marketing, advertising, distributing, offering for sale, transferring (except for exportation), and soliciting U.S. agents or distributors for ground fault circuit interrupters and products containing the same that infringe one or more of claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-16, 35-37, 39, and 41-46 of the '809 patent. The Commission has determined that there are sufficient allegations in the enforcement complaint of domestic activities by the defaulting respondents to support issuance of cease and desist orders. See *Certain Digital Photo Frames and Image Display Devices and Components Thereof*, Inv. 337-TA-807, Comm'n Op. (March 27, 2013).

The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsection (g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337 (g)(1)) do not preclude issuance of the cease and desist orders. Finally, the Commission has determined to set a bond of \$0.25 per unit for temporary activities otherwise prohibited by the cease and desist orders with respect to the articles in question during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)). The Commission's orders and the record upon which it based its determination were delivered to the President and to the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

The Commission has terminated the investigation. 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.

Issued: December 2, 2013.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-29114 Filed 12-5-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Investigation No. 337-TA-878]

### **Certain Electronic Devices Having Placehifting or Display Replication Functionality and Products Containing Same; Issuance of a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders Against Respondents Found in Default; Termination of Investigation**

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has issued (1) a limited exclusion order against infringing electronic devices and products of respondents Monsoon Multimedia, Inc. of San Mateo, California ("Monsoon") and C2 Microsystems, Inc. of San Jose, California ("C2 Microsystems") (collectively "the Defaulting Respondents"); and (2) cease and desist orders directed against the Defaulting Respondents. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amanda Pitcher Fisherow, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2737. 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 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 April 17, 2013, based on a complaint filed on behalf of Sling Media, Inc. of Foster City, California ("Sling") on March 12, 2013. 78 FR 22899 (April 17, 2013). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,877,776 ("the '776 patent"); 8,051,454 ("the '454 patent"); 8,060,909 ("the '909 patent"); 7,725,912 ("the '912 patent"); 8,266,657 ("the '657 patent"); and 8,365,236 ("the '236 patent"). The notice of investigation named the Defaulting Respondents and Belkin International, Inc. of Playa Vista, California ("Belkin"), as respondents. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating as a party in this investigation.

On May 20, 2013, complainant Sling and respondent Belkin jointly filed a motion to terminate the investigation as to Belkin based on a settlement agreement. On June 5, 2013, the ALJ issued an initial determination ("ID") granting the motion. See Order No. 4 (June 5, 2013). On July 5, 2013, the Commission determined not to review the ID terminating Belkin from the investigation.

On June 11, 2013, the ALJ ordered Monsoon to show cause by June 26, 2013, why it should not be held in default for failing to respond to the Complaint and Notice of Investigation. See Order No. 5 (June 11, 2013). On June 26, 2013, Monsoon did not respond to the show cause order, and instead moved to terminate the investigation based on a consent order. On July 8, 2013, the ALJ issued an ID, finding Monsoon to be in default for failing to respond to the show cause order. See Order No. 7 (July 8, 2013). The ALJ found that Monsoon's motion to terminate on consent was defective and did not respond to the show cause order. *Id.* On July 15, 2013, Monsoon filed a contingent petition for review on the grounds that the ID affects Commission policy. The petition argued that the default finding should be reversed or remanded because Commission policy favors consent orders over default judgments. Additionally, the petition argued that Monsoon believed that its motion to terminate the investigation rendered the show cause order moot. On July 22, 2013, Sling opposed Monsoon's petition. On August 7, 2013, the Commission determined not to review the ID finding Monsoon in default.

On July 11, 2013, the ALJ ordered C2 Microsystems to show cause by July 25, 2013, why it should not be held in default for failing to respond to the Complaint and Notice of Investigation. See Order No. 9 (July 11, 2013). No response to Order No. 9 was filed. On July 29, 2013, the ALJ issued an ID, finding C2 Microsystems to be in default under Commission Rule 210.16. See Order No. 11 (July 29, 2013). On August 15, 2013, the Commission determined not to review the ID finding C2 Microsystems in default. 78 FR 52211 (Aug. 22, 2013). The Commission requested briefing from the parties and the public on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. On August 30, 2013, Sling filed responsive briefing, and submitted a proposed limited exclusion order and proposed cease and desist orders against Monsoon and C2 Microsystems. No other responses to the Commission notice were received.

The Commission finds that the statutory requirements of section 337(g) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)) and Commission rule 210.16(a) (19 CFR 210.16(a)) are met with respect to the Defaulting Respondents. Accordingly, pursuant to section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)) and Commission rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)), the Commission presumes the facts alleged in the complaint to be true and finds that Monsoon and C2 Microsystems are in violation of section 337.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate form of relief in this investigation is a limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed entry of electronic devices having placeshifting or display replication functionality and products containing the same that are manufactured abroad by or on behalf of, or imported by or on behalf of, the Defaulting Respondents by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 18-24, 26, 28-30, 32-40, 42, and 43 of the '776 patent; claims 7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 of the '909 patent; claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-20 of the '454 patent; claims 58-68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 103, 104, 106, and 108 of the '912 patent; claim 81 of the '657 patent; and claims 1-8 and 15-20 of the '236 patent. The Commission has also determined to issue cease and desist orders directed against Monsoon and C2 Microsystems, which prohibit, *inter alia*, the importation, sale, advertising, marketing, and distribution of covered products in the United States by the Defaulting Respondents. The Commission has further determined that the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(f)(1) and (g)(1) (19 U.S.C. §§ 1337(f)(1), (g)(1)) do not preclude issuance of the remedial orders. Finally, the Commission has determined that the

bond for importation during the period of Presidential review shall be in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of the imported subject articles of the Defaulting Respondents. The Commission's order was delivered to the President and the United States Trade Representative on the day of its issuance.

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.

Issued: December 2, 2013.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-29115 Filed 12-5-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

---

## JOINT BOARD FOR THE ENROLLMENT OF ACTUARIES

### Meeting of the Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

**ACTION:** Notice of federal advisory committee meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Executive Director of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries gives notice of a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations (portions of which will be open to the public) in Washington, DC, on January 13-14, 2014.

**DATES:** Monday, January 13, 2014, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Tuesday, January 14, 2014, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patrick W. McDonough, Executive Director of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries, 703-414-2173.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice is hereby given that the Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations will meet at the Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, on Monday, January 13, 2014, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Tuesday, January 14, 2014, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss topics and questions that may be recommended for inclusion on future Joint Board examinations in actuarial mathematics and methodology referred to in 29 U.S.C. 1242(a)(1)(B) and to