

Optoelectronics Co., Ltd. of Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, China; Chengdu BOE Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. of Chengdu, China; Chongqing BOE Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. of Chongqing, China; Wuhan BOE Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. of Wuhan, China; BMOT f/k/a Kunming BOE Display Technology of Yunnan Dianzhong New Area, China; and BOE Technology America Inc. of Santa Clara, California (collectively, “Respondents”). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is participating in the investigation. *Id.*

On June 17, 2025, the Commission amended the complaint and notice of investigation to reflect the change in the name of respondent BMOT to Yunnan Insight Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. Order No. 63 (May 27, 2025); *unreviewed by* Notice (June 17, 2025).

On October 23, 2024, the ALJ granted in part SDC’s motion *in limine* 1, precluding Respondents from introducing any argument or evidence that the manufacturing processes for Respondents’ micro-OLED products materially differ from their main OLED lines. That same day, the ALJ also granted in part SDC’s motion for sanctions based on spoliation of evidence, imposing certain non-monetary sanctions against Respondents (collectively, “the ALJ’s Sanctions Orders”).

On July 11, 2025, the ALJ issued the FID finding a violation of section 337. Specifically, the FID found that Respondents misappropriated the asserted trade secrets under the category of TS I, TS II, TS IV, and TS VII, but that Respondents did not misappropriate the asserted trade secret under the category TS III. The FID also found that the statute of limitations provision in the Defense Trade Secret Act, 35 U.S.C. 1836(d), (“DTSA SOL”) is inapplicable to section 337 investigations and, even if applicable, Respondents failed to show that the DTSA SOL would time-bar SDC’s claims of trade secrets misappropriation. Lastly, the FID found that a DI exists, and that the threat or effect of Respondents’ trade secrets misappropriation is to substantially injure that DI or to prevent the establishment of such an industry in the United States.

On September 11, 2025, the Commission issued a notice determining to review the FID in part and requesting written submissions on the issues under review, and on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. 90 FR 45959 (Sept. 24, 2025). Specifically, the Commission determined to review (1)

the ALJ’s Sanctions Orders, (2) the FID’s findings with respect to the applicability of the DTSA SOL, and (3) the FID’s findings with respect to the existence of a DI and injury or threat of injury thereto and the prevention of the establishment of such an industry in the United States. The Commission determined not to review the remainder of the FID.

On November 17, 2025, SDC and Respondents filed a joint motion to stay and terminate the investigation based on settlement pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21(b), 19 CFR 210.21(b). The motion included as an attachment a confidential settlement agreement. The motion also stated that there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties, and that it is in the interest of the public and administrative economy to grant the motion.

On November 25, 2025, SDC and Respondents filed a revised joint motion. The revised motion includes as attachments the same confidential settlement agreement included with the earlier filed motion on November 17, 2025, as well as a redacted public version of the settlement agreement. The revised motion likewise states that there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties, and that it is in the interest of the public and administrative economy to grant the motion.

On November 28, 2025, OUII filed its response supporting the joint motion to terminate the investigation, as revised. OUII states that the settlement agreement appears to fully resolve the dispute between SDC and Respondents concerning the subject matter of this investigation, and the motion complies with the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21(b), 19 CFR 210.21(b). OUII also states that it is not aware of any information that terminating this investigation would be contrary to the public interest, and “[t]he public interest generally favors termination of an investigation when it will avoid needless litigation and conserve public and private resources,” as is the case here. OUII response at 5.

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the FID and the parties’ submissions, the Commission has determined to grant the joint motion to terminate the investigation based on settlement. The Commission has determined to take no position with respect to the FID’s findings under review. *See Beloit Corp. v. Valmet Oy*, 742 F.2d 1421, 1423 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The investigation is hereby terminated in its entirety.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on January 5, 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.

Issued: January 5, 2026.

Susan Orndoff,

Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2026–00099 Filed 1–7–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; Hearing of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules; notice of cancellation of open hearing.

SUMMARY: The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure has been canceled: Bankruptcy Rules Hearing on January 30, 2026.

DATES: January 30, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carolyn A. Dubay, Esq., Chief Counsel, Rules Committee Staff, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle NE, Suite 7–300, Washington, DC 20544, Phone (202) 502–1820, RulesCommittee_Secretary@ao.uscourts.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The announcement for this hearing was previously published in the **Federal Register** on July 14, 2025 at 90 FR 31242.

(Authority: 28 U.S.C. 2073.)

Dated: January 6, 2026.

Shelly L. Cox,

Management Analyst, Rules Committee Staff.

[FR Doc. 2026–00159 Filed 1–7–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules; Hearing of the Judicial Conference

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States.