tamar.khachaturian@usitc.gov) for information specific to this investigation. For information on the legal aspects of these investigations, contact William Gearhart of the Commission's Office of the General Counsel (202–205–3091 or william.gearhart@usitc.gov). The media should contact Margaret O'Laughlin, Office of External Relations (202-205-1819 or margaret.olaughlin@usitc.gov). Hearing-impaired individuals may obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov). 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.

Background: The hearing relates to a report that the Commission is preparing at the request of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1332(g)). The USTR requested that the Commission prepare a report that catalogs trade barriers that U.S. small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) perceive as disproportionately affecting their exports to the EU, compared to those of larger U.S. exporters to the EU. In the request letter, the USTR stated that the United States, in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations with the European Union (EU), is seeking to strengthen the participation of SMEs in transatlantic trade and to address trade barriers that may disproportionately impact small businesses. The notice announcing the institution of this investigation and a hearing on October 8, 2013 was published in the Federal Register of July 30, 2013 (78 FR 45969); the notice is also posted on the Commission's Web site at www.usitc.gov. Due to the lapse in appropriations and resulting furlough, the hearing scheduled for October 8, 2013, did not take place.

Public Hearing: The rescheduled hearing will be held at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC, beginning at 9:30 a.m. on November 20, 2013. Requests to appear at the public hearing should be filed with the Secretary, no later than 5:15 p.m., November 12, 2013, in accordance with the requirements in the "Request to Appear" section below. All pre-hearing briefs and statements should be filed no later than 5:15 p.m., November 13, 2013; and all post-hearing briefs and statements should be filed not later than

5:15 p.m., December 2, 2013. In the event that, as of the close of business on November 12, 2013, no witnesses are scheduled to appear at the hearing, the hearing will be canceled. Any person interested in attending the hearing as an observer or nonparticipant should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000 after November 12, 2013, for information concerning whether the hearing will be held. All hourly times in this notice are eastern time.

Requests to Appear: Requests to appear at the hearing may be in the form of a letter, which should be on company or other appropriate stationery. Requests should identify the name, title, and company or other organizational affiliation (if any), address, telephone number, email address, and industry or main line of business of the company, if any, of the person signing the request letter and of the persons who plan to appear at the hearing. Requests to appear must be made by mail or delivered in person to the Commission's Office of the Secretary (see ADDRESSES), or in the alternative may be filed by email sent to SMEHearing@usitc.gov. The Commission does not accept requests filed by fax.

Written Submissions: In lieu of or in addition to participating in the hearing, interested parties are invited to file written submissions concerning this investigation. Such submissions should be received no later than 5:15 p.m., December 2, 2013. All written submissions must conform to the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.8). Section 201.8 and the Commission's Handbook on Filing Procedures require that interested parties file documents electronically on or before the filing deadline and submit eight (8) true paper copies by 12:00 p.m. on the next business day. In the event that confidential treatment of a document is requested, interested parties must file, at the same time as the eight paper copies, at least four (4) additional true paper copies in which the confidential information must be deleted (see the following paragraph for further information regarding confidential business information). Persons with questions regarding electronic filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any submissions that contain confidential business information (CBI) must also conform to the requirements of section 201.6 of the *Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure* (19 CFR 201.6). Section 201.6 of the rules requires that the cover of the document and the individual pages be clearly marked as to whether they are the

"confidential" or "non-confidential" version, and that the confidential business information is clearly identified by means of brackets. All written submissions, except for confidential business information, will be made available for inspection by interested parties.

In the request letter, the USTR stated that the Office of the USTR intends to make the Commission's report available to the public in its entirety, and asked that the Commission not include any confidential business information or national security classified information in the report that the Commission sends to the USTR. Any confidential business information received by the Commission in this investigation and used in preparing this report will not be published in a manner that would reveal the operations of the firm supplying the information.

Issued: November 1, 2013. By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.
[FR Doc. 2013–26619 Filed 11–6–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-845]

Certain Products Containing Interactive Program Guide and Parental Control Technology; Notice of the Commission's Final Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. 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 (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 June 6, 2012, based on a complaint filed by Rovi Corporation; Rovi Guides, Inc.; Rovi Technologies Corporation; Starsight Telecast, Inc.; United Video Properties, Inc.; and Index Systems, Inc. (collectively, "Complainants"). 77 FR 33487–88. The notice of investigation named LG Electronics, Inc.; LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. (collectively, "LGE"); Mitsubishi Electric Corp.; Mitsubishi Electric US Holdings, Inc.; Mitsubishi Electric and Electronics USA, Inc.; Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.; Mitsubishi Digital Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, "Mitsubishi"); Netflix Inc. ("Netflix"); Roku, Inc. ("Roku"); and Vizio, Inc. ("Vizio") as respondents. Id. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations did not participate in this investigation.

Originally, Complainants asserted numerous claims from seven patents against various respondents. Complainants later moved to terminate the investigation as to three of the seven patents, as to certain claims of one of the remaining four patents, and as to respondents LGE, Mitsubishi, and Vizio. Order No. 9 (Sept. 4, 2012), not reviewed, Oct. 2, 2012; Order No 16 (Nov. 6, 2012), not reviewed. December 7, 2012; Order Nos. 17 (Dec. 19, 2012) and 19 (Dec. 20, 2012), not reviewed, January 18, 2013; Order No. 21 (Jan. 22, 2013), not reviewed Feb. 13, 2013; Order Nos. 34 (Feb. 27, 2013) and 36 (Mar. 1, 2013), not reviewed (Mar. 22, 2013). Netflix and Roku ("Respondents") remain in the investigation, as well as claims 1, 6, 13, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762 ("the '762 patent"), claims 13-20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709 ("the '709 patent"); claims 1-3, 10, and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,906 ("the '906 patent"); and claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 15, 17, and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,776 ("the '776 patent").

On June 7, 2013, the presiding ALJ issued his final initial determination ("ID"), finding no violation of section 337. Specifically, the ALJ found that none of the accused products met the importation requirement of section 337. While the ALJ found that his importation finding was dispositive, he

made additional findings in the event that the Commission determined that the importation requirement was met. The ALJ found that no party infringed any of the four asserted patents. He also found that the '776 patent is invalid as anticipated and obvious, but that Respondents had failed to show that the other three asserted patents were invalid. The ALJ found a domestic industry for articles protected by each of the patents-in-suit, but no domestic industry based on substantial investment in licensing the asserted patents. The ALJ also rejected Respondents' patent misuse, implied license, and patent exhaustion defenses.

On June 24, 2013, Complainants filed a petition for review challenging the ALJ's findings that the importation requirement is not met, that Netflix does not induce infringement, and that the economic prong of the domestic industry is not met by Complainants' licensing activity. That same day, Respondents filed a joint contingent petition for review arguing additional bases for finding no violation. On July 2, 2013, the parties filed oppositions to

each other's petitions.

On August 9, 2013, the Commission determined to review the ID in its entirety. 78 FR 49766-67 (Aug. 15, 2013). The Commission requested written submissions from the parties on seven issues. It also requested submissions on remedy, bonding, and the public interest from the parties and the public. The Commission only received submissions from the Complainants and Respondents.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID and the submissions from the parties, the Commission has determined that Complainants have not proven a violation of section 337. The Commission affirms with modified reasoning the ALJ's finding that the importation requirement is not met for all of the asserted patents. The Commission affirms with modified reasoning the ALJ's finding that the '762, '709, and '906 patents are valid but not infringed, and that the '776 patent is invalid and not infringed. The Commission also determines to modify the ALI's claim construction regarding the order of steps of the asserted claims of the '709 patent, and, under the modified construction, reverses the ALJ's finding that Complainants have shown that the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement has been met for the '709 patent. The Commission also affirms the ALJ's findings that Complainants have shown that a domestic industry exists for the '762, '906, and '776 patents with respect

to articles protected by the patents based on their investments in plant and equipment, labor and capital, research and development, and exploitation of engineering, as set forth in the ID. Accordingly, the Commission need not reach the issue of whether Complainants have also shown that a domestic industry exists based on substantial investments in licensing, and the Commission takes no position on the issue. The Commission also corrects a typographical error on page 49 of the ID. The citation CX-4481C at .10 is corrected to be CX-4145C at .9. All other findings in the ID that are consistent with the Commission's determinations are affirmed. A Commission Opinion will issue shortly.

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 sections 210.45, .49, and .50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.45, .49. and .50).

Issued: November 1, 2013. By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2013-26661 Filed 11-6-13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-892]

Certain Point-to-Point Network Communication Devices and Products Containing the Same Notice of Amendment of the Complaint and Notice of Investigation; Termination of the Investigation as to Two Respondents

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. 2) amending the complaint and notice of investigation in the above-captioned investigation. The amended complaint withdraws two respondents from the investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–2532. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for