

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-15-039]

Sunshine Act Meeting**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.**TIME AND DATE:** November 18, 2015 at 11:00 a.m.**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.**STATUS:** Open to the public**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

1. Agendas for future meetings: None.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Vote in Inv. No. 701-TA-530 (Final) (Supercalendered Paper from Canada). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determination and views of the Commission on December 1, 2015.
5. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701-TA-473 and 731-TA-1173 (Review) (Potassium Phosphate Salts from China). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views of the Commission on December 4, 2015.
6. Outstanding action jackets: None. In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

Issued: November 12, 2015.

By order of the Commission.

William R. Bishop,*Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015-29334 Filed 11-12-15; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Investigation No. 337-TA-929]

Certain Beverage Brewing Capsules, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same; Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation; Schedule for Briefing on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.**ACTION:** Notice.**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part a final initial determination

(“ID”) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”), finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337.

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 September 9, 2014, based on a complaint filed by Adrian Rivera of Whittier, California, and Adrian Rivera Maynez Enterprises, Inc., of Santa Fe Springs, California (together, “ARM”). 79 FR 53445-46. The complaint alleges 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 beverage brewing capsules, components thereof, and products containing the same that infringe claims 5-8 and 18-20 of U.S. Patent No. 8,720,320 (“the ‘320 patent”). *Id.* at 53445. The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents Solofill LLC of Houston, Texas (“Solofill”); DongGuan Hai Rui Precision Mould Co., Ltd. of Dong Guan City, China (“DongGuan”); Eko Brands, LLC (“Eko Brands”), of Woodinville, Washington; Evermuch Technology Co., Ltd., of Hong Kong, China and Ever Much Company Ltd. of Shenzhen, China (together, “Evermuch”); Melitta USA, Inc. (“Melitta”), of North Clearwater, Florida; LBP Mfg., Inc. of Cicero, Illinois and LBP Packaging (Shenzhen) Co. Ltd. of Shenzhen, China (together, “LBP”); Spark Innovators Corp. (“Spark”), of Fairfield, New Jersey; B. Marlboros International Ltd. (HK) (“B. Marlboros”) of Hong Kong, China; and Amazon.com, Inc.

(“Amazon”) of Seattle, Washington. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was also named as a party to the investigation. *Id.*

The Commission terminated the investigation with respect to Melitta, Spark, LBP, and B. Marlboros based on the entry of consent orders and terminated the investigation with respect to Amazon based on a settlement agreement. Notice (Dec. 18, 2014); Notice (Jan. 13, 2015); Notice (Mar. 27, 2015); Notice (Apr. 10, 2015). The Commission also found Eko Brands and Evermuch in default for failing to respond to the complaint and notice of investigation. Notice (May 18, 2015). Accordingly, Solofill and DongGuan (together, “Respondents”) were the only respondents actively participating in the investigation at the time of the issuance of the final ID.

On September 4, 2015, the ALJ issued his final ID finding no violation of section 337. The ID found that ARM had established every element for finding a violation of section 337 except for infringement. The ID found that Respondents were not liable for direct infringement because direct infringement required the combination of Respondents’ products with a third-party single serve beverage brewer, and that Respondents were not liable for induced or contributory infringement because they did not have pre-suit knowledge of the ‘320 patent. The ID did find that Respondents’ products directly infringed when combined with a third-party single serve coffee brewer, that the asserted claims have not been shown invalid by clear and convincing evidence, and that ARM satisfied both the technical and economic prongs of the domestic industry requirement. The ALJ also issued his recommendation on remedy and bonding along with his ID.

On September 21, 2015, Complainants petitioned for review of the ID’s findings that Respondents were not liable for induced and contributory infringement because of a lack of pre-suit knowledge, and Respondents petitioned for review of several of the ID’s findings. On September 29, 2015, the parties opposed each other’s petitions, and the Commission Investigative Attorney opposed both petitions.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ’s final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in part. Specifically the Commission has determined to review the following: (1) The ID’s findings on the construction, infringement, and technical prong of the domestic industry requirement for the limitation “a needle-like structure,