

terminated the investigation with a finding of no violation of section 337 due to the finding that the claims are invalid as indefinite and thus cannot be infringed.

On April 18, 2025, Google filed a Petition for Reconsideration and Petition for Review of the ALJ's Initial Determination Granting Motion for Summary Determination Based on Indefiniteness. Google argued that it did not receive timely service of the ID and, thus, did not have the opportunity to file a timely petition for review of the ID. Google attached its petition for review to its petition for reconsideration.

On April 25, 2025, Sonos filed a response to Google's petition for reconsideration. While noting that the ID was publicly available and that Google only implied it did not have actual notice of the ID, Sonos took no position on Google's motion for reconsideration. Sonos also asked for eight days to respond to Google's petition for review if its motion for reconsideration were granted.

On May 27, 2025, the Commission granted Google's petition for reconsideration, vacated its previous determination of April 8, 2025, and reopened the investigation to consider Google's petition for review. Comm'n Notice (May 27, 2025). The Commission accepted Google's petition for review as filed, gave Sonos eight days to respond to Google's petition for review, and reinstated the investigation's previous target date of July 7, 2025.

Sonos timely filed its response to Google's petition for review on June 5, 2025.

Upon consideration of Order Nos. 37 and the ID, Google's petition for review, Sonos's response thereto, and related submissions, the Commission has determined to adopt the ID's finding that the asserted claims of the '330 patent and '398 patent are invalid because the term "low power mode" is indefinite. Accordingly, the Commission finds there is no violation of section 337, per 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)(B)(1) (requiring infringement of a valid claim for a finding of violation). The Commission previously vacated the ID's termination for "good cause." Comm'n Notice (Apr. 8, 2025). There is no basis in either Commission precedent or the Commission's rules to terminate an investigation based on a PTAB final written decision that may still be appealed. See *Certain Network Devices, Related Software and Components Thereof (II)*, Inv. No. 337-TA-945, Comm'n Op. at 12 (Aug. 2017) (explaining that "the law is clear that patent claims are valid until the PTO

issues certificates cancelling those claims, which it cannot do until the exhaustion of any appeals. . . . take[n] from the PTAB's final written decisions").

The investigation is terminated based on the finding of no violation.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 7, 2025.

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: July 7, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025-12789 Filed 7-9-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1418]

Certain Cochlear Implant Systems and Components Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation by Settlement; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission ("Commission") has determined not to review an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 20) issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting the parties' joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of settlement. The investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carl P. Bretscher, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2382. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.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 23, 2024, based on a complaint filed by Advanced Bionics AG of Stafa, Switzerland and Advanced Bionics LLC of Valencia, California (collectively "Advanced Bionics"). 89 FR 77541-42 (Sept. 23, 2024). The complaint, as supplemented, 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, sale for importation, or sale in the United States after importation of certain cochlear implant systems and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain asserted claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,317,945 ("the '945 patent") and 8,422,706 ("the '706 patent"). *Id.* The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation names MED-EL Corporation, USA of Durham, North Carolina and MED-EL Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH of Innsbruck, Austria. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations ("OUII") was also named as a party to this investigation. *Id.*

On April 21, 2025, the Commission partially terminated the investigation with respect to asserted claims 3, 5-8, 15-18, and 22 of the '945 patent and asserted claims 3, 7-9, 14, 17, and 18 of the '706 patent, pursuant to Advanced Bionics's unopposed motion to withdraw the complaint for those claims under Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1), 19 CFR 210.21(a)(1). Order No. 13 (Apr. 7, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Apr. 21, 2025).

On May 30, 2025, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a confidential settlement agreement. On June 6, 2025, OUII filed a response in support of the joint motion for termination.

On June 12, 2025, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 20) granting the parties' joint motion to terminate the investigation. The subject ID finds that, apart from the parties' confidential settlement agreement, there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between the parties concerning the subject matter of this investigation, in accordance with Commission Rule 210.21(a), (b), 19 CFR 210.21(a)(b). The subject ID also finds that termination of the specified claims of the '945 and '706 patents would not have any adverse impact on the public interest and would conserve public and private resources.

No party filed a petition for review of the subject ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The investigation is hereby terminated.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 7, 2025.

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: July 7, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025-12780 Filed 7-9-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co., et al.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in *United States of America v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co. and Juniper Networks, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 5:25-CV-00951-PCP (N.D. Cal.). On January 30, 2025, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company's ("HPE") proposed acquisition of Juniper Networks, Inc. ("Juniper") would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed on June 27, 2025, requires HPE to divest the HPE Instant On campus and branch business and license the source code for Juniper's Mist AI Ops software.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be

posted on the Antitrust Division's website, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be submitted in English and directed to Civil Chief, San Francisco Office, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Room 10-0101, Box 36046, San Francisco, CA 94102 or ATR.Public-Comments-Tunney-Act-MB@usdoj.gov.

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

Michael J. Freeman (OH BAR #0086797),
Senior Litigation Counsel.

Jeremy M. Goldstein (CA Bar #324422),
Trial Attorney, United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (212) 213-2774, Fax: (202) 514-5847, Email: Michael.Freeman@usdoj.gov.

[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

Attorneys for Plaintiff, United States of America

In the United States District Court Northern District of California

United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co. and Juniper Networks, Inc., Defendants.

Case No. 5:25-CV-00951-PCP

Complaint

1. The United States of America brings this civil action to prevent Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company ("HPE") from acquiring a smaller, but innovative rival, Juniper Networks, Inc. ("Juniper"). HPE and Juniper are the second- and third-largest providers of commercial or "enterprise" wireless networking solutions, respectively, in the United States. The acquisition, if consummated, would result in two companies—market leader Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco") and HPE—controlling well over 70 percent of the U.S. market and eliminate fierce head-to-head competition between Defendants, who offer wireless networking solutions under the HPE Aruba and Juniper Mist brands.

2. For years, pressure from Juniper has forced HPE to discount deeply and invest in developing advanced software products and features as part of a multifaceted campaign to "Beat Mist." The "Beat Mist" campaign failed. Having failed to beat Juniper's Mist on the merits, HPE seeks to acquire Juniper instead for \$14 billion. This proposed acquisition risks substantially lessening competition in a critically important technology market and thus poses the precise threat that the Clayton Act was enacted to prevent. It should be blocked.

Introduction

3. Wireless networking technology is critical in the modern workplace. Millions of Americans today create and share company resources and access the internet from wireless-enabled devices. Retail employees wirelessly process payments and log inventory. Doctors access medical records on phones and tablets and track patient care on the go. University students take notes on their laptops and access course materials from classrooms, dorm rooms, and school libraries. As mobile technology has improved and more services have migrated to the cloud, wireless networking technology in the workplace has become even more essential. Today, it is the primary means by which many employees connect to their employer's computer network and the internet.

4. Providing companies with commercial wireless networking technology is itself a big business. Every year, enterprises, including public and private companies, state and local agencies, and non-profit organizations, spend billions of dollars buying wireless networking solutions for their offices, stores, factories, and warehouses. Those solutions are built around wireless access points, which send and receive data via radio signals and are wired to networks through devices called campus switches. Enterprise-grade wireless networking solutions can simultaneously serve a larger number of users and support feature sets and functionalities more advanced than the consumer-grade wireless systems that most Americans have in their homes. Because many workplaces deploy a large number of access points—sometimes thousands across a single corporate campus—network administrators rely on sophisticated network management hardware and software to monitor and control them. By contrast, consumer-grade wireless networking systems that individuals purchase for their homes are generally managed device-by-device, and they often do not include systems for linking and managing multiple access points from a single location.

5. Enterprise-grade wireless networking solutions generally include wireless access points; the separate hardware or advanced software systems to monitor and manage them; and related logistical support, including security updates and patches (collectively, "enterprise-grade WLAN solutions"). Today, the market for those solutions in the United States is highly consolidated: market-leader Cisco and Defendants collectively represent over 70 percent of it. For years, Cisco and