

States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of chassis and subassemblies from Mexico, Thailand, and Vietnam, provided for in subheadings 8716.39.00 and 8716.90.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”), and imports of the subject merchandise from Mexico and Thailand that have been found to be subsidized by the governments of Mexico and Thailand.^{2 3}

Background

The Commission instituted these investigations effective February 26, 2025, following receipt of petitions filed with the Commission and Commerce by the U.S. Chassis Manufacturers Coalition, whose members are Cheetah Chassis Corporation, Berwick, Pennsylvania and Stoughton Trailers, LLC, Stoughton, Wisconsin. The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of chassis and subassemblies from Mexico and Thailand were subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)) and that imports of chassis and subassemblies from Mexico, Thailand, and Vietnam were sold at LTFV within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission’s investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2025 (90 FR 58054). The Commission conducted its hearing on April 21, 2026. All persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to participate.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to §§ 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on June 8, 2026. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5742 (June 2026), entitled *Chassis and Subassemblies from Mexico, Thailand,*

and Vietnam: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–755–756 and 731–TA–1734–1736 (Final).

By order of the Commission.
Issued: June 8, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–11656 Filed 6–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1441]

Certain Glass Substrate for Liquid Crystal Displays, Products Containing the Same, and Methods for Manufacturing It; Notice of a Commission Determination To Review in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Request for Written Submissions 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 (“Commission”) has determined to review in part a final initial determination (“FID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”), finding a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The Commission requests written submissions from the parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding, under the schedule set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: B. Rashmi Borah, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2518. 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 March 7, 2025, based on a complaint

filed by Corning Incorporated of Corning, New York (“Complainant”). 90 FR 11549–50 (Mar. 7, 2025). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain glass substrates for liquid crystal displays, products containing the same, and methods for manufacturing the same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,642,491 (“the ‘491 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 8,640,498 (“the ‘498 patent”) (together, “the Asserted Patents”), and U.S. Patent No. 7,851,394 (“the ‘394 patent”). *Id.* at 11549. The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry (“DI”) exists. *Id.* The notice of investigation names nine respondents: (1) Caihong Display Devices Co., Ltd., d/b/a Irico Display Devices Co., Ltd. of Xianyang City, Shaanxi Province, China (“Caihong”); (2) Hisense USA Corporation of Suwanee, Georgia; (3) HKC Corporation Ltd. of Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province, China; (4) HKC Overseas Ltd. of Hong Kong; (5) LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. of Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; (6) TCL China Star Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. of Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province, China (“CSOT”); (7) TTE Technology, Inc., d/b/a TCL North America of Irvine, California (“TCL”); (8) VIZIO, Inc. of Irvine, California; and (9) Xianyang CaiHong Optoelectronics Technology Co., Ltd. of Xianyang City, Shaanxi Province, China (“CHOT”). *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not named as a party to this investigation. *Id.*

The Commission previously terminated several respondents from the investigation based on settlement agreements. Order No. 24 (July 15, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Aug. 6, 2025) (HKC Corporation Ltd. and HKC Overseas Ltd.); Order No. 28 (Sept. 10, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Sept. 30, 2025) (VIZIO, Inc.); Order No. 29 (Sept. 30, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Dec. 8, 2025) (LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc.); Order No. 57 (Mar. 24, 2026), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Apr. 20, 2026) (Hisense USA Corporation). Accordingly, four respondents remain in the investigation: Caihong, CSOT, CHOT, and TCL (collectively, “Respondents”).

On December 22, 2025, the Commission terminated the investigation as to the ‘394 patent and claim 2 of the ‘491 patent. Order No. 35

² 91 FR 22140, 91 FR 22130, 91 FR 22131, 91 FR 22136, and 91 FR 22123 (April 24, 2026).

³ Commissioner David S. Johanson dissenting.

(Dec. 2, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm'n* Notice (Dec. 22, 2025).

The ALJ held an evidentiary hearing from January 6 through January 8, 2026. As of the evidentiary hearing, claims 3, 6, 8, and 12 of the '491 patent and claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 of the '498 patent were still at issue.

On April 7, 2026, the ALJ issued the FID, finding a violation of section 337 with respect to each of the remaining asserted claims of the Asserted Patents. Specifically, the FID finds that the "615 Accused Products" infringe all of the remaining asserted claims, but that the "616 Accused Products" do not infringe any of the remaining asserted claims. The FID further finds that the remaining asserted claims are not invalid for indefiniteness, lack of written description, or lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. 112. The FID also finds that the remaining asserted claims are not invalid under 35 U.S.C. 103 for obviousness. The FID further finds that the remaining asserted claims of the '498 patent are not invalid for obviousness-type double patenting. The FID also finds that the Asserted Patents are not unenforceable for inequitable conduct or patent misuse. Finally, the FID finds that Complainant has satisfied both the technical prong and the economic prong of the DI requirement under subsection 337(a)(3)(B).

The FID also includes the ALJ's Recommended Determination ("RD") on remedy and bond, should the Commission find a violation of section 337. The RD recommends issuing a limited exclusion order barring entry of infringing products and also recommends including a standard certification provision. The RD also notes that Complainant requests a cease and desist order against TCL only, but recommends not issuing a cease and desist order against TCL or any other of Respondents. Finally, the RD recommends that the Commission set of a bond rate of zero percent (0%) of the value of infringing articles imported during the period of Presidential review.

On April 20, 2026, Respondents petitioned for review of certain of the FID's findings that the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents are not invalid for indefiniteness and or lack of written description, as well as the FID's finding that the '498 patent is not invalid for obviousness-type double patenting. On April 28, 2026, Complainant submitted a response to Respondents' petition.

On May 7, 2026, Complainant filed a public interest statement pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4), 19 CFR 210.50(a)(4). On May 8, 2026, Respondents submitted their public interest statement pursuant to

Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4), 19 CFR 210.50(a)(4). No submissions were filed in response to the post-RD **Federal Register** notice. See 91 Fed Reg 18478–79 (Apr. 10, 2026).

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the FID, the parties' submissions to the ALJ, and the petition for review and response thereto, the Commission has determined to review the FID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the FID's findings that: (1) the claim term "mole percent on an oxide basis" is not indefinite and (2) Complainant has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under section 337(a)(3)(B).

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the statute authorizes issuance of, *inter alia*, (1) an exclusion order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States; and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337–TA–360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7–10 (Dec. 1994).

The statute requires the Commission to consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The public interest factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and cease and desist orders would have on: (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve, disapprove, or take no action on the Commission's determination. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21,

2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding.

In its initial submission, Complainant is also requested to identify the remedy sought and to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainant is further requested to state the dates that the Asserted Patents expire, to provide the HTSUS subheadings under which the accused products are imported, and to supply the identification information for all known importers of the products at issue in this investigation. All initial written submissions, from the parties and/or third parties/interested government agencies, and proposed remedial orders from the parties must be filed no later than close of business on June 22, 2026. All reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on June 29, 2026. Opening submissions from the parties are limited to 25 pages. Reply submissions from the parties are limited to 10 pages. All submission from third parties and/or interested government agencies are limited to 10 pages. No further submissions on any of these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above pursuant to 19 CFR 210.4(f). Submissions should refer to the investigation number (Inv. No. 337–TA–1441) in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary, (202) 205–2000.

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential

treatment by marking each document with a header indicating that the document contains confidential information. This marking will be deemed to satisfy the request procedure set forth in Rules 201.6(b) and 210.5(e)(2) (19 CFR 201.6(b) & 210.5(e)(2)). Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. Any non-party wishing to submit comments containing confidential information must serve those comments on the parties to the investigation pursuant to the applicable Administrative Protective Order. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed with the Commission and served on any parties to the investigation within two business days of any confidential filing. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 8, 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: June 8, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026-11686 Filed 6-10-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States, et al. v. Taiheiyo Cement Corporation, 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 District of Columbia in *United States of America, et al. v. Taiheiyo Cement Corporation, et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01783-CKK. On May 21, 2026, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition by Taiheiyo Cement Corporation and CalPortland Company of Vulcan Material Company's ready-mix concrete operations in California would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires Defendants to divest: (1) the real property and CalPortland's ready-mix concrete plant in Escondido, California; (2) CalPortland's ready-mix concrete plant in Oceanside, California; (3) a leasehold interest in Vulcan's ready-mix concrete plant in Lakeside, California; (4) leasehold interests in the real property on which the Oceanside Plant and Lakeside Plant are located; (5) fifteen CalPortland ready-mix concrete trucks servicing the Escondido Plant and the Oceanside Plant; and (6) certain licenses, permits, and records relating to the divested plants.

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 District of Columbia. 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 Soyoung Choe, Acting Chief, Defense, Industrials, and Aerospace Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8700,

Washington, DC 20530 (email address: ATR.Public-Comments-Tunney-Act-MB@usdoj.gov).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

United States of America, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530, and, State of California, California Department of Justice, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102, Plaintiffs, v. Taiheiyo Cement Corporation, Bunkyo Garden Gate Tower, 1-1-1, Koishikawa, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan, CalPortland Company, 10655 W Park Run Drive, Suite 275, Las Vegas, NV 89144, and, Vulcan Materials Company, 1200 Urban Center Drive, Birmingham, AL 35242, Defendants. Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-01783 Hon. Colleen Kollar-Kotelly

Complaint

Taiheiyo Cement Corporation ("Taiheiyo"), through its subsidiary CalPortland Company ("CalPortland"), and Vulcan Materials Company ("Vulcan") are two of the leading suppliers of ready-mix concrete in San Diego County, California. Taiheiyo's proposed acquisition of Vulcan's ready-mix concrete operations in California may substantially lessen competition in the market for the production, distribution, and sale of ready-mix concrete in San Diego County in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed acquisition should therefore be enjoined.

I. Nature of the Action

1. Ready-mix concrete is a widely used building material that is essential to building infrastructure, such as bridges, tunnels, and highways; commercial buildings, such as offices, hotels, apartments, skyscrapers, warehouses, and parking structures; and residences, including single-family homes, duplexes, and townhouses. Ready-mix concrete is also used in housing foundations, driveways, patios, and swimming pools.

2. In San Diego County, California, CalPortland and Vulcan are two of the largest producers, distributors, and sellers of ready-mix concrete. Competition between them has ensured lower prices and better quality and service for customers. CalPortland now proposes to acquire Vulcan's competing ready-mix concrete assets in California, including in San Diego County, for approximately \$712 million under the terms of an October 27, 2025 asset purchase agreement.