INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1512]

Certain Foundry Coke; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainants' Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation and To Terminate the Investigation as to Certain Claims

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. 10) granting Complainants' motion to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation to assert claims 1–5 and 7–13 of U.S. Patent No. 12,600,915 (''the '915 patent'') against Respondents MTX Group a.s., OKK Koksovny, a.s., METALIMEX a.s., METALIMEX Deutschland GmbH, and AMEX Coal Sp. z o.o. (collectively, ''MTX Group''), and Complainants' motion to terminate the investigation as to all asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 12,331,367 (''the '367 patent'') with respect to all Respondents.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Chen, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2392. 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 July 20, 2026, based on a complaint filed on behalf of SunCoke Technology and Development LLC and Jewell Coke Company L.P. (collectively, ''SunCoke''), both of Lisle, Illinois. 91 FR 45,282–283 (July 20, 2026). 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, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain foundry coke by reason of the infringement of certain claims of the '915 patent and the '367 patent. The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by the applicable Federal Statute. The Commission's notice of investigation names the following seven (7) respondents: MTX Group, a.s. of Prague, Czech Republic; OKK Koksovny, a.s. of Ostrava-Přívoz, Czech Republic; METALIMEX a.s. of Prague, Czech Republic; METALIMEX Deutschland GmbH of Duisburg, Germany; AMEX Coal Sp. z o.o. of Sopot, Poland; Italiana Coke S.r.l. of Genova, Italy; and Terminal Alti Fondali Savona S.r.l. of Savona, Italy. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not named as a party in this investigation.

On September 21, 2026, SunCoke filed a motion to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation to assert claims 15 and 7–13 of the '915 patent against Respondents MTX Group and to terminate this investigation in part as to all asserted claims of the '367 patent with respect to all Respondents. No party opposed the motion.

On October 5, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 10) granting SunCoke's motion to amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation to add allegations of infringement of claims 1–5 and 7–13 of the '915 patent against MTX Group and to terminate the investigation in part as to all asserted claims of the '367 patent with respect to all Respondents. The ID found SunCoke demonstrated good cause for amending the Complaint and Notice of Investigation and SunCoke's proposed amendments will not prejudice the public interest or the rights of the parties participating in this investigation. ID at 4. The ID also found the motion is unopposed, complies with the Commission's Rules, and that there are no extraordinary circumstances that prevent terminating the investigation as to all asserted claims of the '367 patent. *Id.* at 4–5. No petitions for review were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The Notice of Investigation shall be amended to add allegations of infringement as to claims 1–5 and 7–13 of the '915 patent against MTX Group. Moreover, all claims, including claims 1–4, 7–10, 12, and 14–21, of the '367 patent are hereby terminated from the investigation.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on November 4, 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: November 4, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–22730 Filed 11–6–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1442]

Certain Glow Fish Tape Systems, Safety Helmet Systems, and Components Thereof; Notice of a Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Order; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission (''the Commission'') has determined that respondent Milwaukee Electric Tool Corporation of Brookfield, Wisconsin (''Milwaukee'') has violated section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by importing, selling for importation, or selling in the United States after importation certain glow fish tape systems and components thereof that infringe claim 6 of U.S. Patent No. 12,187,573 (''the '573 patent''). The Commission has determined that the appropriate remedies are a limited exclusion order (''LEO'') and cease and desist order (''CDO'') against Milwaukee, and that the public interest factors do not preclude issuance of such remedial orders. The Commission has also determined to set a bond in the amount of 100 percent (100%) of the entered value of the covered products imported during the period of Presidential review. This investigation is hereby terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carl Bretscher, 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: On March 19, 2025, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint, as supplemented, filed by Klein Tools, Inc. of Lincolnshire, Illinois (''Klein''), accusing Milwaukee of violating section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''section 337''), by importing into the United States, selling for importation, or selling in the United States after importation certain glow fish tape systems, safety helmet systems, and components thereof by reason of the infringement of the asserted claims of the '573 patent and U.S. Patent Nos. 11,713,209 (''the '209 patent'') and 11,452,327 (''the '327 patent''). 90 FR 12790 (Mar. 19, 2025). The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations did not participate in the investigation. *Id.*

On May 30, 2025, the Commission amended the notice of investigation to include allegations of infringement of certain asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 12,268,265 (''the '265 patent''). Order No. 6 (May 1, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (May 30, 2025). The '265 patent and related '327 patent are collectively referred to as the ''Helmet Patents.'' The '209 patent and related '573 patent are collectively referred to as the ''Glow Fish Tape Patents.''

The Commission subsequently partially terminated the investigation with respect to certain asserted claims of the '327 patent, '209 patent, and '573 patent due to Klein's withdrawal of the complaint with respect to those claims. Order No. 14 (Nov. 20, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Dec. 12, 2025); Order No. 19 (Jan. 5, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Jan. 28, 2026).

On January 20, 2026, the Commission granted Klein's motion for summary determination that it has satisfied the technical and economic prongs of the domestic industry requirement for the Glow Fish Tape Patents. Order No. 17 (Dec. 19, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Jan. 20, 2026).

The presiding Chief Administrative Law Judge (''CALJ'') held an evidentiary hearing from January 5–8, 2026. At the time of the hearing, the asserted claims of the Helmet Patents still at issue were claims 8, 10, and 17 of the '327 patent and claims 1–4 of the '265 patent. The asserted claims of the Glow Fish Tape Patents still at issue were claim 6 of the '209 patent and claim 6 of the '573 patent.

On June 5, 2026, the CALJ issued a final Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 (''FID'') and a Recommendation on Remedy and Bond (''RD''). With respect to the Helmet Patents, the FID finds that: (i) Milwaukee infringed the '265 patent but not the '327 patent; (ii) the asserted claims of the Helmet Patents are not invalid as obvious or for failing the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112; and (iii) Klein has satisfied both the technical and economic prongs of the domestic industry requirement for both Helmet Patents. With respect to the Glow Fish Tape Patents, the FID finds that: (i) Milwaukee did not infringe the '209 patent or '573 patent; (ii) the asserted claims of the Glow Fish Tape Patent are not invalid as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 or for failing the written description requirement; and (iii) Klein has satisfied the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to claim 6 of each Glow Fish Tape Patent (to supplement the CALJ's earlier summary determination that Klein has satisfied both the economic and technical prongs with respect to claims 1 and 5 of the Glow Fish Tape Patents in Order No. 17, *supra*). The FID concludes that Milwaukee has violated section 337 with respect to the '265 patent (a Helmet Patent) but not the '327 patent or either of the Glow Fish Tape Patents.

The RD recommends that, if a violation is found, the Commission issue an LEO and a CDO against Milwaukee. The RD also recommends that the Commission set a bond in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of covered products that are imported during the 60-day period of Presidential review.

On June 22, 2026, both Milwaukee and Klein filed petitions and/or contingent petitions for review of certain adverse findings in the FID. On June 30, 2026, each party filed its respective response to the opposing party's petition.

On July 10, 2026, Klein's counsel submitted a letter to the Commission identifying certain allegedly false statements in Milwaukee's opposition to Klein's petition. On the same date, Milwaukee's counsel submitted a response, to which it attached a copy of a letter to Klein's counsel dated July 8, 2026, explaining why Milwaukee's representations are allegedly correct. Upon review of the letters, the Commission declined to consider them because they are not permissible under the Commission's rules.

The parties did not submit statements concerning the public interest pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4)(i), 19 CFR 210.50(a)(4)(i). The Commission also did not receive any submissions in response to its request for submissions from interested third parties or government agencies on remedy and the public interest factors. 91 FR 43402–03 (July 15, 2026).

On September 9, 2026, the Commission determined to review the FID in part. 91 FR 57383 (Sept. 9, 2026). With respect to the Helmet Patents, the Commission determined to review the FID's findings that: (i) the asserted claims of the '265 patent and '327 patent are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103; and (ii) Klein satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. With respect to the Glow Fish Tape Patents, the Commission determined to review: (i) the construction of the claim term ''wherein at least a portion of the case is configured to allow the luminescent material to be energized by light passing through the portion'' in the '573 patent and related infringement and validity findings; (ii) the FID's finding of non-infringement of the '209 and '573 patents, both literal and under the doctrine of equivalents; and (iii) the FID's finding that the asserted claims of the Glow Fish Tape Patents are not invalid as obvious. The Commission determined not to review, and thereby adopted, the other findings in the FID. The Commission directed the parties to brief certain violation issues on review and remedy, the public interest, and bond.

Pursuant to the Commission's directions, the parties filed their initial responses to the Commission's questions on September 18, 2026, and their respective replies to the opposing party's initial response on September 25, 2026.

Having reviewed the FID, the parties' submissions, and the record below, the Commission has determined to reverse the FID and find that Milwaukee has violated section 337 by importing into the United States, selling for importation, or selling in the United States after importation certain glow fish tape products and components thereof that infringe claim 6 of the '573 patent (a Glow Fish Tape Patent). As further explained in the Commission Opinion issued concurrently herewith, the Commission has also determined to adopt the FID's findings that the asserted claims of the Glow Fish Tape Patents are not invalid as obvious and to adopt, with modifications, the FID's

finding that claim 6 of the '209 patent is not infringed. With respect to the Helmet Patents, the Commission has determined to reverse the FID's finding that Milwaukee has violated section 337 with respect to the '265 patent and to find instead that the asserted claims of the '265 patent are invalid as obvious. The Commission, having previously determined to adopt the FID's finding that the asserted claims of the '327 patent are not infringed (91 FR at 57384), takes no position on whether the '327 patent claims are also invalid as obvious or whether Klein has satisfied the domestic industry requirement with respect to the Helmet Patents.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate remedy is: (i) an LEO prohibiting the importation of certain glow fish tape products and components thereof that infringe claim 6 of the '573 patent; and (ii) a CDO against Milwaukee. The Commission has determined that the public interest factors do not preclude issuance of a remedy. The Commission has set a bond in the amount of 100 percent (100%) of the entered value of infringing products imported during the period of Presidential review (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)).

The Commission issues its opinion herewith setting forth its determinations on certain issues. This investigation is hereby terminated.

The Commission's orders and opinion were delivered to the President and United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on November 4, 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: November 4, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–22768 Filed 11–6–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States of America, et al. v. RealPage, Inc., et al.; Response of the United States to Public Comments

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that the Response of the United States to Public Comments on the Proposed Final Judgment in *United States of America et al.* v. *RealPage et al.,* Civil Action No. 24–cv–00710, regarding Defendant Willow Bridge Property Company, LLC, has been filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, together with the comments. Copies of the public comments and the United States' Response are also available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at *http://www.justice.gov/atr.*

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

In the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Plaintiff, vs. *WILLOW BRIDGE PROPERTY COMPANY, LLC,* Defendant.

No. 1:24–cv–00710

Response of Plaintiff United States to Public Comments on the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (the ''APPA'' or ''Tunney Act''), 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States submits this response to the two public comments received regarding the proposed Final Judgment as to Defendant Willow Bridge Property Company, LLC (Doc. 200–1).[1]

After careful consideration of the submitted comments, the United States continues to believe that the proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint.

After this response and the public comments have been published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to 15 U.S.C § 16(d), the United States will move the Court to enter the proposed Final Judgment.

I. Procedural History

On August 23, 2024, the United States, along with several States (''Plaintiffs''), filed a civil antitrust Complaint against RealPage, Inc. (''RealPage'') (Doc. 1). On January 7, 2025, Plaintiffs amended their civil Complaint (the ''Complaint'') to add Willow Bridge Property Company, LLC (''Willow Bridge'') and five other landlords as Defendants (Doc. 47) alleging that Willow Bridge's agreements with RealPage and other landlords to share information and align pricing violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The Complaint seeks to enjoin Defendants from sharing and exploiting competitively sensitive data.

On July 6, 2026, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment (Doc. 200–1) as to Willow Bridge, which is designed to remedy the loss of competition alleged in the Complaint due to Willow Bridge's conduct, and a Stipulation and Proposed Order (Doc. 200), in which Willow Bridge consented to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act.[2] Also on the same date, the United States filed a Competitive Impact Statement describing the proposed Final Judgment as to Willow Bridge. (Doc. 202)

The United States arranged for the publication of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement in the **Federal Register** on July 16, 2026, see 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(c); 91 FR 43,774 (July 16, 2026), and caused notice regarding the same, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, to be published in the *Washington Post* and the *Greensboro News and Record* from July 14 to July 21, 2026. The 60-day period for public comment has now ended. The United States received two comments in response, which are described below and attached as Exhibits 1 & 2 hereto.

II. The Complaint and The Proposed Final Judgment

The Complaint alleges that, by unlawfully sharing its confidential and competitively sensitive information with RealPage for use in its and competing landlords' pricing, Willow Bridge violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. Under their licensing agreements with RealPage, Willow Bridge and competing landlords have provided RealPage with daily, competitively sensitive, nonpublic information for use in RealPage's revenue management software relating to the landlords' leasing businesses, including details like how many leases have been renewed, for what terms, and at what price. The transactional data that Willow Bridge and other landlords have agreed to provide to RealPage includes current, forward-looking, granular, and highly competitively sensitive information. RealPage has

[1] The United States has redacted personally identifiable information from the comments prior to filing them with this response. If the Court requests unredacted versions, the United States will provide unredacted comments under seal.

[2] The Stipulation and Proposed Order, and the proposed Final Judgment, pertain only to Willow Bridge's conduct. They do not propose to resolve the anticompetitive conduct alleged in the Complaint against any other Defendant. Nor do they resolve the claims of any other Plaintiff besides the United States.