

importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain woven textile fabrics and products containing same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–7 of the '790 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(b) whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(A) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, or in the sale of certain woven textile fabrics and products containing same by reason of false advertising, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States; and

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:

AAVN, Inc., 1401 North Central Expressway, Suite 370, Richardson, TX 75080.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

AQ Textiles, LLC, 7622 Royster Road, Greensboro, NC 27455.

Creative Textile Mills Pvt. Ltd., 115/116, Sun Industrial Estate, Sun Mill Compound, Lower Parel (W), Mumbai, Maharashtra 400013, India.

Indo Count Industries Ltd., 301 Arcadia, 3rd Floor, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021 Maharashtra, India.

Indo Count Global, Inc., 295 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1019, New York, NY 10016.

GHCL Limited, B–38, Institutional Area, Sector-1, Noida, Uttar Pradesh 201 301 India.

Grace Home Fashions LLC, 295 Fifth Avenue, Suite 812, New York, NY 10016.

E & E Company, Ltd., Ghodbunder Road, Waghbil Naka, Thane 400 607 Maharashtra, India.

E & E Company, Ltd., d/b/a JLA Home, 45875 Northport Loop East, Fremont, CA 94538.

Welspun Global Brands Ltd., Welspun City, Village Versamedi, Taluka Anjar, District Kutch, Gujarat 370 110, India.

Welspun USA Inc., 295 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1118–1120, New York, NY 10016.

Elite Home Products, Inc., 95 Mayhill Street, Saddle Brook, NJ 07663.

Pradip Overseas Ltd., 104/105, Chacharwadi, Opp. Zydus Cadilla, Sarkhej Bawla Highway, Ahmedabad—382 213, India.

Pacific Coast Textiles, Inc., 12621 Western Avenue, Garden Grove, CA 92841.

Amrapur Overseas, Inc., 12621 Western Avenue, Garden Grove, CA 92841.

Westport Linens, Inc., 230 5th Avenue # 1611, New York, NY 10001.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the second amended complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the second amended complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the second amended complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the second amended complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the second amended complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the second amended complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 15, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–31839 Filed 12–17–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–550 and 731–TA–1304–1305 (Preliminary)]

Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components From Canada and China

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of certain iron mechanical transfer drive components (“IMTDCs”) from Canada and China, provided for in subheadings 8483.30.80, 8483.50.60, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.80, 7325.10.00, 7325.99.10, 7326.19.00, 8431.31.00, 8431.39.00, and 8483.50.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”) and that are allegedly subsidized by the government of China.

Commencement of Final Phase Investigations

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigations. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling, which will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules, upon notice from the Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under sections 703(b) or 733(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determinations are negative, upon notice of affirmative final determinations in those investigations under sections 705(a) or 735(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigations need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigations. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigations.

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Background

On October 28, 2015, TB Wood's Incorporated, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania filed petitions with the Commission and Commerce, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of LTFV imports of IMTDCs from Canada and China and subsidized imports of IMTDCs from China. Accordingly, effective October 28, 2015, the Commission, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)), instituted countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-550 and antidumping duty investigation Nos. 731-TA-1304-1305 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference 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** of November 3, 2015 (80 FR 67789). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on November 18, 2015, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on December 14, 2015. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4587 (December 2015), entitled *Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and China: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-550 and 731-TA-1304-1305 (Preliminary)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 14, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-31779 Filed 12-17-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-932]

Certain Consumer Electronics and Display Devices With Graphics Processing and Graphics Processing Units Therein Commission Decision Not To Review the ALJ's Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Termination of Investigation

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 final initial determination (ID) issued on October 9, 2015, which found no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in this investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Traud, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3427. 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 at <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 based on a complaint filed by NVIDIA Corporation of Santa Clara, California (NVIDIA). The investigation was instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain consumer electronics and display devices with graphics processing and graphics processing units therein by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1, 19, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,488 (the '488 patent); claims 1 29 of U.S.

Patent No. 6,992,667 (the '667 patent); claims 1 5, 7 19, 21 23, 25 30, 34 36, 38, and 41 43 of U.S. Patent No. 7,038,685 (the '685 patent); claims 5 8, 10, 12 20, and 24 27 of U.S. Patent No. 7,015,913 (the '913 patent); claims 7, 8, 11 13, 16 21, 23, 24, 28, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,063 (the '063 patent); claims 1 10, 12, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,209,140 (the '140 patent); and claims 1 6, 9 16, and 19 25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,372 (the '372 patent), and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. 79 FR 61338 (Oct. 10, 2014). Respondents include Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (Republic of Korea); Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (Ridgefield Park, NJ); Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (Richardson, TX); Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. (San Jose, CA); and Qualcomm, Inc. (San Diego, CA) (collectively, Respondents). NVIDIA later withdrew all allegations regarding the '488, '667, '913, and '063 patents and some allegations regarding the '140, '372, and '685 patents.

On October 9, 2015, the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) issued his ID finding no violation by Respondents of section 337 with respect to the remaining allegations. Specifically, regarding the '140 patent, the ID concluded: (1) Claim 14 is invalid for obviousness; (2) the accused products do not infringe; and (3) there is no domestic industry. Regarding the '372 patent, the ID concluded: (1) Claim 23 and claim 24 are invalid for anticipation; (2) some of the accused products infringe claim 23, but none of the accused products infringe claim 24; and (3) there is no domestic industry. Regarding the '685 patent, the ID concluded: (1) Neither claim 1 nor claim 15 are invalid for anticipation; (2) the accused products do not infringe claim 1 or claim 15; and (3) there is a domestic industry. The ID additionally found that the scope of this investigation is limited to consumer electronics and display devices that include graphics processing capabilities and that have graphics processing units therein, rejecting NVIDIA's argument to include Qualcomm graphics processing units separate and apart from the consumer electronic and display devices.

On October 26, 2015, NVIDIA filed a petition for review of the ALJ's findings related to the '372 and '685 patents, and Respondents filed a contingent petition for review of the ALJ's findings related to the '140 and '685 patents. NVIDIA did not seek review of the ALJ's findings related to the '140 patent. On October 30, 2015, the ALJ issued his recommended determination on remedy