

Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2560.

Authority: The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2024).

Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on April 14, 2025, ORDERED THAT—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be 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 products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–20 of the '233 patent; 1–14 of the '252 patent; and 1–19 of the '111 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is “active electrical cables, which are copper cables including high bandwidth connectors, high speed metal conductors, and digital signal support elements such as a digital signal processor (DSP) or retimer, and components thereof”;¹

(3) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties or other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

¹ In this plain English statement of the scope of the investigation, “components thereof” is included pursuant to the allegations in the amended complaint. To the extent that the complainants have included such an allegation based upon a concern regarding specific components, the complainants should, during the course of this investigation, seek adjudication and specifically identify the components of the claimed invention sought for exclusion. The lack of adjudication of specific components, however, would not affect any later ability to adjudicate and remedy circumvention through the importation of components with additional enforcement actions.

(4) 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 complainants are:

Credo Semiconductor Inc., 110 Rio Robles, San Jose, California 95134
Credo Technology Group Ltd., Ugland House, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1–1104

(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:

Amphenol Corporation, 358 Hall Avenue, Wallingford, Connecticut 06492
Molex, LLC, 2222 Wellington Court, Lisle, Illinois 60532
TE Connectivity PLC, Parkmore Business Park West, Parkmore, H91VN2T Ballybrit, Galway, Ireland

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

(5) 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 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 complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the 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 complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the 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 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: April 14, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–06669 Filed 4–17–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1427]

Certain Components for Injection Molding Machines, and Products Containing the Same; Notice of a Commission Determination To Issue a Limited Exclusion Order; 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 to issue a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) barring entry of certain components for injection molding machines, and products containing the same by or on behalf of respondent Ningbo AO Sheng Mold Co., Ltd., d/b/a AOSIMI (“AOSIMI”) previously found to be in default. The investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Lall, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2043. 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, telephone (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 18, 2024, the Commission instituted this investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), based on a complaint filed by Husky Injection Molding Systems Ltd. of Bolton, Ontario, Canada and Husky Injection Molding Systems, Inc. of Milton, Vermont (collectively, “Complainants”). See 89 FR 102953–54 (Dec. 18, 2024). The complaint alleges violations of 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 components for injection molding machines, and products containing the same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,713,891; 11,794,375; 10,093,053; 8,834,149 and 7,645,132 (the “Asserted Patents”). *Id.* at 102953. The Commission’s notice of investigation (“NOI”) named AOSIMI of Yuyao, Zhejiang, China as the sole respondent. *Id.* at 102954. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations was not named as a party.

On January 24, 2025, the Chief Administrative Law Judge issued an order directing AOSIMI to show cause, no later than February 7, 2025, why it should not be found in default for failing to respond to the complaint and NOI. *See* Order No. 5 (January 24, 2025), at 3. AOSIMI did not respond to the order to show cause.

On February 28, 2025, the Commission issued a notice determining AOSIMI to be in default. *See* Order No. 7 (February 14, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice, 90 FR 11437–38 (Feb. 28, 2025) (the “Remedy Notice”). In the same notice, the Commission asked parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. *Id.* On March 14, 2025, Complainants filed a written submission, requesting the Commission to issue a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) and a cease and desist order against AOSIMI. The Commission received no other written submissions in response to the Remedy Notice.

When the conditions in section 337(g)(1)(A)–(E) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)(A)–(E)) have been satisfied, section 337(g)(1) and Commission Rule 210.16(c) (19 CFR 210.16(c)) direct the Commission, upon request, to issue a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both against a respondent found in default, based on the allegations regarding a violation of section 337 in the Complaint, which are presumed to be true, unless after consideration of the public interest factors in section 337(g)(1), it finds that such relief should not issue.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the Complainants’ submission in response to the Remedy Notice, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 337(g)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)), that the appropriate remedy in this investigation is an LEO prohibiting the unlicensed entry of certain components for injection molding machines, and products containing the same by reason

of the infringement of certain claims of the Asserted Patents. The Commission has determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsection 337(g)(1) do not preclude the issuance of the requested LEO. Although Complainants requested the Commission to issue a cease and desist order (“CDO”) directed to AOSIMI, the Commission has determined not to issue the requested CDO because of the lack of evidence or allegations that AOSIMI maintains commercially significant inventories and/or engages in significant commercial operations in the United States.

Chair Karpel agrees that section 337(g)(1) is the appropriate authority for issuance of relief in this investigation but disagrees with the determination not to issue the CDO requested by Complainants. Specifically, Chair Karpel supports issuance of both the requested LEO and the requested CDO against AOSIMI because the criteria for issuance of such relief under section 337(g)(1)(A)–(E) are met as to AOSIMI. (19 U.S.C. 1337(g)(1)(A)–(E); *see* Order No. 7 (February 14, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice, 90 FR 11437–38 (Feb. 28, 2025). Here, in addition to an exclusion order, Complainants have requested a CDO as to AOSIMI in their remedy submission before the Commission. Given that sections 337(g)(1)(A)–(E) are satisfied, in Chair Karpel’s view, the statute directs the Commission to issue the requested CDO, subject to consideration of the public interest. Chair Karpel further finds that the public interest factors enumerated in section 337(g)(1) do not preclude the issuance of the CDO directed to AOSIMI. Accordingly, Chair Karpel supports issuance of the CDO, in addition to the issuance of the LEO discussed above, under section 337(g)(1).

The Commission has further determined that the bond during the period of Presidential review pursuant to section 337(j) (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)) shall be in the amount of one hundred percent (100%) of the entered value of the imported articles that are subject to the LEO.

The investigation is terminated.

The Commission’s vote for this determination took place on April 15, 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: April 15, 2025.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–06719 Filed 4–17–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–755–756 and 731–TA–1734–1736 (Preliminary)]

Chassis and Subassemblies From Mexico, Thailand, and Vietnam

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 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 are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”) and subsidized by the governments of Mexico and Thailand.²

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 § 207.21 of the Commission’s rules, upon notice from the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) of affirmative preliminary determinations in the investigations under §§ 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 §§ 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. Any other party may file an entry of appearance for the final phase of the investigations after publication of the final phase notice of scheduling. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold

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

² 90 FR 13452 and 90 FR 13457 (March 24, 2025).