

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.**

In the Matter of)

CERTAIN ENCAPSULATED)
INTEGRATED CIRCUIT DEVICES AND)
PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME)

Inv. No. 337-TA-501

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION TO EXTEND THE TARGET DATE
FOR COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION**

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to extend the target date for completion of the above-captioned investigation to July 1, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clara Kuehn, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202-205-3012. 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, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<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 under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. § 1337 ("section 337"), on December 19, 2003, based on a complaint filed by Amkor Technology, Inc. ("Amkor") alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain encapsulated integrated circuit devices and products containing same in connection with several claims of three U.S. patents owned by Amkor. The complainant named Carsem (M) Sdn Bhd; Carsem Semiconductor Sdn Bhd; and Carsem, Inc. (collectively, "Carsem") as respondents.

The Commission has been unable to complete this investigation because of ongoing efforts to enforce a Commission subpoena to obtain certain documents that Carsem asserts are critical for certain of its defenses. On June 7, 2004, the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued Order No. 63 granting Carsem’s motion to certify to the Commission a request for judicial enforcement of a subpoena *duces tecum* and *ad testificandum*, which was issued on February 11, 2004, and directed to ASAT, Inc. (“ASAT”), a non-party to this investigation. On August 11, 2004, the Commission filed a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (“the District Court”) seeking to enforce the subpoena. The District Court granted the petition on December 1, 2004, and ordered ASAT to comply with the subpoena. *United States Int’l Trade Comm’n v. ASAT, Inc.*, 355 F. Supp. 2d 67 (D.D.C. 2004). On January 26, 2005, ASAT filed an appeal of the District Court’s decision with the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (“the D.C. Circuit”).

Meanwhile, on November 18, 2004, the ALJ issued a final initial determination (“Final ID”) finding no violation of section 337. After reviewing the Final ID in its entirety, the Commission on March 31, 2005, modified the ALJ’s claim construction and remanded the investigation to the ALJ.

On June 10, 2005, the D.C. Circuit issued its decision in the ASAT subpoena enforcement matter. *See United States Int’l Trade Comm’n v. ASAT, Inc.*, 411 F.3d 245 (D.C. Cir. 2005). While the D.C. Circuit upheld the jurisdiction and venue of the District Court, it held *inter alia*, that “the ALJ’s factual findings and the record are insufficient to support a determination as a matter of law that ASAT, Inc. has control of the subpoenaed documents.” *See ASAT*, 411 F.3d at 252-56. Accordingly, the D.C. Circuit reversed the D.C. District Court’s decision to enforce the subpoena. *Id.* at 256. However, the D.C. Circuit stated that the Commission may instruct the ALJ “to reopen the record to allow further evidence and, based on modified findings by the ALJ, to bring a separate petition for enforcement . . .” *Id.*

On July 1, 2005, Carsem filed a “Motion for Leave to Reopen the Record to Permit Evidence and Briefing Regarding ASAT, Inc.’s Control over the Documents of its Parent and Affiliate Companies.” On July 26, 2005, the Commission granted Carsem’s motion and issued an order remanding the matter to the ALJ to receive additional evidence and to make further findings consistent with the June 10, 2005, opinion of the D.C. Circuit on the question of whether ASAT has the requisite control over the subpoenaed documents. Commission Order of July 26, 2005 at 4. On September 8, 2005, the ALJ issued Order No. 102, finding that ASAT has the requisite control of the subpoenaed documents. On November 17, 2005, the Commission filed a second petition for enforcement of the subpoena with the District Court.

On November 9, 2005, the ALJ issued a Remand ID and a recommended determination on remedy and bond. He found a violation of section 337 with regard to four claims of one patent, but found no violation in connection with the claims of the two other asserted patents. All the parties to the investigation filed comments and response comments on the Remand ID.

On January 9, 2006, respondent Carsem filed a motion to extend the target date in the investigation. On February 9, 2006, the Commission issued an Order granting in part Carsem's motion "to the extent that the target date for completion of this investigation is extended to a date that is three (3) months after completion of the pending ASAT, Inc. subpoena enforcement proceeding in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia." Order of February 9, 2006 at 4.

In an Opinion and Order signed July 1, 2008, the District Court granted the Commission's petition for an order to enforce the subpoena to ASAT. On September 5, 2008, ASAT filed a notice of appeal with the D.C. Circuit appealing the District Court's Order.

On September 30, 2008, the Commission extended the target date for completion of the investigation to February 2, 2009. On December 31, 2008, ASAT moved to voluntarily dismiss its appeal. On January 9, 2009, the D.C. Circuit issued its order of dismissal.

On January 21, 2009, Carsem filed a motion to extend the target date and to remand the investigation to the ALJ. On January 28, 2009, the Commission extended the target date for completion of the investigation to May 1, 2009. On February 2, 2009, the Commission investigative attorney ("IA") and Amkor each filed responses to Carsem's motion. On February 5, 2009, Carsem withdrew its motion to extend the target date and to remand the investigation.

On April 20, 2009, Carsem filed a renewed motion to extend the target date and to remand the investigation to the ALJ.

The Commission has determined to extend the target date for completion of the above-captioned investigation to July 1, 2009. The Commission expects the parties to complete briefing on Carsem's motion to remand. *See* section 210.15 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. § 210.15).

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 section 210.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. § 210.51).

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: April 28, 2009