

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
**Washington, D.C. 20436**

**In the Matter of**

**CERTAIN SEMICONDUCTOR CHIPS  
HAVING SYNCHRONOUS DYNAMIC  
RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY  
CONTROLLERS AND PRODUCTS  
CONTAINING SAME**

**Investigation No. 337-TA-661**

**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 investigation by 2 days to May 26, 2010.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul M. Bartkowski, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 708-5432. 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 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 Inv. No. 337-TA-661 on December 10, 2008, based on a complaint filed by Rambus, Inc. of Los Altos, California ("Rambus"). 73 *Fed. Reg.* 75131-2. The complaint, as amended and supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337 ("section 337"), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain electronic devices by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,470,405 ("the '405 patent"); 6,591,353 ("the '353 patent"); 7,287,109 ("the '109 patent"); 7,117,998 ("the '998 patent"); 7,210,016 ("the '016 patent"); 7,287,119 ("the '119 patent"); 7,330,952 ("the '952 patent"); 7,330,953 ("the '953 patent"); and 7,360,050 ("the '050 patent"). The Commission's notice of investigation named the following

respondents: NVIDIA Corporation of Santa Clara, California; Asustek Computer, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; ASUS Computer International, Inc. of Fremont, California; BFG Technologies, Inc. of Lake Forest, Illinois; Biostar Microtech (USA) Corp. of City of Industry, California; Biostar Microtech International Corp. of Hsin Ten, Taiwan; Diablotek Inc. of Alhambra, California; EVGA Corp. of Brea, California; G.B.T. Inc. of City of Industry, California; Gigabyte Technology Co., Ltd. of Taipei, Taiwan; Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, California; MSI Computer Corp. of City of Industry, California; Micro-star International Co., Ltd. of Taipei, Taiwan; Palit Multimedia Inc. of San Jose, California; Palit Microsystems Ltd. of Taipei, Taiwan; Pine Technology Holdings, Ltd. of Hong Kong and Sparkle Computer Co. of Taipei, Taiwan (referred to collectively as “Respondents”).

On July 13, 2009, the Commission issued a notice terminating the ‘119, ‘952, ‘953, and ‘050 patents and certain claims of the ‘109 patent from the investigation.

On January 22, 2010, the ALJ issued his Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 and Recommended Determination on Remedy and Bond (“ID”). The ALJ found that Respondents violated section 337 by importing certain semiconductor chips having synchronous dynamic random access memory controllers and products containing same with respect to various claims of the ‘405, ‘353, and ‘109 patents (“the Barth I patents”). The ALJ determined that there was no violation of section 337 with respect to the asserted claims of the ‘016 and ‘998 patents (“the Ware patents”).

On March 25, 2010, the Commission determined to review (1) the ID’s anticipation and obviousness findings with respect to the Ware patents; (2) the ID’s obviousness-type double patenting analysis regarding the asserted Barth I patents; and (3) the ID’s analysis of the alleged obviousness of the asserted Barth I patents. The Commission invited briefing on the issues under review and on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Rambus, Respondents, and the Commission investigative attorney filed opening and responsive briefs on the issues under review, remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

The Commission has determined to extend the target date for completion of the investigation by 2 days to May 26, 2010.

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.

/s/  
William R. Bishop  
Acting Secretary to the Commission

Issued: May 24, 2010