

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

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN SEMICONDUCTOR CHIPS
AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME**

Investigation No. 337-TA-753

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DECISION NOT TO REVIEW
TWO INITIAL DETERMINATIONS TERMINATING
RESPONDENTS ON THE BASIS OF A
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

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 determinations ("IDs") (Order Nos. 62 and 63) terminating the above-captioned investigation as to respondent NVIDIA Corp. and its customer respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 708-2532. 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 this investigation on January 4, 2011, based on a complaint filed by Rambus Inc. of Sunnyvale, California ("Rambus"), alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain semiconductor chips and products containing the same. *76 Fed. Reg.* 384 (Jan. 4, 2011). The complaint alleged the infringement of various claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,470,405; 6,591,353; 7,287,109; 7,602,857; 7,602,858; and 7,715,494. The notice of investigation named as respondents Freescale Semiconductor of Austin, Texas; Broadcom Corp. of Irvine, California; LSI Corporation of Milpitas, California;

Mediatek Inc. of Hsin-Chu, Taiwan; NVIDIA Corp. of Santa Clara, California (“NVIDIA”); STMicroelectronics N.V. of Geneva, Switzerland; and STMicroelectronics Inc. of Carrollton, Texas, as well as approximately twenty of their customers.

On February 10, 2012, Rambus and NVIDIA filed a joint motion to terminate NVIDIA from the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. On February 22, 2012, the ALJ granted the motion as an ID. Order No. 62 at 3.

Also on February 10, 2012, Rambus and respondents Biostar Microtech Corp. of City of Industry, California; Biostar Microtech International Corp. of Hsin Tien, Taiwan; Elitegroup Computer System Co., Ltd. of Taipei, Taiwan; EVGA Corporation of Brea, California; Galaxy Microsystems, Ltd. of Kowloon Bay, Hong Kong; Giga-Byte Tech. Co., Ltd. of Hsin Tien, Taiwan; GBT, Inc. of City of Industry, California; Gracom Technologies LLC of City of Industry, California; Jatton Corporation of Fremont, California; Jatton Technology TPE of Hsi-Chih, Taiwan; Micro-Star International Co., Ltd. of Jung-He City, Taiwan; MSI Computer Corp. of City of Industry, California; Palit Microsystems, Ltd. of Taipei, Taiwan; Pine Technology Holdings, Ltd. of North Point, Hong Kong; Sparkle Computer Co., Ltd. of Xizhi City, Taiwan; Nala Sales, Inc. f/k/a Zotac USA, Inc. of City of Industry, California; and Zotac International (MCO), Ltd. of Fo Tan, Hong Kong (collectively “NVIDIA Customer Respondents”) filed a joint motion to terminate the NVIDIA Customer Respondents from the investigation on the basis of Rambus’s settlement with NVIDIA. Rambus and the NVIDIA Customer Respondents argued that good cause exists because the settlement between Rambus and NVIDIA means that none of the accused products of the NVIDIA Customer Respondents are unlicensed. On February 22, 2012, the ALJ granted the motion as an ID. Order No. 63 at 3.

No petitions for review of the IDs were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the IDs.

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 sections 210.21 and 210.42 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 C.F.R. §§ 210.21, 210.42).

By order of the Commission.

/s/
James R. Holbein
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: March 9, 2012