

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–450 and 731–TA–1122 (Third Review)]

### Laminated Woven Sacks From China

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that revocation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on laminated woven sacks from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

#### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on July 1, 2024 (89 FR 54522) and determined on October 4, 2024, that it would conduct expedited reviews (89 FR 88060, November 6, 2024).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). It completed and filed its determinations in these reviews on February 13, 2025. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 5589 (February 2025), entitled *Laminated Woven Sacks from China: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–450 and 731–TA–1422 (Third Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 13, 2025.

**Lisa Barton,**

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2025–02827 Filed 2–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1370]

### Certain Power Converter Modules and Computing Systems Containing the Same; Notice of the Commission’s Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of the Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has found a violation of section 337 in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has determined to issue: (1) a limited exclusion (“LEO”) prohibiting the unlicensed entry of infringing power converter modules and computing systems containing the same that are manufactured by or on behalf of, or imported by or on behalf of, the respondents; and (2) cease and desist orders (“CDOs”) against certain respondents. The investigation is terminated.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joelle P. Justus, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2593. 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](mailto: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 on (202) 205–1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On August 17, 2023, 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 Vicor Corporation (“Vicor”) of Andover, Massachusetts. See 88 FR 56050–51 (Aug. 17, 2023). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges a violation 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 power converter modules and computing systems containing the same by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,166,481; 9,516,761; and 10,199,950. See *id.* The notice of investigation names the following respondents: Delta Electronics, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; Delta Electronics (Americas) Ltd. of Fremont, California; Delta Electronics (USA) Inc. of Plano, Texas; Cytotec Co., Ltd. of Hsinchu, Taiwan; Quanta Computer Inc. and Quanta Cloud Technology Inc., both of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; Quanta Cloud Technology USA LLC of San Jose, California; Quanta Computer USA Inc. of Fremont, California; Hon Hai Precision Industry Co. Ltd. (d/b/a,

Foxconn Technology Group) of Taipei City, Taiwan; Foxconn Industrial internet Co. Ltd. of Shenzhen, China; FII USA Inc. (a/k/a Foxconn Industrial, internet USA Inc.) of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Ingrasys Technology Inc. of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; and Ingrasys Technology USA Inc. of Fremont, California (collectively, “Respondents”). See *id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also a party to the investigation. See *id.*

On January 25, 2024, the Commission partially terminated the investigation as to respondents Delta Electronics (USA) Inc., Quanta Cloud Technology Inc., and Quanta Cloud Technology USA LLC based on withdrawal of the complaint as to those respondents. See Order No. 16 (Dec. 22, 2023), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Jan. 25, 2024).

On January 26, 2024, the Commission amended the complaint and notice of investigation to add DET Logistics (USA) Corporation of Fremont, California as a respondent. See Order No. 18 (Jan. 2, 2024), *unreviewed by Comm’n Notice* (Jan. 26, 2024).

On March 22, 2024, the ALJ granted in part Respondents’ motion for summary determination of no infringement of any patent under the doctrine of equivalents. See Order No. 37. The Commission determined not to review the partial grant of summary determination. See Comm’n Notice (Apr. 23, 2024).

On September 27, 2024, the ALJ issued the Final ID finding a violation of section 337. The Final ID finds, *inter alia*: (1) as to the ’481 patent, the accused power converter modules manufactured by or on behalf of Cytotec (“Cytotec Products”) infringe asserted claim 1 but that the accused power converter modules manufactured by or on behalf of Delta (“Delta Products”) and certain asserted redesign products do not infringe claim 1, asserted claim 1 is not invalid, and certain asserted domestic industry products practice asserted claim 1; (2) as to the ’761 patent, the accused Delta Products infringe asserted claims 1–7, claims 1–3 and 7 are invalid as anticipated, claims 4–6 are not invalid for obviousness or indefiniteness, and the asserted domestic industry products practice claims 1–7; (3) as to the ’950 patent, the accused Delta and Cytotec Products do not infringe asserted claims 9, 13, 14, and 33–38, the asserted claims are not invalid for obviousness, and the domestic industry products do not practice any asserted claim; (4) Respondents do not have a license to practice the asserted patents; and (5) Vicor has satisfied the domestic industry requirement of section 337

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