UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of	
CERTAIN DIGITAL VIDEO RECEIVERS AND RELATED HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COMPONENTS	**Inv. No. 337-TA-1103**

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF INITIAL DETERMINATION ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337

Administrative Law Judge MaryJoan McNamara

(June 4, 2019)

I have issued today in this Investigation the Final Initial Determination ("ID") on Violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337 ("Section 337").

I have found that Complainants Rovi Corporation, Rovi Guides, Inc., Rovi Technologies Corporation, and Veveo, Inc. ("Rovi"), have proven by a preponderance of evidence that Respondents Comcast Corporation, Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC, Comcast Business Communications, LLC, Comcast Holdings Corporation, and Comcast Shared Services, LLC (collectively, "Comcast"), have violated subsection (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 digital video receivers and related hardware and software components.

I have found that Comcast has infringed asserted claims 1 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,779,011 ("the '011 patent"), and also that claims 1 and 9 of the '011 patent are valid.

I have found that Comcast has infringed asserted claims 1, 8, 11, 15, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,827,585 ("the '585 patent"), but that claims 1, 8, 11, 15, and 22 of the '585 patent

are invalid.

I have found that Comcast has not infringed asserted claims 1, 8, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 9,369,741 ("the '741 patent"), and that claims 1, 8, and 14 of the '741 patent are valid.

I have found that one or more of Rovi's domestic industry products have satisfied the technical industry prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to the '011 and '585 patents, but not with respect to the '741 patent.

I have found that Rovi has satisfied the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under Section 337(a)(3)(A), (a)(3)(B), and (a)(3)(C). 19 U.S.C. § 1337 (a)(3)(A), (a)(3)(B), and (a)(3)(C).

I have recommended the issuance of both a Limited Exclusion Order ("LEO") together with a Cease and Desist Order ("CDO"). I have found that Rovi has not met its burden of proof that a bond should issue during the Presidential Review Period

SO ORDERED.

MaryJoan McNamara
Administrative Law Judge

CERTAIN DIGITAL VIDEO RECEIVERS AND RELATED HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE COMPONENTS **Inv. No. 337-TA-1103**

PUBLIC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lisa R. Barton, hereby certify that the attached **NOTICE** has been served by hand upon the Commission Investigative Attorney, **John Shin, Esq.** and the following parties as indicated, on JUN - 4 2019

Lisa R. Barton, Secretary
U.S. International Trade Commission
500 E Street, SW, Room 112
Washington, DC 20436

On Behalf of Complainants Rovi Corporation, Rovi Guides, Inc., and Rovi Technologies Corporation, Veveo, Inc.:

Douglas A. Cawley, Esq.
MCKOOL SMITH P.C.
Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201

- ☐ Via Hand Delivery
- ☑ Via Express Delivery
- ☐ Via First Class Mail
- ☐ Other:_____

On Behalf of Respondents Comcast Corporation, Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC, Comcast Business Communications, LLC, Comcast Holdings Corporation, and Comcast Shared Services, LLC:

Bert C. Reiser, Esq.
LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 100
Washington, DC 20004

- ☐ Via Hand Delivery
- ☑ Via Express Delivery
- ☐ Via First Class Mail
- ☐ Other:_____