This document is scheduled to be published in the
Federal Register on 2026-07-07 and available online at
**https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2026-13633**, and on
**https://govinfo.gov**

**BILLING CODE 7020-02**

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

**[Investigation No. 337-TA-1451]**

**Certain Ink Cartridges and Components Thereof I; Notice of a Commission Determination to Review In Part an Initial Determination Granting a Motion for Summary Determination of Violation; Request for Written Submissions on the Issue Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission ("Commission") has determined to review in part an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 16) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting a motion for summary determination of violation. The Commission requests written submissions from the parties on the issue under review and from the parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding, under the schedule set forth below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward S. Jou, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-3316. 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*. 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, telephone (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on June 17, 2025, based upon a complaint filed on behalf of Epson Portland Inc. of Hillsboro, Oregon, Epson America, Inc. of Los Alamitos, California, and Seiko Epson Corporation of Nagano, Japan (collectively, "Complainants"). 90 FR 25643-44 (June 17, 2025). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 ("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 ink cartridges and components thereof by reason of the infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,540,347 ("the '347 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,061,508 ("the '508 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 11,535,037 ("the '037 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 11,820,150 ("the '150 patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 12,246,539 ("the '539 patent"). *Id*. at 25643. The complaint, as supplemented, further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337. *Id*.

The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents: Dongguan Ocbestjet Digital Technology Co., Ltd. d/b/a Ocbestjet of Guangdong, China ("Dongguan Ocbestjet"); Ocbestjet Printer Consumables (HK) Co., Ltd., d/b/a Ocbestjet of Hong Kong ("Ocbestjet HK"); Tatrix International China Co., Ltd. of Guangdong, China ("Tatrix"); Luozhi Trading Co., Ltd. of Guangdong, China ("Luozhi Trading"); Shenzhen Hongxinyuan E-Commerce Co., Ltd., d/b/a Jianjai, d/b/a Vi-US of Guangdong, China; Shenzhen Kaizhen Technology Co., Ltd., d/b/a PayForLess of Guangdong ("Kaizen Tech."), China; Zhuhai Zhenyang Electronics Co., Ltd., d/b/a Oinkwere of Guangdong, China (“Zhenyang Elec.”); Shangrao Shixuan E-Commerce Co., Ltd., d/b/a Inkgo of Jiangxi, China; Zhuhai Hengyunda Electronics Co., Ltd., d/b/a Upriin of Guangdong, China (“Hengyunda Elec.”); Zhuhai Rongtaida Electronics Co., Ltd., d/b/a Hookink of Guangdong, China (“Rongtaida Elec.”); Zhuhai Shi Wei Tai Electronics Co., Ltd., d/b/a Ondula-A of Guangdong, China (“Shi Wei Tai Elec.”); Zhuhai Yixing Electronics Co., Ltd., d/b/a Greenjob USSOP of Guangdong, China (“Yixing Elec.”); Mei Jin Technology HK Co., Ltd., d/b/a YBFeir, d/b/a MJing of Hong Kong (“Mei Jin Tech.”); ZhuHai MeiJiAn Trading Co., Ltd., d/b/a HaloFox of Guangdong, China (“MeiJiAn Trading”); Qiong Wang, d/b/a 7-magic of Guangdong, China; Shen Zhen Sailing Technology Limited, d/b/a Triple-Color of Shenzhen, China; Zhuhai Shuofeng E-commerce Co., Ltd., d/b/a super-ink-club of Guangdong, China (“Shuofeng E-commerce”); Zhuhai Bowang Technology Co., Ltd., d/b/a office-print-club of Guangdong, China (“Bowang Tech.”); Mountain Peak, Inc., d/b/a/Billiontree Technology USA, Inc. (“Mountain Peak”), d/b/a TonerKingdom of City of Industry, California; and Straightouttaink, LP, d/b/a discountinkllc, d/b/a einkshop2014 of San Jose, California (“Straightouttaink”). *Id*. at 25643-44. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) is also a party to this investigation. *Id*. at 25644.

Respondents Shenzhen Hongxinyuan E-Commerce Co., Ltd., Shangrao Shixuan E-Commerce Co., Ltd., Shen Zhen 2 Sailing Technology Limited, and Qiong Wang were terminated from the investigation by withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 12 (Dec. 16, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Jan. 7, 2026).

Respondents Tatrix, Zhenyang Elec., Hengyunda Elec., Rongtaida Elec., Shi Wei Tai Elec., Yixing Elec., Mei Jin Tech., Mountain Peak, Straightouttaink, Dongguan

Ocbestjet, Ocbestjet HK, Luozhi Trading, Kaizhen Tech., MeiJiAn Trading, Shuofeng E-commerce, and Bowang Tech. (the "Defaulting Respondents") have been found in default. Order No. 10 (Sept. 30, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Dec. 5, 2025); Order No. 13 (Dec. 16, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Jan. 8, 2026).

Complainants have withdrawn their allegations as to claims 1, 4, 14, 16-17, and 23 of the '347 patent, claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, and 19 of the '508 patent, claims 9 and 10 of the '037 patent, claims 9-11 and 19-20 of the '150 patent, and claims 2, 9, 11, 18, 20, and 27 of the '539 patent, and these claims have been terminated from the investigation. Order No. 14 (Dec. 18, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (Jan. 8, 2026).

On February 3, 2026, Complainants filed a motion for summary determination of a violation by the Defaulting Respondents by reason of infringement of claims 8, 11, and 20 of the '037 patent, claims 7 and 17 of the '508 patent, claim 1 of the '037 patent, claim 1 of the '150 patent, and claims 1, 10, and 19 of the '539 patent. On February 13, 2026, OUII filed a response in support of Complainants' motion.

On May 15, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 16) granting the motion for summary determination, which included a recommended determination on remedy and bonding. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

Having reviewed the record of the investigation, including the ID, the pleadings, and the parties' briefing on summary determination, the Commission has determined to review the ID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the ID's findings with respect to indirect infringement and the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. The Commission has determined not to review the other findings in the ID.

In connection with its review, the Commission requests responses to the following questions:

1. Identify any evidence in the record that can be used to quantify the number of Domestic Industry Products practicing each Asserted Patent that were manufactured in the United States within the context of the worldwide manufacturing of these products or other record information that would support in numerical terms Mr. Ramsey's statement that "the vast majority of the Domestic Industry Products are manufactured by EPI in the United States". In particular, discuss whether there is information in the exhibits attached to Mr. Ramsey's declaration that can be used to compare the number of Domestic Industry Products practicing each Asserted Patent that were packaged in the United States with the number of those products that were manufactured in the United States, and identify whether there is any other numerical information that would support Mr. Ramsey's statement. How would this information affect the ID's determination that the domestic industry requirement was satisfied under each of subsection (A) and subsection (B)?

2. Were foreign manufacturing costs for Domestic Industry Products manufactured outside the United States considered as part of the significance analysis addressed in footnote 20 of the ID? In your response, please address whether there is any information in the record that could be used to quantify the manufacturing costs for Domestic

Industry Products practicing each Asserted Patent that were manufactured outside of the United States. How would the inclusion or exclusion of such foreign manufacturing costs affect a value-added computation or the overall domestic industry analysis under each of subsection (A) and subsection (B)?

3. Please explain using a holistic analysis of all relevant considerations why based on the record the asserted investments under subsection (A) and separately under subsection (B) are significant, taking into account *inter alia* the amounts invested, the nature and extent of activities in the United States attributable to the amounts invested, the realities of the marketplace at hand, and any quantitative analyses presented to the ALJ that compare the asserted investments to one or more benchmarks and why such benchmarks are relevant or appropriate in establishing the significance of the asserted investments in this investigation under each of subsections (A) and (B).

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the questions above with reference to the applicable law and the existing evidentiary record. No additional briefing will be considered.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the statute authorizes issuance of, *inter alia,* (1) an exclusion order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States; and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843, Comm'n Op. at 7-10 (Dec. 1994).

The statute requires the Commission to consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The public interest factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and cease and desist orders would have on: (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve, disapprove, or take no action on the Commission's determination. *See* Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

*Written Submissions:* The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. In the initial submission, Complainants are also requested to identify the remedy sought and Complainants and OUII are requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainants are further requested to state the date that the asserted patents expire, to provide the HTSUS subheadings under which the accused products are imported, and to supply the identification information for all known importers of the products at issue in this investigation. The initial written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on **July 15, 2026**. All reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on **July 22, 2026**. Opening submissions from the parties are limited to **30** pages. Reply submissions shall be limited to **10** pages. All submissions from third parties and/or interested government agencies are limited to **10** pages. No further submissions on any of these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above pursuant to 19 CFR 210.4(f). Submissions should refer to the investigation number (Inv. No. 337-TA-1451) in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, https://www.usitc.gov/secretary/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary, (202) 205-2000.

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment by marking each document with a header indicating that the document contains confidential information. This marking will be deemed to satisfy the request procedure set forth in Rules 201.6(b) and 210.5(e)(2) (19 CFR 201.6(b) & 210.5(e)(2)). Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. Any non-party wishing to submit comments containing confidential information must serve those comments on the parties to the investigation pursuant to the applicable Administrative Protective Order. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed with the Commission and served on any parties to the investigation within two business days of any confidential filing. All information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel, solely for cybersecurity purposes. All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS

The Commission vote for this determination took place on July 1, 2026.

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 Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR Part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 1, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026-13633 Filed: 7/6/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 7/7/2026]